

Call to Order

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

Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Sweetser led the Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call of Members

Present 7 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Kevin Walker, Tony Invergo, Robert Spreenberg, and Alissa Verson

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

Commissioner Sweetser called the order of the agenda.

Mr. Heniff 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 Ruth Sweetser Chair. The motion passed by an unanimous vote.

Public Hearings

<u>220160</u>

PC 22-12: 303 W. Roosevelt Road - Heritage Cadillac

The petitioner requests that the Village take the following action on the subject property located within the B4APD Planned Development (Heritage Cadillac Planned Development): Pursuant to Section 155.504 (A) (major changes in a planned development) of the Lombard Village Code, amend the Heritage Cadillac Planned Development, as established by Ordinance No. 5309 and amended by Ordinance No. 5375, to approve a site plan that changes the location of the showroom building by more than 10 feet, based upon the submitted plans. (DISTRICT #2)

Sworn in to present the petition was Anna Papke, Senior Planner, and Luke Sebald of Keller on behalf of the petitioners.

Acting-Chair Sweetser 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. Sebald said Keller had been retained by Heritage Cadillac to construct a new 5,800 square foot showroom with updated interior on the subject property. He said the work on the site was part of an effort to update the Cadillac branding. Other site work will include modifications to stormwater and sanitary sewer lines. *Mr.* Sebald presented the floorplans for the proposed showroom as well as the building elevations. He noted the building would be constructed of structural steel with aluminum metal paneling.

Acting-Chair Sweetser asked if the Plan Commissioners had any questions for the petitioner.

Commissioner Invergo commented that the proposed building looks nice. He asked if the petitioner would remove any of the existing pavement along the front property line. Mr. Sebald said that pavement would be replaced, but not removed.

Commissioner Johnston asked if the new showroom and other improvements were related to Cadillac shifting away from fossil fuels to electric vehicles. Mr. Sebald said that change was part of the reason for the improvements.

Acting-Chair Sweetser asked if any person would like to speak in favor or against this petition, or for public comment.

Aldi Haxhiu said he lived behind the Cadillac dealership. He asked if the petitioner will improve the pavement and fencing in the rear of the property, which is in poor condition. He also said that the dealership's activities on the rear portion of the site often generated a lot of noise and dust from body work on cars or revving engines.

Mr. Sebald said the petitioner would undertake improvements on the rear of the property under a separate permit. Those improvements would include new paving, stormwater improvements and fence repair. Items related to noise and dust would need to be addressed directly with Heritage Cadillac as those items are related to business operations. He mentioned the petitioner planned to break ground on the project in September 2022.

Acting-Chair Sweetser 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. Heritage Cadillac has operated on the subject property since the late 1960s. Heritage proposes to demolish the existing showroom on the north side of the subject property and reconstruct the showroom with an altered footprint. The proposed scope of work also includes alterations to the guest parking areas around the showroom as well as some landscaping modifications. As this property is a planned development, any alteration of the site which moves a building more than 10 feet from its current location requires a public hearing with the Plan Commission and consideration by the Village Board.

Village staff has reviewed the plans and finds the proposed development meets building setback and height requirements, as well as parking requirements. There will be a small increase in open space on the property. Staff found the petition met the standards for a major change in a planned development, and recommended approval of the petition subject to the conditions in the staff report.

Acting-Chair Sweetser 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 thought the issues on the rear of the property mentioned by Mr. Haxhiu should be addressed.

Commissioner Spreenberg asked if the petitioner has submitted a permit for the parking lot improvements on the rear of the property.

Ms. Papke said the permit had been submitted, and was under review by staff.

Mr. Heniff noted that the operational issues related to dust and noise were items that the Village could follow up on with Heritage Cadillac.

