

Village of Lombard

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



Minutes

Monday, September 26, 2022

7:00 PM

Village Hall

Plan Commission

Commissioners:

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

Call to Order

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

Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Giuliano led the Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call of Members

Present 5 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Tony Invergo, and Alissa Verson

Absent 2 - Kevin Walker, and Robert Spreenberg

Also present: Bill Heniff, AICP Director of Community Development, Anna Papke, AICP Senior Planner of Community Development, and Anne Skrodzki, Legal Counsel to the Plan Commission.

Commissioner Giuliano called the order of the agenda.

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

Appoint an Acting Chair

A motion was made by Commissioner Invergo, seconded by Commissioner Johnston to appoint Commissioner Leigh Giuliano Chair. The motion passed by an unanimous.

Public Hearings

[220277](#)

PC 22-22: 2300 S. Highland Avenue

The petitioner requests a conditional use pursuant to Section 155.412(C) (17) of the Lombard Village Code to allow for a restaurant, not including entertainment, dancing and/or amusement devices to operate on the subject property located within the OPD Office District Planned Development. (DISTRICT #3)

Sworn in to present the petition was Anna Papke, Senior Planner, and Nicholas Pappas, attorney for the petitioner.

Acting Chair Giuliano read the Plan Commission procedures and asked if anyone other than the petitioner intended to cross examine and, hearing none, she proceeded with the petition.

Mr. Pappas presented the petition. He said that the subject property was previously a restaurant. The property owner wants to re-establish the conditional use for a restaurant in order to be able to lease the building to a new tenant. He said the property had previously operated as a restaurant with no violations. He acknowledged the Fire Department's comments in the IDRC report about the need to bring the fire alarm and hood suppression system up to code.

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

Ms. Papke presented the staff report, which was submitted to the public record in its entirety. The petitioner proposes to operate a restaurant on the subject property. Restaurants are conditional uses in the underlying Office District. The existing building on the site is currently vacant but was previously operated as a restaurant. Village records indicate the most recent restaurant on the site closed in 2019. Since more than one year has elapsed since the restaurant closed, zoning entitlements for a restaurant have lapsed.

Planning staff reviewed the petition and found it meets the standards for conditional uses. The subject property is located in an area containing office buildings and higher-density residential development. A restaurant was previously operated on the site for several decades without issue. The petitioner does not plan any changes to the exterior layout of the site, though some remodeling may occur. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Acting Chair Giuliano asked if there were any questions or comments on the staff report. Hearing none, she opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners.

Commissioner Johnston said he was looking forward to having a restaurant located on this property again. He said it was a good location for a restaurant.

Commissioner Sweetser agreed, and said it had been a popular spot for a restaurant in the past.

On a motion by Commissioner Sweetser, and a second by Commissioner Johnston, the Plan Commission voted 5-0 to recommend that the Village Board approve the petition associated with PC 22-22 subject to the three (3) conditions in the staff report:

1. That the petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report, including but not limited to compliance with the comments from the Fire Department and the Building Division;
2. That the petitioner shall apply for and receive all required building permits prior to commencing any work on the site; and
3. This approval shall be subject to the commencement time provisions as set forth within Section 155.103(F)(11).

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Tony Invergo, and Alissa Verson

Absent: 2 - Kevin Walker, and Robert Spreenberg

[220291](#)

PC 22-24: 450 E. 22nd Street

The petitioner requests that the Village take the following action on the subject property located within the B3PD Planned Development (St. Regis Planned Development):

1. Pursuant to Section 155.504 (A) (major changes in a planned development) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance, amend the St. Regis Planned Development, as established by Ordinance No. 2249 and amended by Ordinance Nos. 4409, 4470, 4596, 7472, and 7587, in order to provide for the placement of a new (replacement) freestanding sign on the subject property, with the following deviations:
 - a. A deviation from Village Code Section 153.210(H) to allow an automatic changeable copy panel on a freestanding sign that is not perpendicular to a minor arterial road; and
 - b. A deviation from Village Code Section 153.208(B) to allow for a freestanding sign to be located in the clear line of sight area, where the freestanding sign is replacing an existing sign located in the clear line of sight area. (DISTRICT #3)

Sworn in to present the petition was Anna Papke, Senior Planner, and Marcin Wolak of Elevate Sign, representing the petitioner.

