

# Village of Lombard

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



## Meeting Agenda

**Thursday, November 18, 2010**

**7:30 PM**

**Village Hall Board Room**

### **Village Board of Trustees**

*Village President: William J. Mueller*

*Village Clerk: Brigitte O'Brien*

*Trustees: Greg Gron, District One; Keith Giagnorio, District Two;*

*Zachary Wilson, District Three; Peter Breen, District Four;*

*Laura Fitzpatrick, District Five; and Bill Ware, District Six*

**I. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance****II. Roll Call****III. Public Hearings****IV. Public Participation**[100579](#)

President's Community Service Award

Request to present the President's Community Service Award to Craig Kuelzo.

**Attachments:** [100579.pdf](#)

*Pam Bedard nominated Craig Kuelzo of Lombard Pharmacy to receive the President's Community Service Award. Bedard indicated that he went above and beyond in customer service and related that when her kids were babies, Craig went out of his way to deliver medicine to her house. His customer service efforts were praised and attested to by other Committee members.*

[100644](#)

Proclamation - Dane Cuny Day

**Attachments:** [proccuny2010.doc](#)**V. Approval of Minutes****VI. Committee Reports****Community Relations Committee - Trustee Laura Fitzpatrick, Chairperson****Economic/Community Development Committee - Trustee Bill Ware, Chairperson****Environmental Concerns Committee - Trustee Dana Moreau, Chairperson****Finance Committee - Trustee Zachary Wilson, Chairperson****Public Works Committee - Trustee Greg Gron, Chairperson****Transportation & Safety Committee - Trustee Keith Giagnorio, Chairperson****Board of Local Improvements - Trustee Greg Gron, President****Community Promotion & Tourism - President William J. Mueller, Chairperson****Lombard Historical Commission - Clerk Brigitte O'Brien****VII. Village Manager/Village Board Comments**

## VIII Consent Agenda

.

### Payroll/Accounts Payable

- A. [100622](#) Approval of Accounts Payable  
For the period ending November 5, 2010 in the amount of \$1,724,534.93.
- B. [100635](#) Approval of Village Payroll  
For the period ending November 12, 2010 in the amount of \$845,583.37.
- C. [100636](#) Approval of Accounts Payable  
For the period ending November 12, 2010 in the amount of \$180,551.79.

### Ordinances on First Reading (Waiver of First Requested)

- D. [060590](#) PC 06-28: 300 West 22nd Street (Covington/Cove Landing Planned Development)  
Granting a fourth 12-month time extension to Ordinance 5950, as amended by Ordinances 6112, 6277 and 6413 for the property located at 300 W. 22nd Street and known as the Hunter's Woods Development. (DISTRICT #3)

**Attachments:** [APO Letter 06-28.doc](#)  
[Cover Sheet.doc](#)  
[Cover Sheet.doc](#)  
[ORD pd 06-28.doc](#)  
[PH notice.doc](#)  
[ReferralLetter 06-28.doc](#)  
[REPORT 06-28.doc](#)  
[WTL referral memo.doc](#)  
[ORD 5949.pdf](#)  
[ORD 5950.pdf](#)  
[Cover Sheet time extension.doc](#)  
[WTL memo time extension.doc](#)  
[61120001.pdf](#)  
[Cover Sheet time extension2.doc](#)  
[DAH memo time extension 2.doc](#)  
[Ordinance 6277.pdf](#)  
[Cover Sheet time extension3.doc](#)  
[DAH memo time extension 3.doc](#)  
[Ordinance 6413.pdf](#)  
[060590.pdf](#)  
[060590.pdf](#)  
[060590.pdf](#)  
[memo.pdf](#)  
[060590.pdf](#)  
[060590.pdf](#)  
[Ordinance 6548.pdf](#)  
[060590 BOT11 17 11.pdf](#)  
[060590-BOT-11-17-11](#)  
[Ordinance 6660](#)

*Joe Ash, attorney, 77 W. Washington Street, Chicago, representing Kenar LLC, the contract purchaser and developer of the project, presented the petition. He stated that the property consists of 3.34 acres of vacant land at the northwest corner of 22nd Street and Elizabeth Street. The property is part of a planned development developed with apartments and condominiums.*

*The petitioner wishes to develop the subject property with a condominium building of five stories in height totaling sixty units and consistent with the planned development. The sixty units on the remaining acreage will be well below of what which was previously approved by the Village. The planned development allows for height of up to fifteen stories and this plan is also well below that. He mentioned the variation requested. Staff has clearly outlined the request in the staff report and the petitioner concurs with the conditions of approval.*

*He called on Bob Schmude, Director of Land Development of Kenar LLC, 1904 Wright Blvd., Schaumburg, IL to describe the petition in detail. He noted that Kenar is a privately owned Chicagoland builder, with 25 years experience. He also described where they have completed other developments.*

*Mr. Schmude stated that they are seeking approval of the site plan amendment to the planned development. He referred to the colored rendering of the site plan and landscaping in the common space. He displayed a front color rendering showing the building materials and colors proposed for the site.*

*He then described the floor plans. One assigned parking space will be provided within the enclosed garage and he mentioned the front spaces for guests. Each unit has a balcony and storage space. A condominium association will be established and a management company will be employed.*

*He described the site in detail. Half of the total size of the site (the northern portion) is the wetland portion. He has worked with Village and County staff to present and preserve the wetland and buffer area. The County will have regulations and they support the way Kenar is addressing the wetland issues. They will take a 50-foot wide buffer around the wetland and leave it as native vegetation.*

*The southern portion of the site will include the building. The parking lot will be south of the building, and he noted the points of access. There will be a ramp into the parking garage. The 22nd street access is right-in, right-out due to a raised curb median. Both access points will have stop signs. The last access is the northern access which will provide emergency access only for a fire truck. Stormwater will be provided in an underground storage system.*

*KLOA, the Village's traffic consultant, analyzed the site and concluded it is a low traffic generator with minimal impact on surrounding properties. The development is required to provide 96 parking spaces. They will provide 116 spaces - 60 within the first floor parking garage, and 55 in the front lot. In closing they feel this is a responsible development as the plan preserves the wetland.*

*He then introduced Matt Haylock, of Haylock Design, Architect, 1800 National Drive, Gurnee, IL, project architect, who described the building materials. Mr. Haylock noted he has done three buildings similar to this in the community and named Park West, Parkview Point and Lincoln Place - all mixed use developments. They wanted to create something that fit in but also that was more unique. This building will have high-quality materials, using manufactured stone along with real limestone, the base will be rusticated masonry, and the stone treatment will be smooth. They will use three color varieties of brick across the building. The main portion of the building will be light brick. Different heights and styles of parapets which vary in height will provide variety. The first floor is the indoor parking garage. As you move up you see balconies and four floors of condominiums. They will use the same treatment all the way around the building.*

*Mr. Schmude explained the variance for the front parking lot. The landscape plan is located on south side of the building. There is a required thirty foot landscape setback. The variance is for the southern edge of the parking lot which encroaches six feet into the yard. The property is angled and they are dedicating to the Village that part of their property that is within the 22nd Street*

right-of-way. They are exceeding the parking requirement and to preserve the wetland buffer they seek to put the parking lot on the 22nd Street side of the building. At the closest point, the encroachment is about 6-1/2 feet. They want to provide extra parking so as to not impact other properties or the wetland.

