

# **Village of Lombard**

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



## **Meeting Minutes**

**Monday, June 21, 2010**

**7:30 PM**

**Village Hall**

## **Plan Commission**

*Donald F. Ryan, Chairperson  
Commissioners: Martin Burke,  
Stephen Flint, Ronald Olbrysh,  
Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper and Richard Nelson  
Staff Liaison: Christopher Stilling*

## Call to Order

[Play Video](#)

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

## Roll Call of Members

[Play Video](#)

**Present:** Chairperson Donald F. Ryan, Commissioner Stephen Flint, Commissioner Ronald Olbrysh, Commissioner Ruth Sweetser, Commissioner Richard Nelson and Commissioner Andrea Cooper

**Absent:** Commissioner Martin Burke

*Also present: Christopher Stilling, AICP, Assistant Director of Community Development; Michael Toth, Planner I; and George Wagner, legal counsel to the Plan Commission.*

Chairperson Ryan called the order of the agenda.

Christopher Stilling read the Rules of Procedures as written in the Plan Commission By-Laws.

## Public Hearings

[Play Video](#)

[100345](#)

### **PC 10-08: Text Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance (Green Code)**

The Village of Lombard is proposing text amendments to the Lombard Zoning Ordinance, amending Section 155.200 to establish provisions for geothermal systems, rain barrels, cisterns, Small Scale Wind Energy Systems and solar panels, Section 155.212 to establish geothermal systems, rain barrels, cisterns and solar panels as permitted obstructions in certain required yards and Section 155.800 establishing definitions for Small Scale Energy Systems while amending the definition of "Rooftop Mechanical Equipment". (DISTRICTS - ALL)

[Play Video](#)

*Michael Toth, Planner I, presented the petition. The Zoning Ordinance does not specifically address alternative energy structures. However, one can place such structures on their property as they are considered "accessory structures" to principal uses and regulated as such. Due to increased energy costs and the demand for alternative energy solutions, the Village wishes to take a proactive stance and update the Zoning Ordinance to allow these structures to be placed in their niche locations. Through text amendments to the Zoning Ordinance, solar panels, wind turbines, rain barrels and cisterns would all been given special consideration in order to encourage residents to utilize their beneficial attributes.*

*During the April 19, 2010 workshop session, the Plan Commission raised a number of issues relative to the proposed text amendments. While the Plan Commission did not raise any issues with geothermal systems, rain barrels and cisterns, there were a number of issues raised pertaining to solar panels and wind turbines (Small Scale Wind Energy Systems). More specifically, the Plan Commission was concerned of the impact that solar panels and wind turbines could have on residential neighborhoods. With regard to solar panels, it was the Plan Commission's opinion that ground mounted solar panels could produce excessive bulk on a property and roof mounted solar panels could also become an aesthetic issue - if placed too high above the principal structure. The*

*Plan Commission felt that wind turbines could produce unwanted noise, which could have a detrimental impact on surrounding properties. The Plan Commission also instructed staff to look into placing a cap on the permitted number of these devices.*

*The Plan Commission also recommended that staff research the topic based upon findings of surrounding communities. The proposed text amendments are a result of the Plan Commission comments and findings from surrounding communities. Those communities include: Oswego, IL; Lincolnshire, IL; and, the Wind Energy Task Force of Lake County Communities. Please note, staff did originally propose text amendments relative to ground mounted Small Scale Wind Energy Systems; however, those amendments are no longer being proposed. Text amendments particularly relating to ground mounted Small Scale Wind Energy Systems may come at a later date, when more information is available on the structures and when there is an increased demand for such structures.*

*Mr. Toth indicated that he prepared a PowerPoint presentation in order to provide a visual image for the proposed amendments.*

*The first slide shows solar panel application examples. For a single family application a five foot (5') pitch would be allowed to accommodate flat roofs. For commercial, industrial, office and multiple family dwellings, a ten foot (10') pitch would be allowed to accommodate flat roofs.*

*The second slide shows that solar panels having a five foot (5') maximum pitch would be acceptable for single family, attached and two-family dwellings. This pitch allows for the structure itself to be pitched toward the sun.*

*The third slide shows a ten foot (10') maximum pitch which would be acceptable for solar panels on commercial, industrial, office and multiple-family dwellings. As these structures are not located in residential neighborhoods, the allowable pitch would not be an aesthetic issue.*

*The next few slides address small scale wind energy systems or wind turbines as it relates to their allowable location, size, height and sound levels. As previously mentioned, ground mounted structures are not being proposed at this time and possibly could resurrect at a later date when more information is available and there is an increased demand.*