On a motion by Commissioner Walker, and a second by Commissioner Spreenberg, the Plan Commission voted 7-0 to recommend that the Village Board approve the petition associated with PC 22-12 subject to the three (3) conditions in the staff report: 1. That the petitioner shall develop the site in accordance with the plans submitted as part of this petition and referenced in the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report, except as they may be changed to conform to Village Code;

2. That the petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report; 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: 7 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Kevin Walker, Tony Invergo, Robert Spreenberg, and Alissa Verson

220158 PC 22-11: 747 E. Roosevelt Road - Midwest Car Connect

The petitioner requests a conditional use pursuant to Section 155.417(G) (2)(a)(iv) of the Lombard Village Code to allow for motor vehicle sales to operate on the subject property located within the B4A Roosevelt Road Corridor District. (DISTRICT # 6)

Sworn in to present the petition were John Coleman, petitioner and Anna Papke, Senior Planner.

Acting Chairperson Sweetser read the Plan Commission procedures and asked if anyone other than the petitioner intended to cross examine, and proceeded with the petition.

Mr. Colman said he represents the business. He reviewed a powerpoint. He said this dealership sells new and used luxury cars. He said cars arrive multiple times a day usually 1-3 at a time. There are usually 80 cars on-site. They are currently located in Villa Park. There is no repair, they will only do detailing. Mr. Coleman said all deliveries are made on-site, there will be no loading on Roosevelt Road. He went thru the interior floor plan. He said the building will be refreshed and remodeled, parkway trees will be added, and signage will be replaced. He discussed the site and neighborhood compatibility. He said it isn't contiguous with residential, the neighbor to the south is the Flagg Creek District. He said the site is controlled by a four-way traffic light.

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

Ms. Doris Dornberger asked if only detailing would occur and where repairs would occur. *Mr.* Coleman said these are new and collector cars which have already been repaired and serviced. They provide warranties but do not do repairs. They have relationships with repair shops if a car needs to be serviced. She asked about the outdoor display to the west. Mr. Coleman said yes, some cars will be outside and will be secured. She said other neighbors may be affected by the light. Mr. Coleman said the lighting is fine as it is now. She asked who to contact if neighbors have concerns. Mr. Heniff said the petitioner is only asking for a conditional use for auto sales, not repair. In the future, if they do repairs, they would need to ask for an additional conditional use and have another public hearing. He said the lighting will not be modified. Any modifications would need to meet Code. Lastly, he said if there are issues Code Enforcement can be contacted.

Mr. Tomas Novickas said the Century Tile building is painted white in the back. He asked if they would paint that wall dark brown so it disappears into the foliage or add landscaping to the Flagg Creek property. *Mr.* Coleman said they intend to freshen up the building, mostly in the front. He said they can look at that but painting the back of the building is not in the current plan.

Commissioner Invergo asked if there would be a fuel station. Mr. Coleman said there is no need for that.

Acting Chairperson Sweetser asked for the staff report.

Ms. Papke presented the IDRC report for PC 22-11, which was entered into the public record in its entirety. The petitioner proposes to sell used cars, mostly online. They have a location currently in Villa Park at 726 N Ardmore Avenue (Midwest Car Connect), and will be relocating to Lombard. The building was formerly Century Tile. Interior improvements are planned. Exterior improvements include new signage, restriping the parking lot, and minor building repairs. Staff finds the property meets the standards and is compatible for car sales.

Acting Chairperson Sweetser opened the meeting to discussion by the *Plan Commissioners.*

Acting Chairperson Sweetser asked if there were any additional comments. Hearing none, she asked for a motion from the Commissioners.

On a motion by Commissioner Johnston, and a second by Commissioner Invergo, the Plan Commission voted 7-0 to recommend that the Village Board approve the petition associated with PC 22-11, subject to the following seven (7) conditions: 220097

1. That the petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report.

2. This approval shall be subject to the commencement time provisions as set forth within Section 155.103(F)(11).

3. That the petitioner shall keep the frontage along Roosevelt Road available for customer parking.

4. That the petitioner shall store all materials and parts inside the building.

5. All vehicle loading and unloading shall be on private property and shall not be allowed on Roosevelt Road.

6. Landscaping will be added along Roosevelt Road consisting of parkway/ perimeter trees placed every 40 feet within the existing grass area south of the existing public sidewalk.

