



Village of Lombard

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

Minutes

Plan Commission

Donald F. Ryan, Chairperson
Commissioners: Ronald Olbrysh, Martin Burke,
Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, Stephen Flint and
John Mrofcza
Staff Liaison: William Heniff

Monday, January 27, 2014

7:30 PM

Village Hall - Board Room

Call to Order

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

Pledge of Allegiance

Chairperson Ryan led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll Call

Present 6 - Donald F. Ryan, Ronald Olbrysh, Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, and John Mrofcza
Absent 1 - Stephen Flint

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

Chairperson Ryan called the order of the agenda.

Public Hearings

[130661](#)

PC 14-01: 127 Eisenhower Lane South (Request to withdraw by petitioner)

Requests that the Village grant a conditional use, pursuant to Section 155.420 (C) of the Zoning Ordinance, to allow for a Learning Center (indoor athletic training facility) within the I Limited Industrial District. (DISTRICT # 3)

A motion was made by Ruth Sweetser, seconded by John Mrofcza, that this petition be withdrawn. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ronald Olbrysh, Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, and John Mrofcza

Absent: 1 - Stephen Flint

[140028](#)**PC 14-02: Text Amendment to Village Parking Space, Aisle, and Module Dimensional Standards**

The Village of Lombard is proposing the following text amendments to the Lombard Zoning Ordinance:

- 1) An amendment to Section 155.602 (A)(5), and any other sections for clarity, adding provisions regarding the size of off-street parking spaces designated specifically for business, employee, and compact vehicles; and
- 2) An amendment to Section 155.602 (C), including Figure 6-1 and Table 6-2, regarding specific parking space, aisle, and module dimensional standards. (DISTRICTS - ALL)

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

Chairperson Ryan 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.

Mr. Panfil, Sr. Planner, presented the staff report, which was submitted to the public record in its entirety. Mr. Panfil stated that planning staff undertook a comparative analysis of the Zoning Ordinance's existing parking space, aisle, and module dimensions against current industry standards, particularly the forty-five degree (45°) and sixty degree (60°) angled parking spaces. Finding relatively significant differences, staff is proposing text amendments to bring the Village's standards more in line with today's professional engineering standards. The proposed text amendments were developed in cooperation with the Village's traffic consultant, Javier Millan, of KLOA Inc.

Second, planning staff saw an opportunity to further modernize the Village's parking regulations by providing new provisions for business, employee, and compact vehicles within business-oriented zoning districts. Similar to when the Village approved a reduced parking space width for commuter parking lots, staff suggests that business and employee vehicles do not experience the same rate of parking turnover as customer vehicles and are therefore more suitable for narrower spaces.

Referencing comments in the IDRC report, Mr. Panfil explained that the Fire Department and Private Engineering Service's initial concerns were already addressed in the amendments currently proposed. After discussions with both departments, staff opted for standards established by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) rather than the original proposal which was based on standards from the

Urban Land Institute (ULI).

Specifically, staff's first recommendation is to add text regarding parking in the B Districts. In the B1, B2, B3, B4, B4A, B5 and B5A Districts the width of parking spaces shall not be less than nine feet (9'), zero (0") inches. Staff suggests the additional phrasing, "However, parking spaces that exceed the minimum amount of parking spaces as required by Table 6-3 of this ordinance may be reduced in width to no less than eight feet (8'), three inches (3"), provided that the reduced spaces are specifically designated for business, employee, and/or compact vehicles." Mr. Panfil then explained that eight feet (8'), three inch (3") wide parking spaces are already allowed in the O Office and I Industrial District.

Mr. Panfil reviewed the forty-five degree (45°) and sixty degree (60°) parking space dimensions. In 2005, the Plan Commission approved text amendments regarding the parking space, aisle, and module dimensions for parallel and ninety-degree (90°) parking spaces. The standards established in 2005 are still adequate in comparison to current industry standards.

Mr. Panfil showed a few aerial images of where in the Village one can find forty-five degree (45°) and sixty degree (60°) parking in town. He noted that most of the angled parking in town is ninety degrees (90°), which generally proves to be most efficient.

Mr. Panfil then referenced a series of graphics illustrating the proposed recommendations in comparison to the existing dimensions.

Mr. Panfil noted that the proposed text amendment would not create any nonconformities, as the proposed text amendment actually lessen the existing standards in their recognition that not all parking space, aisle, and module dimensions need to be as large as currently required.