Acting Chair Giuliano read the Plan Commission procedures and asked if anyone other than the petitioner intended to cross examine and, hearing none, she proceeded with the petition.

Mr. Wolak presented the petition. He said the property owner intends to replace an existing freestanding sign with a new freestanding sign of

the same sign surface area and height. The current sign is a static sign, but the proposed replacement sign will include an automatic changeable copy (ACC) panel. The Village's Sign Ordinance requires ACC signs to be located perpendicular to 22nd Street. However, the proposed sign is at a 45-degree angle to 22nd Street. The petitioner is requesting approval for a deviation to permit the ACC sign at this angle. Mr. Wolak noted the proposed sign will comply with the sign allotments previously approved for the property in 1999.

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

Ms. Papke presented the staff report, which was submitted to the public record in its entirety. The petitioner proposes to replace the existing freestanding sign located at 450 E. 22nd Street, at the corner of 22nd Street and Fairfield Avenue. The property is located in the St. Regis Planned Development, which has strict regulations for signage. In 1999, the current freestanding sign was approved by the Village through the public hearing process.

The petitioner proposes to install a new freestanding sign that is the same size and height as the existing sign, utilizing the same foundation as the existing sign. The proposed sign includes an automatic changeable copy (ACC) panel. The Sign Ordinance permits ACC panels on properties with more than 350 feet of frontage on an arterial roadway, provided the ACC panel is perpendicular to the arterial roadway. The subject property has more than 350 feet along 22nd Street, which is a designated minor arterial roadway. However, the existing and proposed sign is located at a 45-degree angle to 22nd Street. Therefore, the petitioner is seeking a signage deviation to permit the ACC panel to be at a 45-degree angle to 22nd Street rather than the required 90-degree angle.

Staff has reviewed the petition and finds it meets the standards for signage deviations. The current sign was installed in 2000, prior to the adoption of code requirements for ACC signs to be perpendicular to arterial roads. Further, the position of the current sign accounts for a number of site constraints, including a retaining wall, grade changes, and underground utility lines. Given these issues, staff finds it reasonable that the petitioner would seek to install the sign in the same location as the existing sign. Staff recommended approval of the petition.

Ms. Papke noted that the petition had been advertised to include a deviation for the sign to be within the clear line of sight triangle at the intersection, based on an initial belief that the existing sign encroached into the clear line of sight. However, upon further review, staff determined the existing sign is outside the clear line of sight triangle. Since the new sign will use the existing sign foundation, it will also be outside the clear line of sight. Therefore, this relief is not necessary. To this end, the staff report includes a recommended condition of approval that affirms the sign will remain outside the clear line of sight.

Acting Chair Giuliano asked if there were any questions or comments on the staff report.

Commissioner Johnston asked about the purpose of the code requirement that ACC signs be located perpendicular to the right-of-way. Ms. Papke said that this code requirement was adopted in 2014, when the Village approved significant amendments to the code provisions for ACC signage. Prior to 2014, ACC signs were permitted based on zoning district. Since 2014, ACC signage has been permitted for all properties with 350 feet or more of frontage along an arterial roadway, regardless of zoning district. Ms. Papke said the requirement for the ACC sign to be located perpendicular to the arterial roadway was to ensure that ACC signs were not unreasonably impacting minor roadways in cases where corner properties had frontage on an arterial and a non-arterial roadway.