*The first slide shows a few examples of the technology being used. The horizontal wind turbine type is primarily used on wind farms. The vertical type is popular with residential and business uses and does not have the same impact as the horizontal type.*

*Location - This slide shows the acceptable location for roof mounted small scale wind energy systems which will be permitted in all zoning districts as accessory structures. It shall not project into any requisite yard and would have to stay within the buildable area of the lot.*

*Size - This slide illustrates the allowable size. The maximum rotor diameter will be capped at ten feet (10').*

*Mr. Toth mentioned that the amendments being proposed are a culmination of the different languages found. There wasn't much language found from adjacent communities so in order to be proactive, we used language from the Village of Oswego for the ten feet (10').*

*Height - This language came from Lincolnshire in regard to the allowable height of ten*

feet (10') above the maximum building height. To capture the essence of the technology, it is crucial to have the structure project above the tree lines in order for it to operate successfully.

Sound Levels - This was taken from the Village of Lincolnshire. On the left of the slide shows what we are proposing and to the right a sound comparison chart was provided from the City of Naperville's Zoning Ordinance. It gives an example of what decibel levels are on the property.

Appearance and lighting standards were taken from the Oswego model. This allows our building department to have access to these devices for maintenance.

The permitted structures remain the same from the workshop itself as it relates to geothermal systems, rain barrels and cisterns, and solar panels.

We added a definition for small scale energy systems and had to amend the definition for rooftop mechanical equipment to exclude these energy systems.

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

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

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

Commissioner Olbrysh asked staff to repeat the numbers associated with the amount of sound that comes from air conditioner units versus the wind turbines. Mr. Toth stated that the example gave 60 decibels at 10 feet away. It would be comparable to the number used for setbacks. These structures cannot be placed in interior yards but set back just like an air condenser can.

Commissioner Olbrysh commented that he did not have a problem with solar panels but was concerned about wind turbines. His research indicates that roof mounted wind turbines would have to be a 100' high tower to do its job; otherwise, with these types of home units it is like prepaying your electric bill for 20 years. On average the cost is \$7,000 - \$10,000 and it would take a long time in order to recoup your investment. He questioned whether any one in Lombard had one. Mr. Toth answered that he wasn't aware of any residential applications but there are industrial applications. The height regulation goes back to 30-40' tall so there is clearance from the ground for them to be effective.

Commissioner Olbrysh stated that his research indicates that to be effective they need to be at least 30' above the tree line. He stated that it is good to be proactive but questioned if this type of energy is useful or just for show. He was also concerned about vibration and noise as most of lot widths in Lombard average 60' whereas most of the western communities have larger lots. Mr. Toth answered that was why we excluded ground mounted types. We found that the information pertained to larger lots with different characteristics than Lombard's. We found that what they allowed didn't work here. The technology might evolve in the future to where it can accommodate the smaller lot areas.

Commissioner Olbrysh asked what happens if someone wants to mount one today. Mr. Toth answered that it would be considered an accessory structure and would follow those regulations. Mr. Stilling noted that staff is taking a baby step as we do not know where the technology is going. We would rather take our research and make it available

*should inquiries arise. As time goes by, we can assess this and if we need to change our code, we can take it into consideration.*

*Commissioner Olbrysh asked if it was staff's opinion that it was better to do this as a text amendment rather than on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Stilling stated that right now we are being proactive with building provisions and are comfortable with what we have come up with by meeting the intent of the Zoning Ordinance. If someone wants to go beyond that, for instance, have two units instead of one, they would have to get a variation. Mr. Toth added that this would be similar to a pilot program and staff will see where the market takes us. If we find that we have a lot of variations coming through, we can evolve (along with the market) and allow something above and beyond classifying it as an accessory structure.*

*Commissioner Sweetser stated that this is a great first step and is in favor of it as there is no definitive information about height and cost effectiveness. She suggested that when staff begins to get requests for this technology, that there be as much information available to inform people about statistics and background information. Mr. Toth referenced the green building handbook that was introduced earlier. He added that some municipalities are being reactionary and scrambling to incorporate these elements into their code. He is hoping to see more commitment between the municipalities to share this information with each other. CMAP is currently working to get communities to cull information, but topography will ultimately be the determining factor of what is in demand and what is not.*

