



# Village of Lombard

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

## Meeting Minutes

### Plan Commission

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

---

Monday, June 19, 2017

7:00 PM

Village Hall - Board Room

---

### Call to Order

*Acting Chairperson Flint called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m.*

### Pledge of Allegiance

*Acting Chairperson Flint led the Pledge of Allegiance.*

### Roll Call of Members

**Present** 5 - Ronald Olbrysh, Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, John Mrofcza, and Stephen Flint  
**Absent** 1 - Donald F. Ryan

*Also present: Jennifer Ganser, AICP, Assistant Director of Community Development; Anna Papke, AICP, Sr. Planner, and Jason Guisinger, legal counsel to the Plan Commission.*

### Public Hearings

[170271](#)

#### **PC 17-19: Sign Deviations, Yorkbrook Business Park at Eisenhower Lane**

Requests that the Village grant a conditional use for a planned development with a deviation to Section 153.208 (H) to allow for signs in the clear line of sight area. (DISTRICT #3)

**A motion was made by Commissioner Burke, seconded by Commissioner Olbrysh, to continue this petition to the Special Meeting of the Plan Commission on July 31, 2017. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Ronald Olbrysh, Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, John Mrofcza, and Stephen Flint

**Absent:** 1 - Donald F. Ryan

*Acting Chairperson Flint called the order of the agenda.*

*Ms. Ganser read the Rules of Procedures as written in the Plan Commission By-Laws.*

[170268](#)

**PC 17-21: Approval of a Major Plat of Subdivision with Companion Relief- 222 E. Windsor Avenue (Allied Drywall)**

Requests the Village approve a Major Plat of Subdivision located within the R2 Single-Family Residence District, with the following companion relief:

1. Variance from the Zoning Ordinance for the proposed Lot 11:
  - a. A variation from Section 155.407(F)(1) to reduce minimum required front yard setback from thirty (30) feet to fifteen (15) feet where adjacent to the arc of the cul-de-sac turnaround;
2. Variances from the Zoning Ordinance for the proposed Lot 12:
  - a. A variation from Section 155.407(F)(1) to reduce minimum required front yard setback from thirty (30) feet to fifteen (15) feet; and
  - b. A variation from Section 155.407(F)(4) to reduce minimum required rear yard setback from twenty-five (25) feet to fifteen (15) feet;
3. Variances from the Subdivisions and Development Ordinance:
  - a. A variation from Section 154.503(D)(1) to allow a cul-de-sac turnaround with a right-of-way diameter of 106 feet where a right-of-way diameter of 124 feet is required;
  - b. A variation from Section 154.504(B) to allow a sidewalk that is two (2) feet from the street curb where a minimum separation of five (5) feet is required, for the sidewalk located adjacent to the north side of the cul-de-sac turnaround; and
  - c. A variation from Section 154.304(D)(3) to eliminate the sidewalk from the new roadway adjacent to the

south side of the cul-de-sac turnaround. (DISTRICT # 4)

*Sworn in to present the petition were: Anna Papke, Senior Planner; and Debbie Beaver, representing the petitioner.*

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

*Ms. Beaver presented the petition on behalf of the petitioner. She gave an overview of D.R. Horton, the developer who would be building the subdivision. She noted that D.R. Horton is a large builder with a diverse portfolio. The subject property would be developed under the Emerald Homes brand.*

*Ms. Beaver described the neighborhood around the subject property, noting that it is zoned R2. The proposed plan calls for 12 single-family home lots. These lots will meet or exceed the lot width and area requirements of the R2 zoning district. She also summarized the variances that the petitioner is requesting for the subdivision, including variances for setbacks on Lots 11 and 12, and variances for the cul-de-sac bulb to be constructed at the east end of Windsor Avenue. She noted that the setback variances will not impact neighboring properties, and that the cul-de-sac will have adequate pavement area for maneuvering of fire trucks. She noted that the overall plan for the subdivision is consistent with the concept plans discussed by the Plan Commission in a 2005 workshop relative to the subject property.*

*Ms. Beaver showed examples of the types of homes D.R. Horton will build in the subject property. She said the price point for the homes will be in the range of \$400-\$500K.*

