

**REGULAR MEETING – PLAN COMMISSION/ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
GREGORY J. BIELAWSKI MUNICIPAL CENTER, CAROL STREAM, DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

July 28, 2008

All Matters on the Agenda may be discussed, amended and acted upon

Chairman David Michaelson called the Regular Meeting of the Combined Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals to order at 7:30 p.m. and directed the roll to be called.

Present: Commissioners Anthony Manzzullo, Angelo Christopher, Ralph Smoot, Dee Spink and David Michaelson. (Lateef Vora entered Later in the meeting).
Absent: Joyce Hundhausen

MINUTES:

Commissioner Smoot moved and Commissioner Spink made the second to approve the Minutes of the Meeting of July 14, 2008 as presented. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes: 5 Commissioners Manzzullo, Christopher, Smoot, Spink & Michaelson
Nays: 0
Absent: 2 Commissioners Vora and Hundhausen

PUBLIC HEARING:

Commissioner Manzzullo moved and Commissioner Spink made the second to open the public hearing. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

**#08165: WILLIAM AND SANDY COLEY – 178 Carriage Drive:
*Variation – Lot Coverage***

Commissioner Spink recused herself from hearing this matter because the petitioner lives nearby in her neighborhood.

Mr. William Coley, 178 Carriage Drive, Carol Stream was sworn in as a witness in this matter. He said that he needs a variance for a deck because his yard is sloped and steep and has no flat areas to set up a barbeque grill or table and chairs. The deck size allowed would not be big enough to reach the pool.

There were no comments or questions from those in attendance at the call for public hearing.

The following is the staff report for this matter.

Applicant:
William Coley

Size and Location:

The 7,200 square foot lot is located on the west side of Carriage Lane, across from the intersection of Carriage Lane and Park Hill Trail. (See attached location map.)

Existing zoning and land use:

The subject property is zoned R-3 One-Family Residence District with a Special Use for a Planned Unit Development and improved with a single-family residence.

Adjacent zoning and land uses:

All surrounding properties are zoned R-3 One-Family Residence District with a Special Use for a Planned Unit Development and improved with single-family residences.

Attachments:

Attached for review are a location map, aerial photo, public notice, cover letter from applicant William Coley dated June 13, 2008, the General Application, Variation Application, the proposed deck construction drawings and a copy of the plat of survey.

Request:

The applicant is requesting a variation from Section 16-8-3(G) of the Carol Stream Zoning Code to allow a deck to be constructed adjacent to the existing pool that would exceed the maximum allowable lot coverage of the R-3 One-Family Residence District.

STAFF ANALYSIS

William Coley of 178 Carriage Drive has filed an application for a lot coverage variation to allow a wooden deck to be constructed between the existing pool and home on the property. As seen on the deck drawing plans and plat of survey, the irregularly shaped deck would measure approximately 440 square feet in area. The maximum lot coverage in the R-3 District is 30%, but lot coverage is allowed to increase to 35% for pools and decks only, provided that in the case of decks, the ground surface beneath the deck is pervious to allow rain water to infiltrate the ground. In reviewing the history of this property, we have found that a permit for the existing pool was issued to Mr. Coley in 1999. In the permit file is a calculation showing the lot coverage for the property, including a 220 square foot deck. Unfortunately, there is a mathematical error in the lot coverage calculation performed by Village staff, resulting in an understatement of the lot coverage. Although the lot coverage was indicated on the permit to be 33%, the actual lot coverage at the time of the pool permit was 36.2%, in excess of the maximum allowable 35%. The deck has since been removed, bringing the current lot coverage down to 33.6%, which complies with the Zoning Code requirement. However, with the proposed 440 square foot deck, the lot coverage would equal approximately 39.7%. As such, to allow the proposed deck to be constructed, Mr. Coley is requesting a lot coverage variation from Section 16-8-3(G) of the Zoning Code.

Mr. Coley provides an explanation as to why a lot coverage variation is warranted for his property in the attached letter dated June 13, 2008. In the letter, he points out that his property is unique in that there is significant topographic change in the rear yard with no flat area for common appurtenances such as a grill or patio furniture. Also, Mr. Coley indicates that the current lack of a deck results in mud and grass being tracked into the home by persons who have used the pool. Finally, Mr. Coley believes that the proposed deck would not only improve the functionality of the home and property, but

that it would also improve the view of their property as seen from neighboring properties.