*Commissioner Cooper referred to the table in the staff report, page 3 Section 155.212, water collection, about rain barrels and cisterns. She asked for clarification in that they are not permitted in the front and corner side yards. Mr. Toth answered that it is true, that is in the yard itself a rain barrel or cistern could be put on the side of your house. The more buildable area you have the larger the barrel you can have. He explained that the structure cannot encroach more than two feet into the side yard. In the front and corner side yards we do not list it as a permitted encroachment due to aesthetics but there is no specification in the rear yard. Mrs. Stilling added that it depends on the setback of your house - you are allowed a 2' encroachment.*

*Commissioner Cooper stated that she did not see a problem in having them located within the 30' front yard setback because now you are minimizing and prohibiting water collection points around the home.*

*Commissioner Olbrysh commented that it is good that the Village is taking a proactive approach. He is hoping that everyone will do research to determine if a roof mounted wind turbine is right for them. His research does show that for this area, size does matter. The bigger it is, the better chance of recouping your investment in a shorter period of time.*

**It was moved by Commissioner Sweetser, seconded by Commissioner Flint, that this matter be recommended to the Corporate Authorities for approval. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Flint, Olbrysh, Sweetser, Nelson and Cooper

**Absent:** 1 - Burke

[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)

[Play Video](#)

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.*

It was moved by Commissioner Olbrysh, seconded by Commissioner Cooper, that this matter be recommended to the Corporate Authorities for approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 5 - Flint, Olbrysh, Sweetser, Nelson and Cooper

**Absent:** 1 - Burke

## Business Meeting

[Play Video](#)

*The business meeting commenced at 8:10 p.m.*

## Approval of Minutes

[Play Video](#)

*Mr. Stilling noted that the motion for petition PC 10-05 located on page 9, should include that the Plan Commission recommended approval to the Board of Trustees. He also mentioned there were a few minor typographical errors.*

*On a motion by Nelson and seconded by Sweetser the minutes of the May 17, 2010 meeting were unanimously approved by the members present with the aforementioned corrections.*

## Public Participation

[Play Video](#)

*There was no public participation.*

## DuPage County Hearings

[Play Video](#)

**100347**

### **DuPage County Case Z10-019: 19W725 13th Place**

Variation to reduce the west side yard setback from three (3) feet to one and sixty four hundredths (1.64) feet for an existing shed. (UNINCORPORATED)

[Play Video](#)

*Christopher Stilling, Assistant Director of Community Development, presented the petition. He stated that DuPage County has received a filing for a public hearing for a variation to reduce the interior side yard setback to 1.64 feet from the required 3 feet to allow for a shed. The petition is for the property located at 19W725 13th Place. As the subject property is located within the ultimate municipal boundaries of the Village of Lombard, the Village has received notice of the public hearing from the County and has been asked to provide comments or concerns regarding this petition.*

*Staff would like to solicit the input and a recommendation of the Plan Commission regarding this petition. Staff has informed the County that this matter is being brought forward to the Plan Commission and the Village Board for consideration.*

*According to discussions with County representatives, the existing shed on the property does not achieve code compliance concerning County and Village Codes. Both the Village Code and County Codes require a minimum 3 foot setback.*

*As the petitioner's plan shows, the property is 14,091 square feet in size and bordered by single family residences on all sides. The Village's Comprehensive Plan included the*



*subject property and identifies the site for Low Density Residential use.*

*Staff finds that based upon the site plan, a great deal of flexibility exists for the property owner to locate the shed to an area that meets County and Village Codes. Furthermore, staff finds that the shed's current location may present a negative impact upon the adjacent property owners. Based upon established County and Village codes, there are alternative locations to construct the shed within the buildable area of the lot. Staff also finds that the need for the variation is created by the petitioner and is not unique to the property. Moreover, the variation may also establish a precedent for yard setback relief for other properties in the area. As a practical matter, reductions in side yard setbacks can give an appearance of overcrowding within a subdivision.*

*Based upon this review staff believes that the petition would be inconsistent with established Village policies. Also, the petition would be inconsistent with the objectives included as part of the Comprehensive Plan, creates an adverse impact on a neighboring property, and constitutes an excessive encroachment into a required yard.*

*Staff is not supportive of this petition and requests that the Plan Commission make a recommendation to the Village Board that they deny the petition and adopt a resolution of objection.*

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

*Commissioner Sweetser stated she agreed with staff.*

**It was moved by Commissioner Sweetser, seconded by Commissioner Olbrysh, that this matter be recommended for a Resolution of Objection to the Corporate Authorities. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Flint, Olbrysh, Sweetser, Nelson and Cooper