7. The petitioner shall replace the freestanding sign with a freestanding sign that meets Village Code within one year of approval from the Board of Trustees.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Kevin Walker, Tony Invergo, Robert Spreenberg, and Alissa Verson

PC 22-05: 855 E. Roosevelt Road (Usmania Prime) (Continuance from the 4-18-22 PC Meeting)

The petitioner, SAFA ENTERPRISES, LLC, requests that the Village take the following actions on the subject property located within the B4A Roosevelt Road Corridor District, to provide for the construction of a new principal building:

- A conditional use under Sections 155.103(F) and 155.417(G)(2)

 (a)(vii) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a restaurant, including entertainment and dancing when conducted as part of the restaurant operations and secondary to the principal use;
- A conditional use under Sections 155.103(F) and 155.417(G)(2) (c)(vii) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a building containing a restaurant as a principal use that will exceed 40 feet in height;
- A conditional use under Sections 155.103(F) and 155.417(G)(10)
 (b) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow outdoor display and sales on a seasonal or periodic basis in the row of parking along the south elevation of the building and in the rooftop area;
- 4. A variation under Sections 155.102(B)(3) and 155.103(C)(2)(b) from Sections 155.417(G)(12) and 155.602(C)(Table 6.3) which require 112-132 parking spaces in order to allow 116 parking spaces to serve dining areas not to exceed those shown in the plans and to allow a reduction of eight (8) of these spaces for seasonal outdoor cultural events according to the conditional use noted in Item 3;
- 5. A variation under Sections 155.102(B)(3) and 155.103(C)(2)(b) from Sections 155.417(G)(12) and 155.603(A) which does not require a loading space, but which requires a voluntary loading

space to be constructed with a maneuvering apron (155.603(A)(2) (a)(ii)) in order to allow three (3) employee parking spaces at the entry to a loading zone (155.603(A)(6));

- A variation under Sections 155.102(B)(3) and 155.103(C)(2)(b) from Sections 155.417(G)(12), 155.417(G)(14) and 155.602(A) (10)(d) which requires parking lot lighting to be directed away from the lot lines and to fall below certain maximum intensities in order to avoid these requirements for lighting adjacent to the access easement serving the subject property and the easterly adjacent property;
- A variation under Sections 155.102(B)(3) and 155.103(C)(2)(b) from Sections 155.417(G)(12) and 155.706(B)(2)(c) in order to allow landscape islands on the west elevation of the building to host two rickshaws and have less than the number of required shade trees and ground cover;
- 8. A variation under Sections 155.102(B)(3) and 155.103(C)(2)(b) from Section 155.417(G)(14) which requires lighting to shine down in order to permit evening lighting designed to articulate landscape features and the rickshaws as approved by the Director of Community Development and provided that no perimeter landscaping within 100 feet of the south lot line is articulated with such lighting;
- 9. A variation under Sections 155.102(B)(3) and 155.103(C)(2)(b) from Section 155.707(B)(4)(d) which requires transition yard areas not planted with trees or shrubs to be maintained as lawn in order to permit the south lot line to be maintained with all trees and understory plant material to remain in the wetland, flood way and floodplain reflected in the plans (affects south transition yard except east +/-45 feet);
- 10. A variation under Sections 155.102(B)(3) and 155.103(C)(2)(b) from Section 155.708 which requires a ten-foot foundation landscaping area on all sides of a building in order to allow development with a five-foot foundation landscaping area on the north and west sides and no foundation landscaping area on the east and south;
- 11. A variation under Sections 155.102(B)(3) and 155.103(C)(2)(b) from Article XI which imposes several detailed landscaping requirements in Sections 155.701 through 155.710 in order to accomplish innovative landscaping shown in the two-sheet landscape plan on file with the Village for the benefit of natural areas on the site and to the south as well as residential neighbors to the south; and

12. Approval of a site plan and landscaping plan under Section 155.103(I) and Section 155.702 of the Zoning Ordinance (DISTRICT #6)

Mr. Heniff reviewed the past two meetings on PC 22-05. He said the meeting will be opened for discussion and questions by the Plan Commissioners. He referred to the addendum report 2 which lists possible conditions of approval that could be added to a motion.

