

VILLAGE OF LOMBARD
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW GROUP REPORT

TO:	Lombard Plan Commission	HEARING DATE:	March 24, 2008
FROM:	Department of Community Development	PREPARED BY:	William Heniff, AICP Senior Planner

TITLE

PC 08-06; 455 East Butterfield Road: The petitioner requests that the Village approve a further variation from Section 153.503(B)(12)(b) of the Sign Ordinance to allow for a third wall sign per street front exposure, where a maximum of two wall signs are permitted pursuant to Ordinance 5917, for the subject property located within the O Office District.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Petitioner:	Foremark, Ltd 8235 Douglas Av., Suite 945 Dallas, TX 75225
Property Owner:	Insite Real Estate LLC 1603 West 16 th Street Oak Brook, IL 60523
Relationship to Property Owner:	Construction management entity for lessee (Miller's Ale)

PROPERTY INFORMATION

Existing Zoning:	O Office District
Existing Land Use:	Sit down restaurant under construction
Size of Property:	Approximately 1.58 acres
Comprehensive Plan:	Recommends Office

Surrounding Zoning and Land Use:

North:	B3 Community Shopping District; developed as Yorktown Mall
South:	Interstate 88 - Reagan Tollway
East:	O Office District; developed as an office building
West:	O Office District; developed as the Carlisle banquet hall

ANALYSIS

SUBMITTALS

This report is based on the following documents that were submitted to the Department of Community Development on February 21, 2008:

1. Petition for Public Hearing with response to standards.
2. Approved site plan, prepared by Seton Engineering, dated June 30, 2006. This plan also shows adjacent the NiCor property parking area as well as the approved outdoor dining area that are not being constructed at this time.
3. Proposed building elevations (depicting existing and proposed wall signs), prepared by Interplan LLC, dated February 20, 2008.

DESCRIPTION

The subject property at 455 East Butterfield Road is currently under development with a sit-down restaurant establishment. Ordinance 5917 (PC 06-17) granted approval of the companion zoning relief required by this development. The ordinance provided relief for two wall signs on the building (on the north and west elevations), where only one wall sign is allowed by the underlying O Office District provisions. The petitioner now is seeking approval for a third wall sign on the south elevation of 66 square feet in area, which would face Interstate 88.

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW COMMENTS

PUBLIC WORKS

The Engineering and Utilities Divisions of the Public Works Department has reviewed the proposal and does not have any comments on the petition.

PRIVATE ENGINEERING

The Private Engineering Services Division of the Department of Community Development has reviewed the petition and does not have any comments on the petition.

BUILDING AND FIRE

The Fire Department has no comment on the petition at this time.

PLANNING

Compatibility with the Zoning Ordinance

As noted earlier, the petitioner received zoning approval for a number of zoning actions in order to allow a sit-down restaurant on the subject property. The petitioner has been following the provisions set forth within the ordinance of approval and anticipates that the restaurant will be open for business shortly. Therefore, no additional zoning relief is needed for the building itself. However, additional signage relief is being requested as part of this petition.

As the Plan Commission previously approved zoning actions on the property, this signage request would also be under the purview of the Plan Commission, per the provisions of Section 155.103(C)(2)(b).

Compatibility with the Sign Ordinance

Section 153.503(B) (12)(b) of the Sign Ordinance limits the number of wall signs to one per street frontage in the Office District and caps the overall sign area at a maximum of 100 square feet. The 2006 approval provided for two nearly identical wall signs on the proposed building, with an increase in the overall sign area. The signs on the north and west sides of the building state the name of the establishment.

At the time of considering the 2006 petition, staff noted to the petitioner that the south elevation would have direct visibility to Interstate 88 and inquired if they were considering signage along the south elevation. The issue of additional signage was also discussed at the subsequent Plan Commission meeting. The petitioner noted that if they would want to make subsequent revisions to the proposed sign plan, they would file for approvals at a later date.

With their project nearly completed, they are now revisiting their signage needs along the south side of their property. While staff noted to the petitioner that the Sign Ordinance would not allow by right freestanding signs for Interstate 88 visibility and staff would not find such signs desirable, an additional wall sign along the south elevation could be conceptually supported by staff. The petitioner's submitted plans attempt to replicate the previously approved wall sign design approved for the other elevations, consisting of red block and script channel letters.

Staff also notes that the subject property abuts a NiCor tract of land to the south. If this area was under ownership of the petitioner and NiCor only had utility easement rights to this area, the wall sign would be permitted by right. But as this is not the case for this property, the petitioner technically does not have frontage along Interstate 88. But in consideration of the topography and adjacent uses for the area, staff notes that there is no visual difference between the two scenarios and as such the relief can be supported.

Compatibility with Surrounding Land Uses

The properties to the east and west of the subject property are also zoned in the Office District. As noted in the 2006 petition, the proposed use is compatible with the adjacent land uses. The abutting property to the west is the Carlisle banquet facility. That facility already has a wall sign along its south elevation. Therefore, granting relief for the petitioner's sign would not be inconsistent with the neighboring properties.

Compliance with the Comprehensive Plan

The Long-Range Plan Map of the Comprehensive Plan recommends that the property be designated for office uses. As noted in 2006, the proposed use, while not specifically office in nature, complements and is compatible with the surrounding office and restaurant uses. The additional wall sign would be compatible with the previously approved restaurant use and the Comprehensive Plan.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff has reviewed the response to standards included as part of the petition and concurs that the petition meets the standards set forth in the Zoning and Sign Ordinances. Staff believes that the proposed use is appropriate at the subject location and is compatible with surrounding uses and the Comprehensive Plan. Staff has also reviewed their submitted standards for variations and finds that the petition meets the standards. Based on the above findings, the Inter-Departmental

Review Committee recommends that the Plan Commission make the following motion recommending **approval** of this petition:

Based on the submitted petition and the testimony presented, the requested relief **complies** with the standards required by the Lombard Zoning and Sign Ordinances; and, therefore, I move that the Plan Commission accept the findings and recommendations of the Inter-Departmental Report as the findings of the Plan Commission and I recommend to the Corporate Authorities **approval** of PC 08-06, subject to the following conditions:

1. Condition 1 (e) of Ordinance 5917 shall be amended to provide for the rights for a wall sign to be placed on the south elevation of the existing building on the subject property. Said sign shall be designed in accordance with the submitted plans prepared by Interplan LLC, dated February 20, 2008 a part of the petition. The wall sign shall be compatible with the wall signs on the north and west elevations.
2. The petitioner shall apply for and receive a sign permit for the proposed wall sign prior to installation of the new sign. All signage on the subject property shall be installed in compliance with the Sign Ordinance provisions.
3. All other conditions approved by Ordinance 5917 not amended by this petition shall remain in full force and effect.

Inter-Departmental Review Report Approved By:

David A. Hulseberg, AICP
Assistant Village Manager/Director of Community Development

DAH/WJH
att-

c. Petitioner