**Absent:** 1 - Burke

## Chairperson's Report

[Play Video](#)

*The Chairperson deferred to the Assistant Director of Community Development.*

## Planner's Report

[Play Video](#)

*Mr. Stilling noted that July's meeting will include four to five public hearings and Commissioner Cooper will not be in attendance.*

*He gave a brief update on the Downtown noting that the Village had been awarded a planning grant from the RTA to finalize the implementation plan. The Village had a kickoff two weeks ago and more press releases and notices will be forthcoming throughout the summer. The Village's consultant recently conducted a number of focus group sessions which were held at two different properties in the Downtown. Fifty to sixty people participated. We anticipate the report being completed by mid fall.*

## Unfinished Business

[Play Video](#)

*There was no unfinished business.*

## New Business

[Play Video](#)

*There was no new business.*

## Subdivision Reports

[Play Video](#)

*There were no subdivision reports.*

## Site Plan Approvals

[Play Video](#)

*There were no site plan approvals.*

## Workshops

[Play Video](#)

[100348](#)

### Lyonhart Manor Townhomes

[Play Video](#)

*Christopher Stilling, Assistant Director of Community Development, presented the workshop. He stated that many of the Commissioners may remember this project as it occurred approximately four years ago.*

*Recently, Village staff has been approached by the prospective developer of the Lyonhart Manor Townhome development seeking consideration of a major change to their 2006 zoning and planned development approvals. This change would provide for an alternate design concept consisting of up to 54 townhouse units of a one-car garage format in lieu of the previously approved five single family residences and 25 two-car garage units. The petitioner is requesting the thoughts of the Plan Commission relative to the concept proposal before they formalize their plans for formal consideration by the Village.*

*Providing the background of the subject property Mr. Stilling stated that development approvals were received in 2006 per Plan Commission case 06-10 as part of the Lyonhart Manor Planned Development project. The approvals included an annexation agreement, annexation of the property, rezoning of the property to the R4 District interior to the site and the R2 District along Meadow Avenue, and approval of a conditional use for a planned development. These actions were taken to facilitate the construction of 25 townhouse units that would be similar in nature to the adjacent Buckingham Orchard development north of the site, as well as five single family residences along Meadow Avenue.*

*Since the original approvals were granted, the final plat establishing the public rights of way were established and a sanitary sewer line was constructed within the dedicated Patrick Drive, by the Buckingham Orchard developer. Six single family residences were demolished and one residence that was slated to be relocated to the far west end of the development still remains on the premises. The developer has stated that market conditions have not allowed him to proceed with the development since the original approvals were granted*

*Referring to the aerial, Mr. Stilling showed the location of the proposed 38 units and explained that their latest concept plan replaces 25 townhouse units along Buckingham Court and Patrick Drive. The concept plan attempts to generally mirror the building*

footprint of the previously approved plan. The units would have two-bedrooms, kitchen, dining room and living room and would be approximately 17 feet in width. Living space would range from 1,100 to 1,700 square feet if a basement is added to the units. Each unit would have a one-car garage.

Again referring to the aerial, Mr. Stilling showed the location of the Meadow Avenue residences and noted that in lieu of five single-family residences, up to 16 townhouse units is depicted on the concept plans. The townhomes would be of a similar design as those conceived along Buckingham Court. The detention facility is not intended to be altered at this time.

The developer is considering this modified concept based upon the following:

- *Changing Market Conditions* - the developer has stated that when the project was originally conceived in 2006, it was at the peak of the last real estate boom. Since that time, market conditions significantly eroded the ability to financially advance the original plan. He stated that demand for two bedroom townhouses as was originally envisioned is non-existent at this time, so he is looking for an alternative development concept for the site.
- *Market Differentiation* - one of the challenges he stated that he faces is that the original townhome plan is a product that is too similar to the existing townhomes along Cimarron Road and Meadow Avenue and currently being built by Dearborn Buckingham north of the site.
- *Housing Niche* - the developer stated that the one-car, two bedroom townhouse concept plan is differentiated and does have a broader market appeal than the townhomes that were originally approved. He proposes to market this concept to first-time home buyers and empty-nesters that may not need as much room.

The owner recognizes that the latest proposal is a major change to what was previously contemplated, but is interested in advancing the modified plan, in order to get the project started in a timely manner. The developer informed staff that this modified proposal can receive financing to move forward in the current economy.

In consideration of the modified proposal, staff's comments in response to this latest proposal include issues with the Comprehensive Plan, density, compatibility with adjacent developments, and response to market conditions.