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

Commissioner Mrofcza asked if this proposal is to shorten the length of the parking stall in order to get a wider parking aisle. He is concerned that we would reduce the width of the parking lot and hope everyone pulls all the way into the stall. He stated it is only a more productive use of the space if everyone is compliant. He is apprehensive about shortening the length of the stall and is not convinced that cars today are shorter and notices there are many SUVs and pickup trucks on the road.

Commissioner Sweetser observed when using the commuter parking lot at the former DuPage Theater site that it is almost impossible parking next to a large vehicle. She said if the large vehicle is within the yellow lines it is barely within the yellow lines and you practically cannot get out of your car. She stated that this may or may not pertain to this item but it may pertain to a compact car section and a SUV section.

Mr. Panfil explained those parking spaces are eight foot (8') three inches (3") wide. He was not sure of the drive aisle but he said that it is probably similar in width to staff's proposed dimensions.

Commissioner Sweetser said there needs to be some flexibility in the situation she just described so it would not be replicated.

Mr. Panfil replied to keep in mind the business districts minimum is nine feet (9'). The eight foot (8') three inches (3") width is only allowed once a business has reached the minimum provided amount of nine foot wide spaces.

Commissioner Sweetser thought the situation could still happen and did not know if staff still wanted to facilitate that situation further.

Commissioner Mrofcza asked if there has been a specific need to address reducing the size of the parking lot to accommodate the same number of cars. Mr. Panfil explained it has been brought forward by a couple of businesses, most notably the Yorktown Shopping Center.

Commissioner Cooper asked if staff has information regarding dimensions of standard vehicles. Mr. Panfil said staff does not have the information on hand but he referred to the cars in the graphics as being to scale.

Commissioner Cooper asked if staff has the current parking dimensions at Yorktown. Mr. Panfil said staff did not have the dimensions on hand but could provide more information.

Commissioner Olbrysh referred to the diagrams and said he did not think the vehicles are a representation of what exists on the road today. He thought the majority of the cars today are SUVs, trucks and vans, over sedans. Mr. Panfil explained these vehicles in the diagram are just a sample of sizes.

Commissioner Burke asked if Yorktown, as an example, would be required to provide nine foot (9') parking spaces. Mr. Panfil explained if they have a number of surplus spaces over the minimum required, they can then designate some of them as smaller spaces.

Commissioner Burke asked when they assign the spaces as eight foot (8') three inches (3") if they have to assign them as compact cars. Mr. Panfil said the way the text is written they could designate them as compact or employee/business vehicles.

Chairperson Ryan asked if Yorktown would have the choice of where those parking spaces would be located. For instance, if they have 2,500 parking spaces and 2,000 spaces are required could they move the 500 spaces up front close to the store. Mr. Panfil explained it would be up to the business to decide, they could make some of the spots up front for compact cars.

Commissioner Burke referred to the diagrams and noted in depiction of the proposed angles, the vehicle is over the line in three out of the four examples. Mr. Panfil explained there would be some overhang for some of the larger vehicles.

Commissioner Burke said he understands we are trying to upgrade our standards however he is concerned with the snow piling up and the parking space being shorter. Mr. Panfil stated that he understood that the snow is going to occupy some of the spaces however with the design there should be more spaces available. Ms. Ganser added these parking spaces are extra and only in addition to the required nine foot (9') wide parking spaces.

Commissioner Burke said his concern is with the depth of the space being reduced even though we have a bigger drive aisle. Mr. Panfil referred to the diagrams and noted the proposed overall module width is three foot (3') two inches (2") less than the existing module width, approximately six percent (6%) narrower.

Commissioner Mrofcza expressed concern over the drive aisle area and referred to the diagrams. He stated if more vehicles are going to stick out into the drive aisle area, it will reduce the size of the aisle. He indicated staff is assuming everyone is going to pull up all the way into the space.

Commissioner Cooper asked how many times we have businesses and developments ask to exceed the required parking amount. Mr. Panfil explained it often depends on the characteristics of the lot.

Commissioner Sweetser referred to the new text proposed in 155.602 (B) that eight foot (8') three inch (3") slots in certain areas is not an adequate size. She stated that there are dinged doors because the spaces are so close. She said if you are going to contemplate having a section for compact cars, perhaps contemplate having a section for

larger cars. It does not matter if it is a commuter parking lot. It matters in the use, if you can get in or out of your car and if your car is going to be damaged in the process.

Commissioner Cooper suggested making a recommendation to table the issue until next month and proposing staff come back with additional information and local examples where the proposed standards exist.

Commissioner Burke noted the main issue of petition is the widening the aisle and shortening the stall. Mr. Panfil agreed.

Chairperson Ryan asked if anyone wanted to make a motion.