Acting Chairperson Sweetser then opened the meeting for public comment.

Linda Needinghouse, 254 W. 20th Street, lives in Elizabeth Crossing. Her concern is with the amount of traffic the development may generate. She predicts they will use 20th Street and traffic is a major concern.

Maryann O'Keefe, 77 W. Arboretum, lives in the condominium development south of the subject property. She noted that their retention pond that has gone in has taken care of the flooding. She noted the impacts on future flood zones in a flood sensitive zone area. She commended the developer for the wetland preservation, but if they develop, how is the stormwater runoff going to be handled?

Michael Salins, 2005 S. Finley, President of the Cove Landing Association, is concerned about the additional traffic. Vehicles will go northbound on Elizabeth Street and cut through their parking area to Finley Road. They have to maintain the asphalt and the extra cars are not welcome. They are already thinking about speed bumps. Another concern is making a left turn over 22nd Street and this could be a major problem.

Dan Toucher, 1343 Fairfield Court, Naperville, noted that this land has been vacant and there are four buildings which border the wetlands. He likes the view, it is serene, and the proposal will take away from the residents who live there. They drove by the property noting that it is not a big piece of land and questioned the buffer area around the site. It will make people come through their land to get northbound on Finley and avoid 22nd Street.

Paula Tumpack, 2175 S. Finley Road, Covington Apartments property manager, stated that she is not thrilled about having to look at the proposed building. She is concerned about traffic. The views they currently have are desirable and they get higher premiums for them. This development will affect her budget.

Joe Ash rebutted, noting that the major issue raised is one of traffic. The Village hired a consultant and they prepared a report which says this development will create minimum impact. The owner has a right to develop the property, the planned development would allow a 15-story building, and they are proposing a 5-story building. They feel they are trying to come up with a plan that will have minimal affect on adjacent properties. The staff report included a thorough analysis and considered the traffic report's findings.

Acting Chairperson Sweetser asked what happens with the stormwater. Mr. Ash noted that they are providing underground detention under the parking lot. He mentioned the Lombard Code which states that after the property is developed, there can be no greater run off than before the development.

Acting Chairperson Sweetser then requested the staff report. William Heniff, Senior Planner, referenced the staff report which is submitted to the public record. The property is within the defined boundaries of the Covington/Cove Landing planned development. The original planned development approval and the amendments established general density and development parameters, but it did not address the future development of the subject property. As such, the

*petitioner's plan should be reviewed and approved as an amendment to the original approval, as was done for the Covington Apartments portion of the planned development in the late 1980s.*

*The petitioner is also seeking relief to allow for parking spaces to be located into a requisite yard. This relief is largely the result of a requested right-of-way dedication by the Village as well as the desire to minimize parking lot impacts on the wetland area.*

*Lastly, as a companion to this petition, a map amendment to the Comprehensive Plan is proposed. This amendment is intended to designate the property for medium density residential purposes (as noted in the planned development approval) from public and institutional uses.*

*He noted that the petitioner is meeting the unit count, unit mix, setbacks and building height provisions set forth in the planned development ordinance. The 1966-1968 amendments did not show a building at the proposed location. Staff has been working with the County and petitioner to address any negative impacts of development. The project is oriented toward 22nd Street, away from the rest of the planned development. The building elevations are compatible with recent projects developed along the 22nd Street corridor. Parking will exceed the zoning requirements. The relief is created by the Village's request to have the petition dedicate 22nd Street right-of-way to the Village as a condition of approval. This request would change the front yard dimensions.*

*Staff has reviewed the standards and they have been met. Staff recommends approval subject to five conditions. KLOA reviewed the traffic generated by the project and they note the impacts of development to be minimal.*

*He then noted three correspondences received after the staff report was transmitted to the Plan Commission. These concerns included issues about construction traffic on 20th Street, tree preservation, and traffic generation.*

*Acting Chairperson Sweetser opened the meeting for any comments on the staff report.*

*Michael Salins questioned the access on Elizabeth Street. Mr. Schmude noted that Elizabeth and 22nd Street is a full access intersection. Access from the building ramp is full access, the parking lot would be controlled by a stop sign. He also responded to the letter about traffic on 20th Street. He said they would not want construction traffic on 20th Street either. They will work with staff during the building permit process and will provide signage prohibiting construction traffic from going that way.*

*Paula Tumpack asked about the 15-story provision. Mr. Heniff noted that that provision went back to the 1968 planned development approval.*

*Acting Chairperson Sweetser opened the meeting for Plan Commissioner comments.*

*Commissioner Burke noted that they workshopped this item and the petitioner has responded to all the issues raised in that discussion. He would like to see a condition added to preclude construction traffic along 20th Street or into Cove Landing. As far as general traffic concerns, the Cove Landing driveways are on private property so they can restrict access, provided that emergency access is maintained.*

*Commissioner Olbrysh agreed with Commissioner Burke's concerns about traffic considerations. They have to weigh the concerns of both the residents and business. He noted that the development provides for up to 1,200 units by right - the petitioner could construct 608 additional units on the property. However, they are only constructing sixty units. They also complied with height limitations and is impressed with the remaining amount of open space, which will help address the flooding situation.*

## Other Ordinances on First Reading

- E. [100596](#) ZBA 10-12: 544 S. Highland Ave  
Requests that the Village grant a variation from Section 155.212 of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to allow an unenclosed roofed-over front porch to be set back to twenty-two and a half (22.5) feet where twenty-five (25) feet is required in the R2 Single-Family Residence District. (DISTRICT #5)

**Attachments:** [100596.pdf](#)  
[apoletter 10-12.doc](#)  
[Cover Sheet.doc](#)  
[PUBLICNOTICE 10-12.doc](#)  
[Referral Let.doc](#)  
[Report 10-12.doc](#)  
[Ordinance 6556.pdf](#)

*Tom Mack, 544 S. Highland, presented the petition. Mr. Mack stated that they wanted to add the front porch to the house for a couple of reasons. First, Mr. Mack said that the existing porch is too small to accommodate wheelchair access for his mother-in-law. Second, you have to step off the porch in order to open the front door. He added that the mailman had fallen off his front porch at one time because of this. Lastly, Mr. Mack stated that they have been residents for 25 years and they plan to retire in their current residence. He stated that the front porch would allow them greater access and safety for the years to come.*

*Patty Mack, 544 S. Highland, stated that the front porch would provide wheelchair access for her mother and also mentioned the mailman incident. She then stated that they need the extra room on the porch.*

*Michael Toth, Planner I, presented the staff report. The property contains a one-story single family residence. The petitioner is proposing to construct an unenclosed roofed-over front porch on the front of the residence, twenty-two and a half (22.5) feet from the eastern property line, which is considered the front yard of the subject property. The Zoning Ordinance allows unenclosed roofed-over front porches as a permitted encroachment into the required front yard, provided that a minimum of twenty-five (25) feet is provided. As the proposed porch is set back only twenty-two and a half (22.5) feet, a variation is required.*