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

*Ms. Papke presented the staff report, which was submitted into the public record in its entirety. The petitioner proposes a 12-lot single-family home subdivision in the R2 zoning district. The subdivision will include improvements to the Windsor Avenue right-of-way to the east limits of the subject property.*

*The petition was reviewed by the Village's interdepartmental review committee. Comments from this review have been passed on to the petitioner, and will be addressed in the final review and permitting process.*

*The Planning Division notes that the proposed single-family homes are a permitted use in the R2 district, and the 12 lots will meet lot width and area requirements. The development as proposed will be consistent with the other single-family homes in the immediate neighborhood. The petitioner has requested several variances related to the cul-de-sac bulb and the setbacks for Lots 11 and 12. All variances are requested as a result of the need to install the cul-de-sac bulb within the existing platted Windsor Avenue right-of-way. Staff has reviewed these variances and is supportive of them.*

*Staff notes that the Plan Commission is reviewing a final plat. Village staff is in the process of reviewing final engineering, which is expected to be complete prior to the Village Board hearing on July 20, 2017.*

*Staff recommended approval of the petition subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.*

*Acting Chairperson Flint asked for public comment, and, hearing none, opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners.*

**A motion was made by Commissioner Sweetser, seconded by Commissioner Olbrysh, to recommend to the Corporate Authorities approval of this petition subject to the following three (3) conditions.**

- 1. The petitioner shall develop the site in accordance with the plans submitted as part of this petition, including:
  - a. Preliminary plat of subdivision for Windsor Place, prepared by Wolf Pack Consulting, LLC, dated May 22, 2017;**
  - b. Final Site Development Plans (preliminary engineering), prepared by CivWorks Consulting, LLC, dated May 22, 2017; and**
  - c. Preliminary stormwater analysis, prepared by CivWorks Consulting, LLC, dated May 5, 2017;****
- 2. The petitioner shall obtain a demolition permit and demolish all existing structures on the subject property prior to recording of the final plat; and**
- 3. The petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Ronald Olbrysh, Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, John Mrofcza, and Stephen Flint

**Absent:** 1 - Donald F. Ryan

[170269](#)

**PC 17-22: 1 E. St. Charles Road**

Requests that the Village grant a variance from Section 153.506(A)(6) (c) to allow for a freestanding sign of seventeen feet (17') in height,

where six feet (6') is allowed on the subject property located within the B5 Central Business District. (DISTRICT #1)

*Sworn in to present the petition were: Jennifer Ganser, Assistant Director; William Sheehan and Tim Bingham, representing the petitioner.*

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

*William Sheehan presented on behalf of the petitioner and said he is requesting a freestanding sign at 1 E St. Charles Road. The sign would be consistent with other gas station signs such as the Mobil at 610 S. Main Street. He said they are trying to make the gas station look presentable. The current sign is districting and hard to read.*

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

*Ms. Ganser presented the staff report, which was submitted into the public record in its entirety. The petitioner is requesting approval for a freestanding sign with a height of seventeen feet (17'). The petitioner intends on placing the sign at the northwest corner of the site. A previous freestanding sign was located at this corner prior to 1991. The subject property is currently improved with a gas station, convenience center, and restaurant/donut shop. The name of the business and fuel rate signs are currently displayed on the canopy. Due to the constraints of the area for a freestanding sign and the intensity of pedestrian traffic, staff found that a monument sign could impact the safety of the intersection. A sign supported by a narrow or pole style base would provide higher visibility of pedestrians utilizing the intersection of Main Street and St. Charles Road. The proposed freestanding sign is consistent with other types of freestanding signs approved for gas stations in the Village such as Mobil at Main Street and Madison Street and BP at Finley Road and 22nd Street. Staff is supportive of this request.*

*Acting Chairperson Flint asked for public comment, and, hearing none, opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners.*

*Commissioner Olbrysh asked what type of construction is occurring at the site now. Mr. Bingham said the fuel islands and dispensers are being replaced. The site is being spruced up and will tie into the downtown.*

A motion was made by Commissioner Burke, seconded by Commissioner Mrofcza, to recommend to the Corporate Authorities approval of this petition subject to the following seven (7) conditions.