Commissioner Cooper stated that she is in favor of tightening up our parking module specifications for storm water purposes. However, she is concerned with the grates and bumpers of the cars hitting the curb stop.

Commissioner Burke asked if staff, the Engineering Department, and the Fire Department are all in support of the amendment. Mr. Panfil said that they are all now in agreement and the proposed drive aisle widths exceed those which were originally requested by the Fire Department.

Chairperson Ryan asked the Commission if they would continue, accept, or deny the petition.

A motion was made by Martin Burke, seconded by Andrea Cooper, that this petition be recommend for approval to the Corporate Authorities. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Ronald Olbrysh, Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, and Andrea Cooper

Nay: 1 - John Mrofca

Absent: 1 - Stephen Flint

Business Meeting

The business meeting convened at 8:12 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

On a motion by Commissioner Sweetser and seconded by Commissioner Olbrysh the minutes of the December 16, 2014 meeting were approved by a 5-0 vote.

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

DuPage County Hearings

There were no DuPage County hearings.

Chairperson's Report

Chairperson Ryan referred to the memo regarding the Plan Commission reschedule the March 17, 2014 meeting date, as has been done in the past. Staff is proposing to change the date to Monday, March 24, 2014.

Chairperson Ryan asked the Commissioners about the date change.

The Commissioners agreed to change the date to Monday, March 24, 2014.

Planner's Report

Chairperson Ryan asked for a report on the County Board meeting. Ms. Ganser gave an update to the County Board meeting. She noted that in December of 2013 there was hearing regarding the Ken Loch Donovan Homes petition to include rezoning and a planned development. It was approved by the DuPage County Board.

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

Comprehensive Plan Update

Ms. Ganser presented the workshop Comprehensive Plan Update including the Westmore-Meyers Plan, to the Plan Commission for a workshop session. She noted the Plan Commission may remember reviewing the Comprehensive Plan in 2011 and 2012. Staff put the project on hold for potential land use reviews of properties in the Village's planning boundaries, including Ken Loch. Staff is now ready to bring the plan forward for review and comment.

In 2014, staff reviewed the 2012 update and made minor revisions. Ms. Ganser explained a red-line copy is attached for review noting revisions were kept to a minimum and include items such as: updated data, notable events from 2012-present, reference to Complete Streets, and grammatical changes.

Ms. Ganser explained staff will hold a public open house in winter 2014 to obtain comments and answer questions from the public. Next, the full Plan Commission case and public hearing petition will be brought forth at a later meeting date. Finally, staff will take the Comprehensive Plan to the Village Board of Trustees.

Ms. Ganser asked if the Commissioner's had any questions or comments.

Commissioner Mrofcza asked about the red line copy on page four. He questioned the timing of the open house and when the Update would be brought forth to the Village Board of Trustees. Ms. Ganser replied the Comprehensive Plan could get completed in 2014.

Chairperson Ryan asked if there were major changes made to the Update. Ms. Ganser explained the concepts all stayed the same, no sections were deleted. There were some grammatical changes and some data updates.

Commissioner Mrofcza referred to page seven and asked if we have an update on the demolition and new construction applications through 2012. Ms. Ganser said she is still looking for additional information and when she does it will be incorporated in the Update.

Commissioner Olbrysh made an observation that Ken-Loch is going to be with us for a while. He referred to page thirty-three (33) regarding

pursue annexation and open space and page thirty-one (31) regarding open space opportunities. He noted this is contradictory of the County's decision. Ms. Ganser explained in 2013 the Village of Lombard Board of Trustees voted to amend to open space plan to allow assessor development in Ken Loch up to twenty-five percent (25%).

Commissioner Sweetser referred to the recommended action sections noting that when words like "encourage" are used it is very hard to justify later on if you have encourage something or not unless there are very specific tactics outlined. She explained the purpose of the Plan is so you can measure what you have done or not done. She asked if staff can help the Commissioners as they go forward to understand what they mean by encourage. Ms. Ganser replied staff can look at the Plan and see if there is other language to use.

Commissioner Cooper referred to page forty (40) regarding the Complete Streets initiative. Ms. Ganser replied as more information becomes available staff can update the Plan Commission.

Commissioner Sweetser referred to the charts on pages thirty-four (34) through thirty-nine (39) regarding the recommend actions and asked if there are any potential plans of accomplishing what should be or not be annexed as well as a timeline. Ms. Ganser explained the information was taken from an annexation strategies report from 2009 and she will look into adding a time line.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

*Donald F. Ryan, Chairperson
Lombard Plan Commission*

*William J. Heniff, Secretary
Lombard Plan Commission*