*The Zoning Ordinance allows roofed-over porches, which are unenclosed and projecting not more than seven (7) feet, as a permitted encroachment in the front yard, provided that a minimum twenty-five (25) foot front setback is maintained. The principal structure on the subject property is situated*



*twenty-nine feet nine inches (29'9") from the eastern property line at its closest point. Under the permitted obstructions provision, an unenclosed roofed-over porch could be constructed on the subject property approximately four feet three inches (4'3") from the principal structure as a matter of right. The petitioner is proposing to construct an unenclosed roofed-over porch that will extend (eastward) six feet ten inches (6'10") from the principal structure. This would result in a setback deficiency of two feet one inch (2'1") as the structure would only be set back a distance of twenty-two feet eleven inches (22'11") from the eastern property line, where twenty-five feet (25') is required.*

*The existing porch consists of a concrete landing with no roof or overhang over the landing. In the response to standards, the petitioner indicates that the existing stoop is very small and when the door opens out, there is no room for anyone to stand. Moreover, constructing a wider porch would allow greater clearance around the door area, creating safer and easier access to/from the home. While staff recognizes this issue, staff believes that the hardship for the variation has more to do with the location of the principal structure in relation to the eastern property line.*

*As previously mentioned, the principal structure on the subject property is situated less than thirty (30) feet from the eastern property line at its closest point. Staff notes that this setback is considered legal non-conforming with respect to the front yard setback. Although this setback deficiency is minimal, it does reduce the property owner's ability to construct an unenclosed roofed-over front porch to a usable standard.*

*There is also precedent for setback variations to allow roofed-over porches within required yards. Recently, the property owners at 322 E. Elm (ZBA 10-08) received approval to fully enclose a stoop, which was located in the required corner side yard. As the porch was built with the house in 1924 it was also considered legal non-conforming. Although this case involved a corner side yard, staff believes that the relevance is similar in nature as it involves a required yard that is visible from the right of way.*

*A variation was also granted in 2006 (ZBA 06-03) to allow a roof over an existing stoop within the front yard. ZBA 06-03 (121 N. Lincoln Ave.) was similar in nature as the existing front yard setback of the principal structure was also considered legal non-conforming at approximately twenty-eight and one half feet (28.5') from the front property line. ZBA 06-03 received approval to construct an unenclosed roofed-over front porch that only maintained a twenty-three and one half foot (23.5') setback from the front property line.*

*Staff finds that the requested relief can be supported, as the proposed porch will be setback two feet one inch (2'1") less than what is allowed by code. Staff is also able to support the requested variation based upon established precedence for unenclosed roofed-over porches in required yards on properties with legal non-conforming setbacks. Furthermore, the proposed improvements will not increase the visual bulk within the front yard as the setback of the house itself will remain the same and the porch itself would be unenclosed. Lastly, the proposed porch would not alter the essential character of the neighborhood as there are a number of homes in the immediate area with non-conforming front yard setbacks that have constructed either enclosed or unenclosed front porches.*

*Concluding, Mr. Toth stated that staff is recommending approval of ZBA 10-12, subject to the four conditions outlined in the staff report.*

Chairperson DeFalco then opened the meeting for discussion by the ZBA members.

Mr. Tap asked if the front steps are included in the setback measurement.

Mr. Toth stated that the steps are actually a separate item; however, they are considered a permitted encroachment in the required front yard.

Chairperson DeFalco stated there are a number of homes in the neighborhood that have deficient front setbacks that have porches constructed on the front of the house. He then stated that a condition of approval would require the house to meet the current setback requirement. He then mentioned the new average setback provisions. He asked staff if there was a minimum setback.

Mr. Toth stated that the house would be required to be setback a minimum of thirty (30) feet.

- F. [100618](#) Garbage Collection and Disposal Test Amendments  
Staff recommendation to amend the Village Code to reflect the definitions and fee rates in the Solid Waste contract that was approved on August 19, 2010. The amendments would also set a 30-day time limit for dumpsters kept on properties unless regularly serviced or associated with building permits.

**Attachments:** [100618.pdf](#)  
[Ordinance 6557.pdf](#)

### Ordinances on Second Reading

- G. [100346](#) PC 10-09: Text Amendments to the Sign Ordinance (Sandwich Board Signs)  
The Village of Lombard requests text amendments to Section 153.234 of the Lombard Sign Ordinance amending the provisions for Sandwich Board Signs. (DISTRICTS - ALL)

**Attachments:** [PUBLICNOTICE 10-09.doc](#)  
[Referral Letter.doc](#)  
[Report 10-09.doc](#)  
[DAH referral memo.doc](#)  
[Cover Sheet.doc](#)  
[DAH referral memo PC 10-09 Remand.doc](#)  
[Cover Sheet Remand.doc](#)  
[PC memo remand.doc](#)  
[Referral Letter \(remand\).doc](#)  
[100346.pdf](#)  
[Ordinance 6549.pdf](#)

Michael Toth, Planner I, presented the petition. Village staff has been requested by the Lombard Chamber of Commerce to discuss and review aspects of the Sign Ordinance, particularly relating to sandwich board signage.

*Additionally, staff notes that there have been other practical concerns pertaining to the Village's regulations that warrant additional discussion. As such, staff conducted a workshop session for direction regarding sandwich board signs at the May 17, 2010 Plan Commission meeting. Staff is now bringing forward text amendments to amend the Sandwich Board Sign regulations.*

*Sandwich Board Signs are primarily intended to guide and provide information to pedestrian traffic. The Sign Ordinance currently places geographic restrictions on the ability to display a Sandwich Board Sign by requiring that the signs only be displayed in business districts, on public rights of way and adjacent to buildings that meet a maximum setback requirement. Staff believes that these signs can also serve a similar purpose for not only businesses, but any institution. As such, staff is proposing to modify the locational restrictions associated with Sandwich Board Signs.*

*The only requirement that an establishment must meet in order to display a Sandwich Board Sign is that the establishment itself must be non-residential. This would allow not only businesses to display the sign, but also other religious institutions and like uses.*

*Rather than the building being required to be setback ten (10) feet from the property line (to be allowed to display a Sandwich Board Sign), the only location requirement is that the sign be located within ten feet (10') of a customer entrance or service window. This amendment keeps with the original intent of the Ordinance, which is to guide pedestrian traffic to a customer entrance or service window and provide subsequent information to patrons, such as daily specials or events.*

*During the May 17, 2010 workshop session, staff raised a number of issues relative to the current Sandwich Board Signs. While the Plan Commission did not have any issues with changes relative to the duration and location of the signs, they did not want to amend the Sign Ordinance to allow mixed signage (Temporary Signs in conjunction with Sandwich Board Signs). More specifically, the Plan Commission was concerned that mixed signage could create a negative visual impact due to extraneous signage. The Plan Commission also suggested that Sandwich Board Signs in the downtown be allowed additional hours of display. The Plan Commission originally suggested that three (3) additional hours be granted, which would require the signs in the downtown to be brought in at 12 a.m. In keeping with the suggestion of the Plan Commission, staff is proposing to extend the hours in the downtown. However, staff is proposing that the hours be extended to 2 a.m., which coincides with the time that businesses (with liquor licenses) are required to close.*