Lot Coverage Regulation – Purpose and Intent

In consideration of the requested lot coverage variation, staff believes it is important to review the purpose and intent of the lot coverage provision. There are two primary purposes for establishing a maximum lot coverage requirement. First, the percentage of allowable lot coverage is directly related to the overall character of a neighborhood. For example, in highly urban areas, lot coverage may approach 100%, with properties having little or no open space, landscaping or green space. In more rural areas, lot coverage may be very low (5 to 10%). In Carol Stream, residential properties typically have maximum lot coverage of 30% to 35%, which ensures ample open space and outdoor activity area on individual properties. Second, lot coverage regulations have an important impact on storm water management. The higher the lot coverage, the greater the amount of storm water that must be conveyed by storm sewers and stored in storm water management facilities. Conversely, with lower lot coverage, more storm water can infiltrate into the ground. The Village of Carol Stream has historically been careful to adhere to the lot coverage provisions of the Zoning Code in part to reduce flooding that could result in the future from an increase in impervious ground coverage.

Staff is sympathetic to applicant's circumstance, and we can understand why Mr. Coley believes that a deck between the home and pool is necessary. Further, staff agrees that the proposed deck would be convenient, attractive, and would reduce the current problem of grass and mud being tracked into the home. However, staff has not been able to find anything unique about the property that justifies the variation. The fact that there is topographic relief on the rear of the property does not by itself justify the approval of a lot coverage variation, and further does not seem to have a direct bearing on the need for a deck between the house and pool. The lot coverage provisions set forth in the Zoning Code apply to all residential properties. It is incumbent upon an individual property owner to decide how to allocate the available lot coverage amongst the home, driveway, and various accessory structures. It is worth noting that the existing above-ground pool is relatively large (over 500 square feet). With the size of the pool as installed, only approximately 100 square feet is available for a deck, to remain under the 35% maximum lot coverage. We also note that, with respect to the issue of tracking mud and grass into the home, the applicant has the option of installing sidewalk. As long as the sidewalk is no greater than four feet in width, it is not included in the lot coverage calculations. Finally, we note one characteristic of the lot in Mr. Coley's favor is that the lot is only 7,200 square feet in size, as compared with the standard minimum size of 10,000 square feet for the R-3 Zoning District. This size was allowed by the planned unit development and is consistent with all of the properties in the Park Hill neighborhood. Although we cannot consider the small lot size to be unique, we would observe that if the lot were to be of the of the standard minimum size, the lot coverage would not be exceeded by Mr. Coley's request.

History of Lot Coverage Variations

In review of the request, staff notes that the degree of the variation is relatively large, being nearly 5% above the amount permitted by the Zoning Code. Over the past several years, the Plan Commission has reviewed four applications for residential lot coverage variations, with the requested lot coverage amounts being 40%, 31%, 33% and 30.7%. The circumstances of each request were determined to be unique, and the

Plan Commission recommended approval in each case. The Village Board ultimately approved each request as well. In the case of the request to allow 40% lot coverage, the property in question was very small (6,600 square feet), and the applicant was seeking to replace an existing patio that had settled and was causing rain water to seep into the basement.

Variation:

With regard to any variation, the Zoning Board of Appeals shall not recommend a variation unless it shall make findings based upon the evidence presented to it in the following case, as per Section 16-15-6(D) of the Zoning Code:

1. The property in question, other than a single-family residential lot, cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations governing the district in which it is located.

Does not apply.

2. The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances.

Staff is unable to identify any unique circumstances associated with the request. The applicant has stated that the topographical condition of the property serves as justification for the variation to exceed maximum allowable lot coverage. Staff does not concur. The applicant would be seeking to construct a deck between the existing home and pool regardless of the topographic conditions present on the property.

3. The variation, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality.

The variation, if approved, would not have a significant impact on the character of the immediate area.

4. The plight of the owner is due to the failure of a previous owner of the property in question to follow then-applicable ordinances or regulations, and where the benefit to health, safety or appearance to be derived from correcting the nonconformity would not justify the cost or difficulty of the correction. The evidence must show that the current owner had no role in the creation of the nonconformity.

Does not apply.

5. The particular physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the specific property involved bring a particular hardship upon the owner as distinguished from a mere inconvenience.