Acting Chair Sweetser opened the meeting to discussion by the Plan Commissioners.

Commissioner Invergo asked if the weight of building and parking will cause a need for pylons and asked how the underground sewer system will be managed. Mr. Miller said geotechnical work has been done and the soils are quite good. Commissioner Invergo asked if there is a drop off on the property towards the wetlands. Mr. Miller said the site is higher than Roosevelt Road and drainage goes towards the wetlands. He said the retaining wall will be added. Mr. Heniff said should the petition be approved the geotechnical report would be required for building permit review by staff.

Commissioner Johnston asked about the bald cypress trees versus a fence. He asked if the fence could be taller for more screening. Mr. Daniel said that height will get to an elevation above most car headlights but allow for the view to be enjoyed as well. He said the fence will be on top of a curb.

Commissioner Spreenberg said the additional conditions are acceptable to him. He asked about lighting and suggested an additional condition of no lighting on the second floor of the building. Mr. Daniel said there would be one light on the second floor exterior. Mr. Daniel gave Mr. Heniff a list of previously discussed conditions of approval. Mr. Heniff admitted the exhibit into the public record and read it. Mr. Daniel noted conditions such as the hours of operation of the rooftop and sound. Mr. Daniel said they can live with the parking condition.

Commissioner Invergo asked if the numerous conditions set a precedence for the future. Mr. Heniff said some of the conditions of approval are to address neighborhood compatibility. Some conditions are more housekeeping and are to get the building built. Conditions also helps staff by noting property regulations. He said conditions are also site specific.

Acting Chairperson Sweetser asked if there were any additional comments. Hearing none, she asked for a motion from the

Commissioners.

On a motion by Commissioner Guilano, and a second by Commissioner Johnston, the Plan Commission voted 7-0 to recommend that the Village Board approve the petition associated with PC 22-05, subject to the following twelve (12) conditions:

1. The petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report.

2. That the petitioner shall be required to apply for and receive building permits prior to construction.

3. This approval shall be subject to the commencement time provisions as set forth within Section 155.103(F)(11) and 155.103(C)(10).

4. The outdoor display and sales shall occur in the row of parking along the south elevation of the building and in the rooftop area. Such activity in the parking spaces will only occur between noon and 7:00 PM on Saturdays and Sundays unless the Village issues a special event permit.

5. The rooftop patio shall close by 10:30 PM Monday through Thursday; 11:30 PM Friday and Saturday; and 9:30 PM on Sunday.

6. There shall be no amplified sound on the rooftop patio.

7. The petitioner shall include screening trees (bald cypress or a suitable alternative suggested by DuPage County) along the northeast portion of the wooded wetland or wetland buffer near the mid-elevation that divides the retention area from the wetland. Such trees shall meet DuPage County's design approval for the wetland area. The petitioner is allowed to amend this condition should DuPage County require a change (in the number, type, or location of the trees).

8. There shall be seven (7) spaces designated as employee only. Three (3) are near the loading area and four (4) are at the south end of the parking lot. The three (3) parking spaces near the loading zone shall be signed for employee use only.

9. The outside bazaars shall not contain amplified sound.

10. If DuPage County eliminates the bald cypress trees for screening, the petitioner shall place a 4' (four foot) tall fence for screening in conformance with the plan prepared by the petitioner.