*If you go through the amendments you see applicability in that no longer are these signs required to be in a business district but non residential. The location of the sign has to be located within ten feet (10') of a customer entrance or service window. Sandwich board signs may be located partially or entirely on a sidewalk within a public right-of-way. A minimum of four feet (4') of public sidewalk shall remain unobstructed at all times. Mr. Toth exemplified Export Fitness on Roosevelt Road indicating, if the amendments were approved, they could have a sandwich board sign located ten feet (10') from their door but not on the sidewalk along Roosevelt Road.*

*The allowable size of the signs will remain unchanged. The design can include*

*the "A" frame or a comparable design which would include flat panel signs on a spring mount. The allowable number would stay the same so not more than one sandwich board sign shall be permitted per establishment except when a property abuts two or more rights-of-way, then the business shall be permitted one sign per right-of-way, adjacent to a customer entrance or service window.*

*Time restrictions would remain unchanged with the exception of the downtown. If located in the B5 or B5A zoning district, you can have a sign until 2:00 a.m.*

*Concluding, Mr. Toth stated that staff finds that the proposed text amendments meet the standards for text amendments and therefore is recommending approval.*

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

*Commissioner Sweetser referred to the staff report, page 3, A.2., and the statement that says the establishment has to be on the ground level. She stated that requirement has never been discussed. She is aware of one business in the downtown as well as others around town that are not located on the ground level and are currently using sandwich board signs. She was interested in staff's thinking behind it.*

*Mr. Toth answered that the statement was part of the original amendment and he was unsure as to why it was in there, but the intent might have been to guide pedestrian traffic. He agreed that there are establishments that have staircases and are not located on the ground level that use sandwich board signs.*

*Commissioner Sweetser asked if staff would be agreeable to eliminating the statement if there is not a good reason for it. Mr. Toth stated that if those situations are few and far between and the businesses have service entrances on the ground level, he doesn't think that should be a problem. Mr. Stilling stated that the layout of the downtown area is vertical in nature and the concern might have been having multiple signs. He doesn't see that being a problem and suggested that the Plan Commissioners could strike that statement if they chose to.*

*Commissioner Flint stated that if the entrance is on the ground level and leads to the upper floor, wouldn't that still constitute ten feet (10'). Mr. Toth stated he interprets the statement as meaning that the establishment has to be located and functioning on the ground level. Mr. Stilling indicated that staff might want to understand the historical context of the statement first by researching it. He believes the amendment isn't that old and was incorporated within the last ten years.*

*Commissioner Sweetser questioned whether the petition could move forward and suggested that if reasonable, give staff the ability to override the statement. Mr. Stilling answered that it could be continued to July if need be. He thought that the statement, when drafted, might have been intended solely for the downtown businesses, so the thought might have been there wasn't a demand or need for them.*

*Commissioner Sweetser encouraged staff to keep track of any of these situations and requests, do some research, and determine if it is reasonable or not.*

*Commissioner Sweetser asked if voting signs, which are often located at schools*

and the library and not necessarily within ten feet (10') from the entrances, are subject to this. Mr. Stilling answered that the types of signs they display are treated differently.

Commissioner Flint asked if Lombard Town Centre has a second floor. Mr. Stilling answered yes. Commissioner Flint added that should they want to promote themselves, that might be an example of not having an opportunity to utilize a sandwich board sign.

The Commissioners agreed to leave the wording as is, but that staff should research and analyze the amendment. If staff finds that the statement needs to be amended, the wording can be changed at a later date.

Director of Community Development Bill Heniff indicated this matter had come to the Village Board via a request by the Chamber and some businesses. He noted sandwich boards are the portable A-frame signs that are generally used to advertise a specific event or sale. These signs are meant to be business friendly and to relax some of the standards with regard to these signs. The signs are required to be moved by 9 pm each day. He spoke of the signs being placed ten feet from the front entrance of a business or establishment.

Trustee Wilson did not feel that this resolved the issue and referred to the meeting with the church regarding signage. He felt the signs should be out at the curb to draw attention to the passers-by. He felt ten feet from the front entrance did not help businesses like X-Sport which is located a couple hundred feet from Roosevelt Road.

Director Heniff indicated this could be referred back to the Plan Commission, but that the Plan Commission did not want to give blanket approval on the signs. It had been suggested to do a case-by-case evaluation and specific site plan approval. He noted the church's needs would be addressed as well as X-Sport's. He noted there are other means of advertising including banners. Trustee Wilson did not feel this allowed enough flexibility. He noted the Statue of Liberty in front of tax offices. He felt the ordinance could be left alone and variances granted.

Trustee Gron agreed with Trustee Wilson and questioned businesses that do not have entrances on the visible or traffic side of the property such as Capone's. Trustee Ware stated he also agreed with Trustee Wilson and was concerned about the ten foot requirement.

Trustee Gron questioned the one sign limit.

Director Heniff indicated it was a limit of one sign. He stated the Board could refer this back to the Plan Commission. He noted that the sandwich board signs were exclusive to the right-of-way. The banner provisions would work for businesses along Roosevelt Road and temporary signage was also a possibility. He stated sandwich board signs were more to entice pedestrian traffic and used to draw attention to the business.

President Mueller questioned if the Board wanted to refer this back to the Plan Commission.

Trustee Wilson inquired about banner signs.

Director Heniff stated that they are temporary signs of wood or fabric and they can be affixed to another sign.

Trustee Wilson stated that this does not allow for the quick set up and take down option. He spoke of the issue of the sandwich board at the church.

Trustee Moreau requested clarification. She felt the modifications did not address the problems on Roosevelt Road. She indicated she was not familiar with the church issue.

Trustee Wilson reported the church issue was that Christ the King Church is set back off of Main Street and every Monday from 11 am to 1 pm they are open to help the underprivileged. Having the sign ten feet from the door does not get

*the attention that is needed to advertise this assistance.*

*Trustee Moreau felt this should be referred back to the Plan Commission for modifications. She wanted to see the emphasis on walk-ability.*

*Trustee Wilson felt that any business located on a second floor would not receive any benefit as well as any businesses with back entrances.*

*President Mueller felt that not-for-profit also needed to be addressed.*

*Trustee Gron questioned section H regarding signs going up an hour before the event and coming down an hour after the event. He stated that not all entrances to businesses are on the main street. He asked that the ten foot requirement be addressed. He noted some businesses downtown do not have entrances on the main street. The idea of the sandwich board is for people to see it and to draw attention to the business. He talked about businesses that are set back from the street. He felt all of these concerns should be addressed.*

*President Mueller asked how this would be addressed.*

*Director Heniff stated this ordinance was intended to relax requirements for sandwich boards. He noted that Capone's could have a banner or they could have a sandwich board within ten feet of the main entrance. Sandwich boards are intended more for the pedestrian and banners are intended more for the vehicular traffic.*

*Village Manager Hulseberg stated another option is to give authority to the Director of Community Development to approve permits.*

*Christopher Stilling, Assistant Director of Community Development, presented the petition on behalf of the Village. He gave a brief history of the petition noting that the Plan Commission at their June 21, 2010 meeting reviewed the petition and made a recommendation to the Village Board.*