The applicant has stated that the topographical condition of the property create an unsafe condition. Staff does not concur. With the existing property improvements, the lot coverage regulations allow a deck measuring approximately 100 square feet on this property, and sidewalk could be constructed as well. However, staff would note that the lot size of 7,200 square feet is well below the minimum standard size of 10,000 square feet for the R-3

Zoning District. The smaller lot size was allowed by the planned unit development. With a standard lot size, the variation would not be necessary.

6. The conditions upon which the petition for the variance is based would not be applicable generally to other property within the same district.

The conditions involved with this case are only applicable to this request, and each variation application is evaluated on an individual basis.

7. The granting of the variation will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located.

The variation, if approved, would not have a significant impact on public welfare nor would it be injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood. However, if the variation is approved, staff is concerned about the precedent that could be established for future requests wherein there is no demonstrated hardship or unique condition.

Summary:

Once again, staff sympathizes with the applicant and understands why he wishes to construct a deck between the home and pool. However, since the evaluation criteria for variation requests have not been satisfied, staff cannot support the variation.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends denial of the variation to allow lot coverage of 39.7% on the property at 178 Carriage Lane to permit the construction of a 440 square foot deck. However, if the Plan Commission / Zoning Board of Appeals determines to recommend approval of the request, staff recommends that it only do so subject to the condition that the applicant must obtain the required building permit for the deck.

Commissioner Vora entered at this point.

Mr. Glees gave the following highlights:

William Coley of 178 Carriage Drive has filed an application for a lot coverage variation to allow a wooden deck to be constructed between the existing pool and home on the property. As seen on the deck drawing plans and plat of survey, the irregularly shaped deck would measure approximately 440 square feet in area. The maximum lot coverage in the R-3 District is 30%, but lot coverage is allowed to increase to 35% for pools and decks only, provided that in the case of decks, the ground surface beneath the deck is pervious to allow rain water to infiltrate the ground. With the proposed 440 square foot deck, the lot coverage would equal approximately 39.7%.

In reviewing the history of this property, we have found that a permit for the existing pool was issued to Mr. Coley in 1999. In the permit file is a calculation showing the lot coverage for the property, including a 220 square foot deck. Unfortunately, there is a mathematical error in the lot coverage calculation performed by Village staff, resulting in an understatement of the lot coverage. Although the lot coverage was indicated on the permit to be 33%, the actual lot coverage at the time of the pool permit was 36.2%, in

excess of the maximum allowable 35%. The deck has since been removed, bringing the current lot coverage down to 33.6%, which complies with the Zoning Code requirement.

In the staff report, we review the purpose and intent of the lot coverage provision. We note that the Village of Carol Stream has historically been careful to adhere to the lot coverage provisions of the Zoning Code, in part to reduce flooding that could result in the future from increases in impervious ground coverage.

Staff is sympathetic to Mr. Coley's circumstance, and we can understand why he believes that a deck between the home and pool is necessary, convenient, and attractive. However, staff has not been able to find anything unique about the property that justifies the variation. Since the evaluation criteria for variation requests have not been satisfied, staff cannot support the variation.

Commissioner Manzzullo asked about the previous deck and Mr. Coley confirmed that he had removed it. Commissioner Manzzullo asked about the plan and Mr. Coley said that it would extend from the house to the pool so that anyone using the pool would not keep killing the grass and tracking grass and mud into the house. There would also be room enough for a barbeque grill and a table and chairs.

Chairman Michaelsen asked about the pitch of the yard and Mr. Coley described the physical characteristics of the lot, and the differences in elevation. Chairman Michaelsen asked questions regarding the elevation of the proposed deck and asked what size deck would be allowed under the Code. Mr. Glees replied that a 100 square foot deck would be allowable. In response to the question about the ground underneath the proposed deck, Mr. Coley said it would be stone.

Commissioner Smoot asked whether a 100 square foot deck would be sufficient and Mr. Coley said no.

Commissioner Smoot moved and Commissioner Vora made the second to recommend denial of the petitioner's request for a lot coverage variation. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes:	5	Commissioners Manzzullo, Christopher, Smoot, Vora and Michaelsen
Nays:	0	
Absent:	1	Commissioner Hundhausen

The recommendation is that the petitioner's request be denied.