1. The petitioner shall develop the site in accordance with the plans submitted as part of this request from Ahern Signs dated 5/11/17 and Red Rooster Flow dated 5/1/17;
2. The petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report;
3. This relief shall be valid for a period of one year from the date of approval of the ordinance. If the sign is not installed by said date, this relief shall be deemed null and void;
4. The freestanding sign must be completely enclosed within the airspace of the petitioner's property and shall not project into the public owned right of way;
5. The petitioner shall install and maintain a landscaping area surrounding the freestanding sign in accordance with the Downtown Landscape Enhancement Recommendations;
6. All lighting must conform to the Village's photometric standards; and
7. The existing freestanding sign located in the northeast corner of the subject property shall be removed.

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 5 - Ronald Olbrysh, Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, John Mrofcza, and Stephen Flint

**Absent:** 1 - Donald F. Ryan

[170270](#)

**PC 17-20: Amend interior side yard setbacks for single-family homes in the Oak Creek Planned Development**

Requests that the Village take the following actions on the subject property located within the R5PD Planned Development District (Oak Creek Planned Development):

1. Pursuant to Section 155.504 (A) (major changes in a planned development) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance, amend the Oak Creek Planned Development, as established by Ordinance No. 1351, and amended by the Consent Judgment and Decree entered on June 19, 1978 in the Circuit Court of DuPage County in Case No. 78 MR 28 and subsequent amendments thereto (collectively the "Consent Decree"), to allow for modifications to the interior side yard setback for single family residences, from 10 feet (10'), as originally established by Ordinance No 1351 and unaffected by the Consent Decree, to six feet (6'). (DISTRICT #2)

*Sworn in to present the petition were: Anna Papke, Senior Planner.*

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

*Ms. Papke presented the petition and the staff report, which was submitted into the public record in its entirety. The Village is proposing to amend interior side setback requirements for single-family homes in the Oak Creek Planned Development. The ordinance that established the Oak Creek Planned Development in 1968 requires a minimum setback of 10 feet for single-family dwelling units. It has come to the attention of staff that many of the houses in this planned development have been built to a six-foot interior side yard setback, which is consistent with required side yard setbacks in the Village's Residential zoning districts. The discrepancy between the required setback of 10 feet and the actual setbacks of existing houses poses a challenge for Oak Creek homeowners who want to add on to their homes, as they would need to apply for a deviation from the Oak Creek Planned Development standards. Therefore, staff proposes to amend the interior side yard setback for single-family homes in the planned development to six feet, which will make the Oak Creek standards consistent with existing development in the neighborhood as well as other single-family homes throughout the Village.*

*Ms. Papke noted that there is no new development associated with this petition. The petition is focused only on amending standards for single-family homes in the Oak Creek Planned Development.*

*The Forest Preserve District of DuPage County, which owns a piece of property within the Oak Creek Planned Development, sent a letter of no comment to the Village prior to the meeting.*

*Staff recommended approval of the petition.*

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

*Heather Murphy, 1580 S. Lloyd Avenue, addressed the Commissioners. Ms. Murphy asked why the Village is proposing to amend the standards for the entire planned development, rather than requiring individual property owners who want to build less than 10 feet from the property line to apply for a variance on a case-by-case basis. She asked if there are many people in the area that want to put additions onto their homes.*

*Ms. Papke stated that the Village had processed a Plan Commission petition in 2005 for an individual homeowner in Oak Creek that was adding onto a home that did not meet the 10-foot setback requirement. The Village had recently received a building permit application from another homeowner in Oak Creek that wanted to build a second story addition onto a home that does not meet the setback requirement. Village staff researched existing development in the area and found that many houses are not meeting the 10-foot side setback requirement. Given the widespread nature of the issue, staff had determined it would be worthwhile to amend the standards for the entire planned development rather than process individual petitions as homeowners seek permits to add onto homes.*

*Ms. Murphy asked if she would need to build a house with a six-foot side setback if the standards are changed and something were to happen to her home. Ms. Papke responded that the proposed six-foot setback would be a minimum setback. Homeowners would have the option to build homes with larger setbacks if they chose to do so.*