11. The petitioner shall limit the available patron seating associated with the facility to not exceed 282 seats due to the amount of parking provided. Should the petitioner apply for a conditional use for off-site parking at a later date, the petitioner may petition for an increase in the numbers of seats at a ratio of 1 parking space for 3 seats.

12. There shall be no outside lighting above the second floor. There shall only be one light on the second floor facing south. There shall be one light on the south side on the southwestern corner.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Kevin Walker, Tony Invergo, Robert Spreenberg, and Alissa Verson

Business Meeting

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Invergo, seconded by Commissioner Walker, that the minutes of the March 28, 2022 meeting be approved with noted correction to PC 22-09. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Kevin Walker, Tony Invergo, Robert Spreenberg, and Alissa Verson

Public Participation

There was no Public Participation

DuPage County Hearings

There was no DuPage Hearings

Chairperson's Report

The Chairperson deferred to the Director of Community Development

Planner's Report

Mr. Heniff advised the Commission there will be a Special Plan Commission meeting scheduled for June 6, 2022 at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Heniff explained additional Special meetings may be scheduled in July.

Unfinished Business

There was no Unfinished Business

New Business

There is no New Business

Subdivision Reports

There was no Site Plan Approvals

Site Plan Approvals

220178 SPA 22-01: 331 W. Madison Street - College Preparatory School of America (CPSA): Upon a request by CPSA and concurrent with the provisions of Section 155.504(B) of the Zoning Ordinance, the Community Development Director seeks concurrence by the Plan Commission on a minor change to the previously approved planned development, in order to provide for an alternate paint color scheme for the recently completed school

building. (DISTRICT #6)

Mr. Heniff provided background information on the petition. CPSA is a private school located at 331 W. Madison Street. The school received zoning entitlements in 2016 in order to build a new building on the subject property. At that time, the renderings for the building showed it would be painted a red tone to compliment the red brick of the existing building on the site.

As of May 2022, construction of the new building is complete and the petitioner is finishing up smaller punch list items on the site. The petitioner has indicated to the Village that they would prefer to paint the new building in grey tones rather than the red tone originally shown to the Plan Commission. The CPSA school board has submitted five possible Sherwin Williams paint colors to the Village; four grey tones and one yellow tone that will be used as an accent color. The petitioner is seeking approval to use some combination of the five colors on the building. Mr. Heniff showed the Plan Commissioners the paint chips for the five proposed colors.

Mr. Heniff noted that the proposed change in paint color meets the definition of a minor change in a planned development. Staff has the authority to approve minor changes administratively, or can take them to the Plan Commission for a vote of concurrence. In this case, because the aesthetics of the building had been discussed at length in the original 2016 Plan Commission petition, staff was bringing the requested change to the Plan Commission as a request to approve a minor change to the approved exterior paint color of the building. Staff recommended approval.

Acting Chair Sweetser asked if there were any questions from the public. Hearing none, she opened the discussion to the Commissioners.

Commissioner Johnston said he was concerned about the building color with respect to neighborhood compatibility. He preferred the warmer tone of the red proposed in 2016 to the grey tones now being proposed. However, he understood the Village does not regulate paint colors.

Acting Chair Sweetser asked if there were any additional comments from the commissioners. Hearing none, she asked for a motion.

On a motion by Commissioner Spreenberg, and a second by Commissioner Invergo, the Plan Commission voted 7-0 to approve the petition associated with PC SPA 22-01 subject to the one (1) condition in the staff report:

1. That the exterior colors for the new CPSA School building shall be in accordance with the planned alternate color palate submitted by CPSA and made a part of this request.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Kevin Walker, Tony Invergo, Robert Spreenberg, and Alissa Verson

Workshops

There was no Workshops

Adjournment

A motion was made by Commissioner Spreenberg, seconded by Commissioner Walker, to adjourn the meeting at 832 p.m. The motion passed by an unanimous vote.

Ruth Sweetser, Vice Chairperson Lombard Plan Commission

Jennifer Ganser, AICP, Assistant Director Community Development