**# 08190: DOMINICKS – 560 Schmale Road
 Variation – Sign Code**

Terry Doyle and Jim Orn, Doyle Signs, Inc. 232 W. Interstate Rd. Addison, IL were sworn in as witnesses in this matter. Mr. Doyle stated that the staff report was thorough and provides all of the necessary information. He believes that the request is in keeping with original approvals of the Center and community standards.

There were no comments or questions from those in attendance at the call for public hearing.

The following is the staff report.

Applicant:

Lisa Neal of Doyle Signs on behalf of Regency Centers Corporation

Size and Location:

The 19.12-acre property is located generally at the northwest corner of Schmale Road and Geneva Road. (See attached location map.)

Zoning and Land Use:

The subject property is zoned B-3 Service District with a Special Use for Planned Unit Development and improved with the Geneva Crossing Shopping Center.

Surrounding Zoning and Land Uses:

The properties to the north are zoned B-4 Office, Research and Institutional Building District and B-3 Service District with a Special Use for Planned Unit Development, with the B-4 property improved with an office and warehouse building and the B-3 property being vacant. The property to the south is zoned I1 Institutional District in the City of Wheaton and improved with the Theosophical Society campus. The properties to the east are zoned C-3 General Business District in the City of Wheaton, B-2 General Business District in unincorporated Milton Township and B-2 General Retail District in the Village of Carol Stream, with all properties improved with commercial uses. The properties to the west are zoned R-4 Single Family Residence District in unincorporated Milton Township and improved with single family residences.

Attachments:

Attached for review are a location map, an aerial photograph, cover letter from Dominick's Property Manager Maria Tillmann dated February 28, 2008, the General Application, the Sign Code Variation Application, pages 14 and 15 from Ordinance 97-01-13, a plat of survey and the sign exhibits from Doyle Signs.

Request:

The applicant is requesting two variations from Section 6-11-6(B)(2) of the Sign Code to: 1) not include the blank wall area between multiple wall signs on the same façade in the calculation of sign area, and 2) allow multiple smaller signs to extend below the largest sign.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Regency Centers, owner of the Geneva Crossing Shopping Center, wishes to make several changes to the existing wall (façade) signage to the Carol Stream Dominick's store. However, the Sign Code requires that the blank wall area between multiple wall signs be included in the calculation of total sign area. If the blank wall area between each wall sign is included in the sign area calculation, the total sign area will exceed the maximum area allowed in the business (B-1, B-2, and B-3) zoning districts. The Sign Code also requires that when there are multiple wall signs, smaller signs cannot extend above or below the largest sign. To allow the proposed wall signage for the Dominick's store, Regency Centers is requesting variations from Section 6-11-6(B)(2) of the Sign Code to: 1) exclude the blank wall area between multiple signs in the calculation of wall sign area, and 2) allow four smaller signs to be installed below the largest sign.

History of Dominick's Signage

In review of Regency Centers' current request, it is necessary to review the history of signage for the Dominick's store. In 1997, the Village Board approved Ordinance 97-

01-13, which granted a Special Use for a Planned Unit Development along with several variations. Two of the variations, which are discussed in section 2 on page 14 (attached) of Ordinance 97-01-13, involved wall signage for Dominick's. Specifically, this ordinance stipulated that: 1) the blank area between multiple wall signs shall not be included in the sign area calculation, and 2) that smaller signs could extend below the larger sign. As a note, in consideration of the relief granted to not include the blank wall area in the calculation of wall sign area, this ordinance also contained a provision reducing the total wall sign area allowance from 10% of the façade area, as typically allowed in the business districts, to 6% of the façade area.

Variations typically "run with the land", which means that any relief that is granted through a variation continues to be applicable to the property in perpetuity. However, as seen at the bottom of page 14 of Ordinance 97-01-13, the sign variations granted were only applicable to the following specific signs: "Dominick's", "Drug", "Food" and "Fresh Store". Further, Section 3 at the top of page 15 states that "any modifications requested for future unknown tenants are at the present denied...". As such, the Sign Code variations granted for Dominick's through Ordinance 97-01-13 do not apply to the currently proposed signage modifications.

Existing Versus Proposed Signs

As stated, Regency Centers would like to make several changes to the existing wall signs on the Dominick's store façade. The attached sign exhibit (Sheet 1 of 3) depicts the existing and proposed wall signage. The table below also summarizes the existing and proposed signage, along with the existing and proposed signage area.