*At the August 19, 2010 Village Board meeting, the Village Board remanded PC 10-09 back to the Plan Commission for further consideration and discussion related to the following specific issues:*

- 1. Should all non-residential establishments in the downtown have the ability to display a Sandwich Board Sign adjacent to the right of way, regardless of where their customer entrance is located? The Village Board raised concerns about the proposed text amendments with regard to the ten feet (10') setback requirement adjacent to customer service entrances or windows. The Board stated that there are businesses located in the downtown, which would not benefit from the proposed text amendments as their customer service entrances or windows are located a greater distance from the sidewalk.*
  
- 2. Should all non-residential establishments (outside of the downtown area) have the ability to display a Sandwich Board Sign adjacent to the right of way, regardless of where their customer entrance is located? The Village Board stated that the proposed ten (10) foot setback from the customer service entrance or window area may not provide adequate right of way exposure for all non-residential establishments, specifically those located along Roosevelt Road. The Board cited X-Sport Fitness and other businesses located within the Hobby Lobby Plaza Shopping Center.*
  
- 3. Should establishments that are not located on ground floor have rights to display a Sandwich Board Sign? The Village Board raised concerns about whether or not businesses that are not located on the ground level should be afforded rights to a Sandwich Board Sign.*

*The Plan Commissioners are asked to review this information and offer a recommendation back to the Village Board accordingly. He stated that any comments should be related to these items.*

*Mr. Stilling then summarized the first item:*

*1. Should all non-residential establishments in the downtown have the ability to display a Sandwich Board Sign adjacent to the right of way, regardless of where their customer entrance is located?*

*Mr. Stilling provided additional background on the matter stating that the Village Board raised concerns about the proposed text amendments with regard to the ten foot (10') setback requirement adjacent to customer service entrances or windows. The Board stated that there are businesses located in the downtown, which would not benefit from the proposed text amendments as their customer service entrances or windows are located a greater distance from the sidewalk, such as Capone's or Praga/Bon Ton. Staff believes that Sandwich Board Signs are intended to address pedestrian-oriented traffic. As the downtown caters to pedestrian traffic, staff believes that non-residential establishments in the downtown should be afforded the right to display a Sandwich Board Sign adjacent to the sidewalk. As such, staff has further amended the proposed text amendments to allow non-residential establishments the ability to display a Sandwich Board Sign adjacent to the "establishment", rather than the customer service entrance or window.*

*Mr. Stilling referenced some draft language provided by staff stating that this revision allows businesses within the downtown area to display Sandwich Board Signs directly adjacent to their building or tenant space frontage - therefore closer to the sidewalk. For example, Capone's Restaurant is located along St. Charles, with the building and tenant space located up along the right of way. However, their customer entrance is greater than 40' away. Under the previous provisions, Capone's would not have been able to have a Sandwich Board Sign on or near the sidewalk. The revised text amendment would allow them to now have a sandwich board sign within the sidewalk, to the north of their building. Staff notes that this amendment would also apply to all non-residential establishments that are eligible to display a Sandwich Board Sign.*

*Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners relative to item #1.*

*Chairperson Ryan asked staff to clarify if the proposed changes to the "establishment", meant that some businesses located in the downtown that are located towards the back of the building would still not be able to have a sign within the right-of-way. Mr. Stilling clarified by stating that some businesses, such as Capone's, have direct frontage along the street, but their entrance is further back. The proposed new language would allow them to now have a sign. However other businesses, which do not have frontage on the street, would be allowed to have a sign, provided that it was within 10' of their tenant space.*

*Commissioner Sweetser supported the proposed new language stating that certain businesses that have direct frontage along the street paid a premium for that exposure.*

*Commissioner Burke agreed and said that he would not want to see the sidewalk lined up with sandwich board signs for all businesses, unless they are within 10 feet.*

*The Plan Commission recommended approval to amend the proposed language to allow all non-residential establishments, regardless of their zoning, the*

ability to display a Sandwich Board Sign within ten feet (10') of the "establishment and/or outdoor service area". The proposed amendment would address the concern raised by the Village Board for businesses whose tenant space is adjacent to the right-of-way, but their customer entrance is setback greater than 10'. The proposed amendment would apply to all zoning districts.

Mr. Stilling summarized item #2:

2. Should all non-residential establishments (outside of the downtown area) have the ability to display a Sandwich Board Sign adjacent to the right of way, regardless of where their customer entrance is located?

Mr. Stilling said that the Village Board stated that the proposed ten (10') foot setback from the customer service entrance or window area may not provide adequate right of way exposure for all non-residential establishments, specifically those located along Roosevelt Road. The Board cited X-Sport Fitness and other businesses located within the Hobby Lobby Plaza Shopping Center as an example. As previously stated, staff believes that Sandwich Board Signs are intended to address pedestrian-oriented traffic. On the contrary, staff feels that non-residential establishments located outside of the downtown already have sufficient signage mechanisms, such as banners, which are specifically intended to capture the attention of automobile traffic. Furthermore, the current permanent signage provisions allow businesses outside the downtown area, greater rights to larger freestanding and wall signs. Additional rights are also afforded to a business if they are setback at greater distances.

Mr. Stilling stated that staff believes those establishments located outside of the downtown should not be able to display a Sandwich Board Sign any closer to the street than allowed (10' away from the establishment) as it could create visual clutter along the right of way. The intent to allow Sandwich Board Signs in other areas outside of the downtown was to cater to the customers already within the shopping center. Staff notes that the Code does not allow establishments, which display a sandwich board sign, the right to display any other temporary sign. Therefore, if a business was displaying a banner (or other temporary sign) they could not display a Sandwich Board Sign. Mr. Stilling asked the Commissioners if they supported granting additional rights to non-residential establishments to allow all of them the ability to have a sandwich board sign up along the right-of-way.

Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners relative to item #2.

The Plan Commission unanimously recommended against allowing non residential businesses the ability to display a Sandwich Board Sign any closer to the street than allowed (10' away from the "establishment"). The Plan Commission felt that allowing all businesses the ability to have a Sandwich Board Sign, regardless of its location to the establishment, adjacent to the right-of-way, could create visual clutter.