On a motion by Commissioner Invergo, and a second by Commissioner Sweetser, the Plan Commission voted 5-0 to recommend that the Village Board approve the petition associated with PC 22-24 subject to the three (3) conditions in the staff report:

- 1. That the petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report, including but not limited to compliance with the comments from the Fire Department and the Building Division;**
- 2. That the petitioner shall apply for and receive all required building permits prior to commencing any work on the site; and**
- 3. This approval shall be subject to the commencement time provisions as set forth within Section 155.103(F)(11).**

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Tony Invergo, and Alissa Verson

Absent: 2 - Kevin Walker, and Robert Spreenberg

[220290](#)**PC 22-23: Text Amendments to Chapter 155 of Village Code (the Zoning Ordinance) pertaining to permitted and conditional uses.**

The petitioner, the Village of Lombard, is requesting comprehensive text amendments to Chapter 155 of the Village Code (the Zoning Ordinance), and any other relevant sections for clarity and consistency. Said section and subsection amendments include the following:

1. Amending Chapter 155 of Village Code as it pertains to permitted and conditional uses in the following Districts: O Office District; B1 Limited Neighborhood Shopping District; B2 General Neighborhood Shopping District; B3 Community Shopping District; B4 Corridor Commercial District; Roosevelt Road Corridor B4A District; B5 Central Business District; B5A Downtown Perimeter District; and I Limited Industrial District. Proposed changes affect uses related to retail uses, personal care services, banquet halls, banks and financial institutions, tattoo studios, clubs and lodges, animal care services, laboratories, and recategorization and removal of obsolete uses.
2. Amending Section 155.802 as it pertains to definitions for the following terms: "Amusement devices;" "Laboratories: medical, dental, and support;" and "Laboratories: research and testing." (DISTRICT ALL)

Sworn in to present the petition was Anna Papke, Senior Planner, and Bill Heniff, Community Development Director

Acting-Chair Giuliano read the Plan Commission procedures and asked if anyone other than the petitioner intended to cross examine and, hearing none, she proceeded with the petition.

Ms. Papke presented the petition and staff report. The IDRC report for PC 22-23 was entered into the public record in its entirety. Ms. Papke said that staff is proposing comprehensive updates to Chapter 155 (the Zoning Ordinance) as it pertains to permitted and conditional land uses. The purpose of the proposed amendments is to streamline the list of permitted and conditional uses in the Office District, all Business District, and I District in order to provide clarity to staff and businesses. The proposed amendments also add some new or emerging land uses to the Zoning Ordinance, and recategorize or remove obsolete uses.

The Plan Commission conducted a workshop on these amendments in June 2022, at which time staff gathered input from the Plan Commission on potential code amendments. Based on the Plan

Commission feedback and further staff review, staff proposed the following text amendments:

- A new use called “general retail” will be added to Chapter 155. The current Village Code lists specific retail uses. The new use will combine most retail uses into one general category, which will simplify issuance of certificates of occupancy and classification of businesses that sell multiple types of goods. General retail will be permitted in all Business Districts.*
- A new use called “personal care services” will be added to Chapter 155. Personal care services will combine the current listed uses of barber shops, beauty shops, tanning salons, and other similar businesses. It will also include tattoo studios, which are presently conditional uses in a few of the Business Districts. Med spas, an emerging land use, will also fall in the personal services use category. Personal care services are proposed to be permitted uses in the Office and Business Districts.*
- Banquet halls will be listed as permitted uses in B3, B4, B4A, B5, and B5A. Currently, banquet halls are not listed and staff considers them to be the same as restaurants. However, there are some important operational differences between banquet halls and restaurants. The parking standards in Chapter 155 already differentiate between the two uses. The addition of banquet halls as a distinct use will provide clarity and consistency.*
- Laboratories will be divided into two different types: medical, dental and support laboratories; and research and testing laboratories. The first type will be permitted in O, B3, B4, B4A, B5, B5A and I Districts. Research and testing laboratories will be permitted in the I District. New definitions for each laboratory are proposed for Section 155.802.*
- A number of other amendments were proposed to clarify the following: animal-related uses; banks and financial institutions in the B4A and O Districts; parking lots and parking garages; and clubs and lodges.*
- The definition for “amusement devices” will be updated to*

clarify that it does not apply to video gaming terminals, which are regulated separately in Chapter 112 of Village Code.

Staff recommended approval of the proposed text amendments.

Acting-Chair Giuliano asked if there were any questions or comments on the petition and staff report. Hearing none, she opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners.