Existing Sign	Area	Proposed Sign	Area
Dominick's (w/wave)	437 s.f.	Dominick's (w/wave)	291.3 s.f.
Food	37 s.f.	Starbuck's Coffee	13.3 s.f.
Drug	42 s.f.	Pharmacy	57.47 s.f.
Fresh Store	100 s.f.	Café	25 s.f.
Chase	27.4 s.f.	Chase	27.4 s.f.
Total area (existing)	643.4 s.f.	Total area (proposed)	414.47 s.f.

As seen on Sheet 2 of 3, the building façade area is calculated to be 10,706 square feet. Existing signs measure 643.4 square feet in area, which is exactly 6% of the façade area, as permitted by Ordinance 97-01-13. The new signage plan for the Dominick's façade would reduce sign area by almost 230 square feet, or 4% of the façade area, to 414.47 square feet, provided that the blank area between the various wall signs continues not to be included in the sign area calculation. The reduction in sign area is primarily attributable to a decrease in the size of the Dominick's logo (referred to as the "wave"), although the "Food" (37 s.f.), "Drug" (42 s.f.) and Fresh Store (100 s.f.) signs are also proposed to be removed. New proposed signs, detailed on the sign plan exhibit sheets 2 and 3, include a "Signature Cafe" sign (25 s.f.) over the northern building entrance, a "Pharmacy" sign (57.47 s.f.) near the southern end of the store, and a "Starbuck's Coffee" sign (13.3 s.f.) at the north end of the façade. The "Chase" bank sign (27.4 s.f.) is proposed to be relocated, with no change in the area of this sign. The Dominick's sign and logo, which is the largest sign, would be the highest

sign on the overall façade, with the four other signs proposed to be located lower than the Dominick's sign at approximately the same height.

Variations:

When contemplating a decision on any request for a Sign Code variation, the Zoning Board of Appeals shall consider the following criteria, as stated in Section 6-11-21(B) of the Sign Code:

Any unique physical property of the land involved.

The physical property of the land is not particularly unique, although the distance of the building facade from Schmale Road presents a challenge related to the visibility of the businesses from the road.

The available locations for adequate signage on site.

The available locations for signage are adequate. The need for multiple signs on the Dominick's façade relates to the fact that there several distinct businesses within the Dominick's store, including a Chase Bank and Starbuck's Café. Further, Dominick's wishes to make motorists aware that there is a pharmacy within the store.

The effect of the proposed signage on pedestrian and motor traffic.
Staff is not aware of any negative impacts that the existing signage has on pedestrian or motor traffic. Although the current proposal would reduce the area of signage on the building, we believe that area motorists are generally familiar with the Dominick's store at this location.

The cost to the applicant of complying with the Sign Code as opposed to the detriment, if any, to the public from the granting of the variance.

Again, the current proposal would reduce the area of wall signage on the building. It is expected, however, that the revised signage would more clearly convey the products and services offered at Dominick's. Staff is not aware of any detriment that would accrue to the public from the granting of the variations.

Other pertinent information or reason for the request.

The applicant is concerned that sales could decrease if one or more of the signs had to be removed, as would be required if the variations were not approved.

Summary:

In evaluation of the variation requests to not include the blank wall area between signs in the calculation of wall sign area, and to allow multiple signs to be installed below the largest sign, staff notes that Ordinance 97-01-13 previously granted relief to the Dominick's property to accommodate the current signage. Unfortunately, the ordinance was very clearly written so as not to be transferable to future signs other than the specific signs that were approved. As such, the applicant has had to apply for variations identical to those that were previously approved. As we have noted, if the sign area is calculated such that the blank wall area between multiple signs in not included, overall sign area would decrease by almost 230 square feet with the current

proposal. As such, staff can support the request to not include the blank wall area in the sign area calculation. Also, with respect to the smaller signs being installed lower on the building than the largest sign, staff notes that the Village has approved variations from this Sign Code provision several times in the past for larger shopping centers. Inasmuch as the current request will allow the signage package for the Dominick's store to be refreshed, staff has no objection to the smaller signs being installed at a lower height on the façade than the main Dominick's sign.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the Sign Code Variations to not include the blank wall area between multiple signs in the calculation of total wall sign area, and to allow multiple signs to be installed below the largest sign, subject to the following conditions:

1. That a building permit must be obtained prior to the construction of the installation of the signs; and
2. That the signs shall comply with all state, county, and village codes and requirements.