*Comprehensive Plan* - As part of the 2006 approval, the Comprehensive Plan was modified to provide for lower density single-family residential along Meadow and provided for a modification for higher density through the remainder of the development. The lots along Meadow are oriented to the south and away from the other townhome units. While the developer notes that no other single family exists north of Meadow Avenue, the plan change was supported in 2006 as the abutting single-family residences serves as a proper transition from the single-family detached residences to the south and the higher density townhomes to the north. The previously approved plan also makes the transition interior to the Lyonhart Manor development, further minimizing its impact.

*Density* - An element of concern raised by staff is the net change in density for the development for the townhouses. Subtracting the detention facility and the rights-of-way, the original plan established a net density of 10 units per acre in the townhouse portion of the project. The concept plan would have a net density of approximately 15.26 units per acre. This is a significant increase above the adjacent developments, which also range in the 10 unit/acre range.

*Compatibility with Adjacent Developments* - staff noted to the developer, one of the key

provisions of the past development approvals for the Buckingham Orchard and Lyonhart Manor projects was that the units should be compatible with the adjacent townhouse units. Referring to the colored pictures of example elevations, Mr. Stilling stated that the modified plan, while it may incorporate some of the same architectural features as the adjacent development, staff notes that the units and neighborhood would not be similar in nature. While the developer suggests that additional amenities can be provided to address site constraints, such as a guest/visitor parking lot, the modified plan would not have the same character as the adjacent units. While the developer sees this as an asset opportunity, staff questions whether it is ultimately desirable.

*Market Conditions* - A key driving factor in the latest proposal is the market conditions. While the developer can make a case that his modified housing proposal may have more of an immediate impact, in order to get the project started, staff also notes that in a long-range view, shorter term market conditions cannot be the sole driving force in zoning considerations. Land development decisions have long-lasting impacts on neighborhoods and the community as a whole and as such, should not be considered based upon shorter term considerations. As such, these decisions should be reviewed carefully.

In summary, staff has raised concerns and believes that the previously approved plan does address the myriad of site development issues contemplated in 2006. However, the developer is seeking the input of the Commissioners regarding the development proposal prior to formalizing modified plans for the site. As the annexation agreement for the property ties the annexation with the original development plans, the associated annexation agreement would need to be amended - this amendment would be subject to Village Board consideration. However, the Plan Commission would be hearing the Plan amendment, land use and zoning issues associated with the proposed development change.

Chairperson Ryan requested the opinions and thoughts of the Plan Commissioners.

Commissioner Sweetser noted that she agreed with staff's perspective but had a question. Referring to the staff report from March 20, 2006 she asked if the original proposal only comprised of two-bedroom units. Mr. Stilling answered that they proposed a mix of two and three-bedroom units and there was considerable talk about maintaining or exceeding the standards of the surrounding developments. He added that adjacent residents spoke and had concerns about the quality of the development and making sure it was comparable to what existed nearby.

Chairperson Ryan stated that the Commission previously spent a lot of time discussing parking issues on the original development. This latest concept proposal is contrary to what we fought for and he believes that the units are for 2-car families. He stated he is against the proposal.

Commissioner Sweetser agreed. She asked staff if they had seen the market research the developer refers to which shows a preference for two-bedroom, one-car townhomes. Mr. Stilling answered that they have not provided this to staff.

Commissioner Olbrysh agreed and exemplified the Cambria development. He noted that the townhomes there are similar to what is being proposed and how they have major parking issues.

Commissioner Cooper asked if the developer was proposing a visitor parking lot. Mr. Stilling answered that they could accommodate it but there would be a lot of issues to work through. The bigger issue here is density.

*Chairperson Ryan referred to the colored example elevation pictures and stated that the appearance is one of trying to put too much into a small area. It doesn't flow with the neighboring communities.*

*Commissioner Cooper asked where the photos came from. Mr. Stilling answered that the developer mailed them to staff.*

*Chairperson Ryan stated that the proposed townhomes will downgrade the area and will be a cause for concern to landowners in that area.*

*Commissioner Sweetser stated that staff's argument is most compelling and the current market situation will change. We have to take the long-range view.*

*Commissioner Cooper noted that she agreed with everything the Commissioners and staff have previously said.*

## **Adjournment**

[Play Video](#)

*The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.*

---

*Donald F. Ryan, Chairperson  
Lombard Plan Commission*

---

*Christopher Stilling, Secretary  
Lombard Plan Commission*