Mr. Stilling summarized item #3:

3. Should establishments that are not located on ground floor have rights to display a Sandwich Board Sign?

Mr. Stilling stated that the Village Board raised concerns about whether or not businesses that are not located on the ground level should be afforded rights to



*a Sandwich Board Sign. The Code has always required establishments must to be located on ground level in order to display a Sandwich Board Sign. The proposed text amendments did not change this provision. There are a number of businesses in Lombard that are either located on a second floor (or higher) or below ground level. Staff believes that maintaining this provision in its current state will prevent unnecessary visual clutter that could be a result of an excessive amount of Sandwich Board Signs. If the Plan Commission finds that non-residential establishments, not located on the ground level, should be afforded rights to a Sandwich Board Sign, the provision should only be applicable to properties within the B5 and B5A districts. Staff also referenced some draft language for the Plan Commission to consider.*

*Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners relative to item #3.*

*Commissioner Sweetser stated that there are a few businesses within the downtown that are located on the lower level of the building and that their only sign is a sandwich board sign. She expressed a concern about limiting it to only businesses on the ground level. Mr. Stilling also reference the building at 3-15 N Main Street which has several businesses located on the second floor.*

*Several of the Commissioners supported allowing businesses not on the ground level the ability to have a sandwich board sign. They cited that the provisions still require a permit and staff has the ability to work with them to ensure signs are placed in the proper locations.*

*The Plan Commission agreed with the draft language provided by staff and recommended approval to amend the proposed language to allow non-residential establishments not located on the ground level in the B5 & B5A Zoning Districts only, the ability to have a Sandwich Board Sign.*

- H. [100549](#) Pleasant Lane School  
Recommendation from the Transportation & Safety Committee limiting parking on one side of Charlotte north and south of Pleasant Lane School and designating Berkshire as a one-way street during school hours. (DISTRICT #4)

**Attachments:** [100549.pdf](#)  
[Ordinance 6550.pdf](#)

*Kalisik reviewed the item. The one side parking, north bound, will force the traffic away from the school instead of into the congestion. The resident that requested action, wants Charlotte one-way northbound, but that may be too restrictive. The Committee can revisit the item if this doesn't work.*

*Kalisik suggested and the Committee occurred that the one-way be posted for Berkshire between Main and Charlotte instead of all the way to Garfield.*

- I. [100550](#) Glenbard East High School  
Recommendation from the Transportation & Safety Committee extending parking limitations on Elizabeth Street from Harrison to Madison. (DISTRICT #2)

**Attachments:** [100550.pdf](#)  
[Ordinance 6551.pdf](#)

*Kalisik reviewed the item. The issue is cars parking on both sides of Elizabeth*

between Harrison and Harding. One of the concerns is if there is parking on both sides it restricts traffic and Elizabeth is a heavily travelled road. Madison School is also in the vicinity. The recommendation is to extend the No Parking on Elizabeth. Schwarz asked if the students were able to park at Sunset Knolls. Chairperson Giagnorio answered that to date, only five spaces have been sold. Glenbard East High School started selling those spots three weeks into the school year for \$100, which is the same cost to park on campus.

Ms. Glazier pointed out that there could also be an issue with the snow plows getting through and it's a bus route. Chairperson Giagnorio said that there are only two houses directly affected and they do not have any problem with restricting the parking to Harding. Schwarz asked if the no parking should extend to Madison. When it's posted between Harding and Harrison they will move north.

J. [100568](#)

PC 10-19: 11 S. Eisenhower Lane

Requests that the Village approve a conditional use to allow a contractors material storage yard for the subject property located within the I - Limited Industrial District along with the following variations:

1. A variation from Section 155.210(A)(3)(b) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to allow an accessory structure to exceed seventeen (17) feet.
2. A variation from Section 155.420(J) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to reduce the required transitional building setback from forty-five (45) feet to twenty (20) feet.
3. A variation from Section 155.420(J) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to reduce the required transitional landscape yard from thirty (30) feet to twenty (20) feet.
4. A variation from Section 155.205(A)(3)(c)(i) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to increase the maximum allowable fence height from ten (10) feet to fifteen (15) feet. (DISTRICT #3)

**Attachments:** [APO Letter PC 10-19.doc](#)

[Cover Sheet.doc](#)

[DAH referral memo.doc](#)

[PUBLICNOTICE 10-19.doc](#)

[Referral Letter 10-19.doc](#)

[Report 10-19.doc](#)

[100568.pdf](#)

[Ordinance 6552.pdf](#)

Jeff Baity, Matocha Associates, 5846 Sunrise Ave, Clarendon Hills presented the petition on behalf of Gasaway Maintenance Co, located at 11 S. Eisenhower Lane. Mr. Baity indicated that they are proposing to construct an outdoor salt storage bin and outdoor brine storage tanks. The property currently has an outdoor storage yard, which is completely fenced in. The intent of this design is to install the salt storage dome at the southeast corner of property, slightly increase the outdoor yard area and install a two-bin salt storage bin. The intent of the storage bin is to protect the storage of the bulk salt. They will divide the bin into two. Mr. Baity stated that the first variance they are requesting is for the height of the building. The height of the building is approximately 34' in front and will taper down to 25' in height toward the back and is 35' wide at its

opening. He then mentioned that the height of the building is indicative of how it will function. In order for the dump truck to raise up, it has to clear the overhang; consequently, the height in the front of the building is designed to be taller in order to provide enough clearance.

To be good neighbors to the residential area to the east they will alleviate the impact of the building by making use of the topography. He explained how the property has a radical vertical rise - 26' -30' at the rear of the building and is well vegetative. Currently, there is vegetation, an unimproved right-of-way and another row of vegetation between the subject property and the residential properties to the east. Mr. Baity then mentioned that they have a unique situation on the property because their interior side yard abuts the rear yard of the property to the south because of its configuration. He added that the property to the east and south are owned by the Village of Lombard. They want to bring the building towards the rear of the property for access purposes. This will result in not having to modify or disrupt the cross over to the building. Mr. Baity then discussed the variations being requested. He stated that bringing the building back would hide it from the eastern and southern properties. He added that they will make use of the vegetative berm as a screen. He also mentioned that they are also proposing four brine storage tanks on the property.

David Gasaway, 8534 Thistlewood, Darien (owner of Gasaway Maintenance Co.) stated that the brine tanks will contain only salt brine. He noted they distribute products to various villages, including Lombard. Salt brine is used to energize rock salt to make it work faster. The biggest products they have in the tanks are salt brine and magnesium chloride. All these products are non-placard (non-hazardous) products. Everything they deal with (both dry and liquid) are non-hazardous.

Mr. Baity finished their presentation by stating that they want to move the proposed building far enough away so as to not impede the operation because they are forced to use their side and rear yards. Lastly, he stated that they're increasing the existing storage yard by 1000 square feet. That back area is currently fenced in and we are increasing that area.

Chairperson Ryan asked if anyone was present to speak in favor or against the petition. There was no one present to speak in favor or against the petition.

Chairperson Ryan then requested the staff report.

Michael Toth, Planner I, presented the staff report. The petitioner is proposing to construct two covered salt storage bins and four brine storage tanks. The salt bins would be constructed adjacent to the southern portion of the existing building and the brine storage tanks would be constructed adjacent to the eastern portion of the existing building. The salt storage bins would be constructed to a height of thirty-four (34) feet. As such, a variation is required to allow an accessory structure to exceed the maximum height of seventeen (17) feet.

Properties located within the I - District, which abut properties in a residence district, are required to provide a forty-five (45) foot transitional building setback and a thirty (30) foot transitional landscape yard. The eastern property line of the subject property abuts property in the R4 - Limited General Residential; therefore, the transitional yards are required. The transitional building setback includes accessory structures and the transitional landscape yard requires that the designated area be free of any improved surfaces and/or

structures. The proposed salt bins are located twenty (20) feet from the eastern property line; as such, they are located within the required transitional building setback and transitional landscape yard. The brine storage tanks are located forty-two (42) feet from the eastern property line; therefore, they are located within the required transitional building setback, but outside of the required transitional landscape yard.