*Ms. Murphy requested the Plan Commission consider not changing the standards for the whole development. She suggested property owners wanting to vary from the current 10-foot setback should continue to make individual petitions to the Village.*

*Acting Chairperson Flint asked if anyone else from the public wanted to speak, and, hearing none, opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners.*

*Commissioner Burke asked if there was support in the neighborhood for the proposed change. He noted that this petition appeared to be a staff initiative.*

*Ms. Papke confirmed that staff had initiated the petition. She had spoken to multiple residents on the phone after they received public notice of the petition, and none had expressed opposition. Ms. Ganser said she had also spoken with neighbors and they had not expressed opposition.*

*Commissioner Flint noted that in the long run, changing the setback standard will save residents time when they apply for a permit for an addition.*

*Mr. Burke asked staff about the fees that an individual would have to pay if petitioning the Village for a variance on an individual basis. Ms. Papke said the fees for this type of petition would be around \$900. She also noted that the petition process takes two to three months*



*from start to finish. Mr. Burke said that changing the standard seems to make sense in that it will save residents time and money.*

*Commissioner Sweetser noted that the proposed six-foot interior side setback would be consistent with requirements for other single-family homes in the Village, and the proposed change will save residents time and money. She did not see a disadvantage to the change.*

*Commissioner Mrofcza asked how the homes in Oak Creek had come to be built out of compliance with the 10-foot side setback requirement. Ms. Papke said that staff had researched that question and not been able to determine how this had happened.*

*Commissioner Burke asked if there could be issues for homeowners who want to sell houses that do not meet the current 10-foot setback requirement.*

*Ms. Ganzer said that the Village does sometimes receive requests for zoning compliance letters from buyers or lenders, but that they rarely request setback information.*

*Mr. Guisinger said that a buyer considering a home with a setback that is not in compliance with the standards for the planned development could potentially have difficulties securing a loan or title insurance.*

**A motion was made by Commissioner Olbrysh, seconded by Commissioner Burke, to recommend to the Corporate Authorities approval of this petition. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Ronald Olbrysh, Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, John Mrofcza, and Stephen Flint

**Absent:** 1 - Donald F. Ryan

## **Business Meeting**

*The business meeting convened at 7:41 p.m.*

## **Approval of Minutes**

**On a motion by Commissioner Olbrysh, and seconded by Commissioner Sweetser, the minutes of the May 22, 2017 meeting were approved with Commissioner's Mrofcza and Burke abstaining citing their absence at the meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 3 - Ronald Olbrysh, Ruth Sweetser, and Stephen Flint

**Abstain:** 2 - Martin Burke, and John Mrofcza

**Absent:** 1 - Donald F. Ryan

## Public Participation

*There was no public participation.*

## DuPage County Hearings

*There were no DuPage County hearings.*

## Chairperson's Report

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

## Planner's Report

*Ms. Papke provided an update on the development of Yorktown Commons Parcel 1, located at the northeast corner of Grace Street and the Yorktown Ring Road. When this project was approved by the Village Board in 2016, a condition of approval was that the developer (GreyStar) would meet with residents of the Yorktown Condo building directly to the north of the subject property to determine the best screening option for the shared property line. GreyStar conducted this meeting on May 24, 2017. GreyStar presented two alternative screening choices to the Yorktown Condo residents (fence or landscape buffer). Following the meeting, the property manager for Yorktown Condo alerted Village staff that the residents had expressed a preference for a six-foot tall shadowbox fence. The developer is aware of this preference and will seek a fence permit accordingly.*

*This was presented as an informational item, not requiring any action by the Plan Commission.*

## Unfinished Business

*There was no unfinished business.*

## New Business

*There was no new business.*

## Subdivision Reports

*There were no subdivision reports.*

## Site Plan Approvals

*There were no site plan approvals.*

## Workshops

*There were no workshops.*

## Adjournment

A motion was made by Commissioner Mrofcza, seconded by Commissioner Sweetser, to adjourn the meeting at 7:43 p.m. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

---

*Stephen E. Flint, Vice Chairperson  
Lombard Plan Commission*

---

*Jennifer Ganser, Secretary  
Lombard Plan Commission*