On a motion by Commissioner Johnston, and a second by Commissioner Invergo, the Plan Commission voted 5-0 to recommend that the Village Board approve the petition associated with PC 22-23.

motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Tony Invergo, and Alissa Verson

Absent: 2 - Kevin Walker, and Robert Spreenberg

Business Meeting

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Invergo, seconded by Commissioner Verson, that the minutes of the August 15, 2022 meeting be approved.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Tony Invergo, and Alissa Verson

Absent: 2 - Kevin Walker, and Robert Spreenberg

Public Participation

There was no Public Participation

DuPage County Hearings

There was no DuPage County Hearings

Chairperson's Report

The Chairperson defered to the Director of Cummunity Development

Planner's Report

There was no Planner's Report

Unfinished Business

There was no Unfinished Business

New Business

There was no New Business

Subdivision Reports

There was no Subdivision Reports

Site Plan Approvals

There was no Site Plan Approvals

Workshops

1. Parking Code Text Amendments

Mr. Heniff presented the workshop. He said Planning staff is in the process of reviewing the parking standards in the Village Code for non-residential land uses. He noted that this was one of the tasks identified by the Village Board in the most recent strategic planning effort. Further, a review of the parking requirements would be an opportunity to address environmental concerns related to excess impervious surfaces and other issues that arise when developments are over-parked.

Mr. Heniff described previous review efforts related to assessing parking requirements, including the Roosevelt Road Corridor studies completed in the mid-2000s and selected text amendments that had revised parking requirements for specific uses. He also mentioned Visions 4 and 7 from the Village Comprehensive Plan, which address environmental concerns (Vision 4) and economic development (Vision 7). He said that revisions to parking requirements would directly and indirectly tie into addressing environmental concerns and economic development goals. He showed photos of several office buildings and shopping centers with excess parking fields.

Mr. Heniff summarized the potential changes to parking requirements as noted in the memo to the Plan Commission.

These included:

- *Reducing required parking for retail uses from 4 spaces per 1,000 gross square feet to 3 spaces to 1,000 gross square feet. This would put Lombard more in line with retail parking standards in other communities.*
- *Proposed reductions in restaurant parking to reflect the changes that have occurred in the industry in recent decades. He noted restaurant parking standards had been increased in the 1990s when the Village noticed high demand for parking at the Fountain Square restaurant campus. However, that peak in demand had not been sustained in recent years.*
- *Parking standards would be lowered for offices, religious institutions, and medical clinics, to make them more consistent with parking standards for these uses in other communities, and to reflect observations that these developments often have a lot of parking area that goes unused.*

Mr. Heniff opened the workshop to questions and comments from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Sweetser asked if the proposed amendments would include allowing temporary alternative use of parking spaces in the downtown. Mr. Heniff said that parking requirements in the downtown are half the requirements for properties in other zoning districts. He said that the Village had been working on a parklet concept to allow for alternative use of street parking spaces for select events in the downtown.

Commissioner Giuliano asked if reducing the amount of required parking would have negative impacts on snow removal procedures, since many commercial properties store plowed snow in unused corners of parking lots during the winter. Mr. Heniff said he did not anticipate this would be an issue, and noted that businesses could use landscaped areas for snow storage.

Commissioner Johnston agreed that there is an oversupply of

parking. However, he wanted to be cautious not to make the required parking standards too low. He said the Plan Commission should be careful with any amendments, though he agreed amendments are necessary. He expressed some concerns about parking in the downtown area.

Mr. Heniff said that parking in the downtown will always have unique concerns. As far as reducing parking standards in general, he said that some communities have gone so far as to implement parking maximums or eliminate parking requirements all together. Lombard Planning staff is not proposing to do either of those things, but to look at slight reductions in required parking. An individual business or property owner would always have the option to build more parking than required by Village Code if it makes sense for a particular development.

Adjournment

A Motion was made by Commissioner Johnston, seconded by Commissioner Invergo, to adjourn the meeting at 8:10 p.m. The motion passed by an unanimous vote.

*Leigh Giuliano, Commissioner
Lombard Plan Commission*

*Jennifer Ganser, AICP, Assistant Director
Community Development*