Mr. Glees provided the following highlights:

Regency Centers, owner of the Geneva Crossing Shopping Center, wishes to make several changes to the existing wall (façade) signage to the Carol Stream Dominick's store. The requested variations are to: 1) exclude the blank wall area between multiple signs in the calculation of wall sign area, and 2) allow four smaller signs to be installed below the largest sign.

In the staff report, we provide information regarding similar Sign Code relief that was granted to the center at the time of its approval in 1997. Although the requested variations are very similar to what was approved in 1997, and although such variations typically run with the land, the approval ordinance clearly states that only the signage specifically requested at that time was being approved. As such, the applicant has had to apply for similar variations for the proposed new signage.

Staff notes that the overall sign area would actually decrease by almost 230 square feet with the current proposal. We also note that the Village has approved similar Sign Code variations for other shopping centers.

Staff recommends approval of the Sign Code Variations to not include the blank wall area between multiple signs in the calculation of total wall sign area, and to allow multiple signs to be installed below the largest sign, subject to the conditions contained in the staff report.

Commissioner Spink asked if there would also be window signs and Mr. Orn said there would be none.

Commissioner Spink moved and Commissioner Christopher made the second to approve the variations to the Sign Code in accordance with staff recommendations. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes: 5 Commissioners Manzullo, Christopher, Smoot, Spink, Vora and

Michaelson
 Nays: 0
 Absent: 1 Commissioner Hundhausen

Commissioner Smoot moved and Commissioner Christopher made the second to close the public hearing. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes: 5 Commissioners Manzzullo, Christopher, Smoot, Spink, Vora and Michaelson
 Nays: 0
 Absent: 1 Commissioner Hundhausen

PRESENTATION:

**#08176 – GOODWILL INDUSTRIES – 520 S. Schmale Road
 Minor Modification to the Approved PUD Plan**

Jim Sparesus said that the request was for a minor modification to a PUD Plan to allow the construction of a trash enclosure and reconfiguration of the existing tenant space at 520 S. Schmale Road and described the proposed location of the new trash enclosure. The masonry would match the building and the chute would be painted to match the building as well. Mr. Sparesus described the existing screening of the site against the residential neighborhood to the west. He described the new doors on the west side of the building to create a truck delivery area.

The following is the staff report for this case:

Applicant:

Kevin Conner of Archiplan International, Ltd., on behalf of Goodwill Industries

Size and Location:

The approximate 18.7-acre property is located in the northwest quadrant of the intersection of Geneva Road and Schmale Road. (See attached location map.)

Existing zoning and land use:

The subject property is zoned B-3 Service District with a Special Use for Planned Unit Development, and is improved with the Geneva Crossing shopping center.

Adjacent zoning and land uses:

The property to the north is zoned B-4 Office, Research and Institutional Business District and is improved with the Tyndale House Publishers building. The property to the northeast is zoned B-3 Service District and is vacant. The properties to the west are zoned R-4 in unincorporated DuPage County and are improved with single-family residences. The properties to the south are zoned I-1, C-3 and R-1 in the City of Wheaton and are improved with the Theosophical Society, Quest Book Shop and single-family residences. The properties to the immediate east are zoned B-2 in unincorporated DuPage County and are improved with commercial uses. Other properties to east are zoned B-2 and B-3 in Carol Stream and are improved with commercial uses and the Northland Mall Shopping Center.

Attachments:

Attached for review are a location map, aerial photo, cover letter dated June 24, 2008, from Kevin Conner of Archiplan International, and reduced copies of the site plan (Exhibit A) and color elevations (Exhibit B).

Request:

The applicant is requesting approval of a minor modification to a Planned Unit Development Plan, in accordance with Section 16-16-5(B)(2)(a) of the Carol Stream Zoning Code, to allow the construction of a trash enclosure and reconfiguration of the existing tenant space at 520 S. Schmale Road.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Kevin Conner of Archiplan International is requesting approval of a minor modification to the Planned Unit Development Plan that was granted in 1997 to the Geneva Crossing Shopping Center through Ordinance 97-04-30. Two minor modifications to the PUD Plan for Geneva Crossing were approved later in 1997, one for a realignment of the access drive and one for a change to one of the tenant wall signs. The proposed modification is to relocate the existing trash storage area to the north side of the building, in order to use the west side of the building for truck access. The changes are necessary in order to remodel two existing tenant spaces so as to accommodate a Goodwill Industries retail/resale store. The Goodwill store will sell a mix of new and used items, mostly clothing but also electronics and furniture. The two existing tenant spaces to be occupied by Goodwill include a vacant space, formerly occupied by Teachers' Toolbox, and the space currently occupied by John's Christian Store.