Lastly, the petitioner has been operating on the subject property as a Contractors office since 2009. With the inclusion of the proposed outdoor amenities, the use of the property transitions to become a 'Contractors office and yard', which requires conditional use approval in the I - Limited Industrial District.

The Gasaway Maintenance Company has been working in the pavement maintenance industry (snow removal, dust control & bulk water delivery) for almost thirty years. The subject property is primarily used for off-season storage and support activities for their main location in Romeoville, IL. During the winter months, the plow trucks and salt trucks that service the Lombard/Oak Brook area operate out of the subject property. The loaders and heavy pieces of equipment are kept at the job sites, when in operation, but are returned to storage in April. Furthermore, the 14,000 square foot warehouse space is used for inside storage of snow removal equipment and other miscellaneous articles. The 6,000 square foot office is used by sales representatives on an as-needed basis.

As previously mentioned, the petitioner has been operating on the subject property as a Contractors office since 2009. With the inclusion of two covered salt storage bins and four brine storage tanks, the use of the property transitions to now be considered a 'Contractors office and yard', which requires conditional use approval in the I - Limited Industrial District.

The salt bins would be constructed adjacent to the southern portion of the existing building and the brine storage tanks would be constructed adjacent to the eastern portion of the existing building. With the inclusion of these structures, additional outdoor on-site activities would occur. As the proposed structures would contain elements that are used in the snow removal/de-icing process, they will be primarily used in the winter months during snow and ice events. The hours of operation could fluctuate drastically, depending upon the time of a storm occurrence. Moreover, there is no set timeframe to which the on-site activities could be fully operational. Due to the configuration of the subject property the proposed structures would be located adjacent to the property lines that abut Village-owned properties. As such, the additional outdoor on-site operations would most impact Village-owned property. Staff also notes that both Village-owned properties are currently vacant.

Lastly, the previous tenant that conducted business on the subject property, Pyramid Stone, received conditional use approval to operate a concrete and stone fabrication and molding facility in 2004 (PC 04-32). As such, the site has a history of conditional use approval for outdoor 'yard' activities.

The intent of a transitional yard is to provide a buffer area between two differing land uses, one of which is more intensely used than the other. The subject industrial property abuts property in the R4 - Limited General Residential; however, the abutting property is actually a forty-three (43) foot wide unimproved strip of Main Street, which is owned by the Village and is heavily vegetated. The unimproved portion of Main Street spans the entire

*length of the eastern property line of the subject property and acts as a natural buffer between the subject property and the residential properties to the east. The petitioner has indicated that the proposed location of the salt bins was specifically chosen in order provide safe maneuvering and mobility space for vehicles. Essentially, pushing back the salt bins towards the east will allow the existing south side overhead door, which provides access to the main building, to remain clear of any structures and allow for optimal vehicular maneuverability.*

*The salt storage bins would be constructed to a height of thirty-four (34) feet. The salt storage bins would be connected to the principal structure by means of a small enclosed addition. As the storage bins are functionally considered incidental to the principal building, they are still considered to be accessory structures and therefore must meet the seventeen (17) foot height requirement. Although the height variation being requested is double than that permitted by code, the topography of the property significantly minimizes the affect that a taller structure would have on adjacent properties. As previously mentioned, the salt bins would be constructed adjacent to the southern portion of the existing building. As such, those structures would be located closest to the southern and eastern property lines of the subject property. Moreover, both adjacent properties that abut the southern and eastern property lines of the subject property are vacant and owned by the Village. Furthermore, there is a significant grade change on the eastern portion of the property that would diminish the affects of the salt domes from the residential properties that are located to the east of the unimproved portion of Main Street.*

*Staff is supportive of the conditional use and associated variations. If approved, the additional outdoor operations created by the conditional use would not have a significant impact on adjacent properties. The unimproved portion of Main Street acts as a natural buffer between the subject property and the residential property to the east. The change in grade on the eastern portion of the subject property minimizes the height impact of the proposed accessory structures. As such, the geographic and topographic conditions on the subject property reduce the impact that the variations would create on the surrounding area. The petitioner has provided a response to the Standards for Conditional Uses and Variations. Staff finds that those standards have been met. Staff is recommending approval of this petition, subject to six conditions.*

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

*Commissioner Sweetser stated that it seems like everything is straight forward and the rationale is very reasonable.*

*Commissioner Burke questioned the petitioner's testimony in that moving the building to the east and into the berm area, reduces the affect on the adjacent property. He commented that statement was subjective. Even if you move it closer to the back and bury it in the berm, it is still 34' in height. He asked how this will have less affect on the neighbors and requested an explanation.*

*Mr. Baity stated that there is no neighbor to the south except for the Village owned property, which is vacant. The front of the salt bin will be 34' high and the back will get buried. Rather than have a large building and see complete mass, they have the ability to bury it into the berm and minimize the overall visual effect of the storage bins.*

*Mr. Toth distributed a picture of the subject property from a westward perspective. He stated that the picture was taken when he was standing on the unimproved portion of Main Street with the vegetative buffer in front and behind him and the residential properties located at his back. The picture demonstrates how much of a grade change there is and how the vegetative buffers play a significant role in the screening.*

*Commissioner Burke stated that he is not suggesting that it is not going to be visible but by asking for a variance to move it closer to the property line makes it less expensive for the petitioner because they will not have to change the existing building around. It won't be visible meeting our ordinances for setbacks, so moving it back won't make it less visible. There were two reasons the petitioner gave for the variance. One is that it would be less visible from the Village right of way and the other was that it saved on site costs with regard to not having to change the facility. He wasn't sure that either reason is a legitimate reason for our standards for variations.*

*Christopher Stilling, Assistant Community Development Director, answered that there is cost involved, but given the location, grade change and the distance to the residential property, staff felt comfortable supporting the petition.*

*Commissioner Burke questioned the standards for variations and stated that the testimony isn't accurate in that there is a financial benefit for the petitioner for this variation for on site improvements. He added that the variations aren't necessary and added that there is no direct benefit to placing them at their proposed location.*

*Mr. Gasaway stated that there is a 45' to 50' radius they are putting into the hill so you don't see the back of the structure, which makes it less noticeable. We need this because of the rotation of the wheel loader and trucks at the side door. That southern door cannot be moved to the west because there is a 6" main coming into the building. He added that they tried to make the plan functional and they are only asking for relief in what they really need.*

*Mr. Baity mentioned that they are unique in that area because they are the only lot that abuts the R4 in the back yard. Because of the required transitional setback, they are required to be set back 45'. If they were on the next lot, they could build 15' from the lot line because that lot is not adjacent to the R4 District.*

*Commissioner Sweetser stated that she understands Commissioner Burke's point but believes that it has to do with how the petitioner presented his testimony specifically the statement about the visibility. She added that a new piece of information was just provided regarding how the fire requirements preclude the entrance from being changed, which could be a mitigating factor. She stated that she doesn't object to this, but needs clarification and justification as to the testimony.*

*George Wagner, Village Attorney, referred to the standards for variations. One of the issues was if there was a basis to financial gain. The standards say there cannot be a primary basis for financial gain but there can be other valid reasons; so, the standards can still be met.*

*Commissioner Burke stated one of the reasons the petitioner gave isn't legitimate in that the testimony says moving the building makes it less visible when further testimony stated that it would never be visible.*

*Attorney Wagner addressed the fire main issue. He stated that it could be moved so you still get into whether that is a specific condition of the land and unique to cause the reason for the salt bin to be located where it is.*

*Mr. Stilling stated that staff's position is based upon the given circumstances of the existing building. He added that this is the most suitable location for the salt bins and brine tanks and staff is supportive of it.*

*Attorney Wagner added that is based on the uniqueness of the land. That because of the vegetation and the affect it has and where the salt bin would be located in relation to Village property, would weigh in to the uniqueness of the land and could result in a hardship to relocate it. The hardship might be on their operations but also it sill might affect how it will be seen from the outside.*

*Commissioner Burke stated that it can be reworded. He added that all he is saying is that the request and the testimony are not jiving.*

*Chairperson Ryan stated that if the rewording the standards based upon the testimony provided, there is no objection to it.*

*Attorney Wagner stated that they can add that to the standards to reflect the testimony.*

## Resolutions

- K.**     [100621](#)     St. Charles Road Watermain Replacement Final Balancing Change Order No. 2  
Reflecting an increase of \$18,667.20 to the contract with ALamp Concrete Contractors, Inc. (DISTRICT #1)
- Attachments:**   [Legistar#100621.pdf](#)  
                          [R 48-11.pdf](#)  
                          [Change Order # 2 ALAMP.pdf](#)
- Dratnol: reviewed the final balance change order with the committee members present. Discussion ensued regarding asphalt quantities. Dratnol: the AT&T vault is not part of this project. Preins: questioned the paving over the gutter at St. Charles and Garfield; overlaps the curb. Dratnol: should not be a problem; essentially sloppy paving. This is very thin. Preins: where we put in the stamped concrete, will this have to be patched with asphalt? Dratnol: it can be restamped. It will be painted in the Spring. Schuert: why was this done in some areas and not others? Dratnol: this was only done in the designated cross walks. Gron: I thought we were putting a handicap ramp crossing at St. Charles and Lincoln to get to the Splash Park. Goldsmith: will look into this and get back with you.*
- L.**     [100628](#)     Great Western Trail Bridges, Amendment to the Intergovernmental Agreement with DuPage County  
Authorizing the signatures of the President and Clerk on Amendment No. 1 to the Agreement. (DISTRICTS #4 & #5)

**Attachments:** [#100628.pdf](#)  
[R 49-11.pdf](#)  
[Agreement Bicycle-pedestrian Bridge.pdf](#)

- M. [100634](#) Lombard Circulator - Letter of Postponement  
Authorizing the signature of the Village President on a letter to the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) relative to the denial of Year Two funding for the Lombard Circulator.

**Attachments:** [R 50-11.pdf](#)  
[100634.pdf](#)  
[Letter 11-21-10.pdf](#)  
[Letters from State Reps & Senators.pdf](#)

- N. [100640](#) Change Order #1 for Alternate Asphalt Mix Supplier  
Reflecting an increase of \$11,968.72 to the contract with DuPage Materials Company. (DISTRICTS - ALL)

**Attachments:** [#100640.pdf](#)  
[R 51-11.pdf](#)  
[Change Order 1 Asphalt Mix.pdf](#)

#### Other Matters

- O. [100637](#) Sidewalk Snow & Ice Removal Contract  
Award of a contract to Beverly Snow & Ice, Inc., the lowest responsible bidder of four bids, in an amount not to exceed \$30,970. Bid in compliance with Public Act 85-1295. (DISTRICTS #1, #2, #4, #5 & #6)

**Attachments:** [100637.pdf](#)  
[Contract # PWO-1116.pdf](#)  
[Beverly Snow PWO-1116 Contract term.pdf](#)  
[PO#68721.PDF](#)

- P. [100638](#) Catch Basin Cleaning  
Award of a contract to National Power Rodding Corp., the lowest responsible bidder of three bids, in the budgeted amount of \$50,000. Bid in compliance with Public Act 85-1295. (DISTRICTS - ALL)

**Attachments:** [#100638.pdf](#)

- Q. [100639](#) Water & Sewer Systems Supplies  
Award of a contract to Ziebell Water Service Products of Elk Grove Village, the only bidder, in the budgeted amount of \$50,000. Bid in compliance with Public Act 85-1295. (DISTRICTS - ALL)

**Attachments:** [#100639.pdf](#)  
[Contract PWU-1119.pdf](#)

- R. [100602](#) Recycling Education Grant, Glenbard East High School  
Recommendation from the Environmental Concerns Committee to



approve a request in the amount of \$350.00. (DISTRICT #2)

Attachments: [100602-603-604-606.pdf](#)

- S. [100603](#) Recycling Education Grant, Glenn Westlake Middle School  
Recommendation from the Environmental Concerns Committee to approve a request in the amount of \$714.03 or lower if the number of lids requested is incorrect. (DISTRICT #3)  
**Attachments:** [100602-603-604-606.pdf](#)  
*Adams pointed out that they are ordering six cans and 12 lids. He also pointed out that the recyclables don't need to be separated because Waste Management picks it up commingled materials. Jendras suggested that they may be separating to draw more attention to the materials.*
- T. [100604](#) Recycling Education Grant, Manor Hill  
Recommendation from the Environmental Concerns Committee to approve a request in the amount of \$340.00 or 20 books, whichever is less. (DISTRICT #3)  
**Attachments:** [100602-603-604-606.pdf](#)  
*Jendras pointed out that the book is for ages 4-7 so she is not sure 4th and 5th graders would value it. She also suggested that they just buy one for each classroom and a couple for the library. Cooper added that there needs to be more benefit than just those particular kids. If they are purchased for the classrooms, then more children will benefit.*
- U. [100606](#) Recycling Education Grant, Pleasant Lane  
Recommendation from the Environmental Concerns Committee to approve a request in the amount of \$650.00. (DISTRICT #4)  
**Attachments:** [100602-603-604-606.pdf](#)
- V. [100629](#) Fire Pension Report  
Accept and file the 2010 Municipal Compliance Report from the Fire Pension Fund as prepared by Lauterbach & Amen.  
**Attachments:** [firepensionreport2010.pdf](#)  
[100629.pdf](#)
- W. [100641](#) Police Department Pension Report  
Accept and file the 2010 Municipal Compliance Report from the Police Pension Fund as prepared by Lauterbach & Amen.  
**Attachments:** [policepensionreport2010.pdf](#)  
[100641.pdf](#)

## IX. Items for Separate Action

### Ordinances on First Reading (Waiver of First Requested)

### Other Ordinances on First Reading

### Ordinances on Second Reading

### Resolutions

**Other Matters**

**X. Agenda Items for Discussion**

- A. [100643](#) Downtown Revitalization Project Guidebook "The Plan"  
Request to review and discuss the Lombard Downtown Revitalization  
Project Guidebook with referral of specific elements contained therein to  
the affected standing committees for their review and recommendation.  
(DISTRICTS #1, #4 and #5)  
*Attachments:* [100643.pdf](#)

**XI. Executive Session**

**XII. Reconvene**

**XIII Adjournment**

.