Section 16-16-5(B)(2)(a) of the Zoning Code provides direction regarding how to process requests for modifications to approved PUD Plans:

"Any minor extensions, alterations, or modifications of existing buildings or structures may be authorized by the Plan Commission, if they are consistent with the purpose and intent of the final plan."

Due to the nature of the applicant's request, Village Board action is not required, and the Plan Commission has the authority to render the final decision regarding this matter.

Proposed Changes:

The changes that Archiplan is proposing are to relocate the existing trash collection facilities from the west side of the building to the north side and construct a truck door on the west wall. The existing trash collection facilities along the west wall consist of a dumpster and a one-sided 8-foot masonry screening wall, while the proposed facilities would consist of a compactor and a dumpster located within a complete masonry enclosure along the north wall. The new enclosure will be located adjacent to the building wall, and will be constructed of masonry that will match the existing building. The compactor chute which feeds the compactor from inside the building will likewise be painted to match the building wall. The new masonry enclosure wall will be eight feet in height, which is sufficient to completely screen the equipment. The former location of the dumpster at the west wall of the building will be remodeled for truck access by adding a 12-foot high overhead door and relocating one of the existing man doors. The existing 8-foot masonry screening wall will remain, and will screen the new truck door and delivery area. Staff would note that the west side of the shopping center is used for

deliveries, and that the Dominick's truck dock is currently located at the south end of the west building wall. In addition, there is an existing masonry screening wall located atop a berm along the west property line, with landscaping on both sides of the wall. This screening wall was constructed in order to screen the Geneva Crossing shopping center from the residential properties to the west.

The attached site plan (Exhibit A) and building elevations (Exhibit B) show the area at the north end of the building where the truck door and trash enclosure will be located. The proposed changes will be accommodated with no change to the service drive and minimal change to the building facades.

Summary:

Staff is comfortable with the changes proposed by the petitioner. The modifications are not contrary to the purpose and intent of the originally approved Final PUD Plan, and the proposed use serves a community need.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the petitioner's request for a minor modification to the PUD Plan for the building and property at 520 S. Schmale Road, for the trash enclosure, the truck door and the relocated man door, subject to the conditions listed below:

1. That the dumpster and compactor be completely screened by the trash enclosure wall;
2. That the enclosure be eight feet in height, and constructed of masonry materials to match the building, and that the compactor chute be painted to match the building;
3. That the proposed trash enclosure meet the requirements of the Fire Code with respect to fire protection; and
4. That the operation of the facility shall comply with all applicable state, county and Village codes and requirements.

Mr. Glees gave the following highlights:

Kevin Conner of Archiplan International is requesting approval of a minor modification to the Planned Unit Development Plan that was granted in 1997 to the Geneva Crossing Shopping Center. The proposed modification is to relocate the existing trash storage area to the north side of the building, in order to use the west side of the building for truck access. The changes are necessary in order to remodel two existing tenant spaces so as to accommodate a Goodwill Industries retail/resale store.

Due to the nature of the applicant's request as a minor modification to the approved PUD Plan, Village Board action is not required, and the Plan Commission has the authority to render the final decision in this matter.

Staff is comfortable with the changes proposed by the petitioner. The modifications are not contrary to the purpose and intent of the originally approved Final PUD Plan, and the proposed use serves a community need.

Staff recommends approval of the petitioner's request for a minor modification to the PUD Plan for the building and property at 520 S. Schmale Road, for the trash enclosure, the truck door and the relocated man door, subject to the conditions contained in the staff report.

Chairman Michaelsen asked about how the trash would be emptied. Mr. Sparesus described the proposed location of the new trash enclosure, saying that it would consist of a compactor and a dumpster located within a complete masonry enclosure along the north wall. The masonry would match the building and the chute would be painted to match the building. Mr. Sparesus described the truck movements on how the trash would be emptied in response to the question and also noted that their hours of operation would be the same as the center. He also stated that he does not know exactly what the trash pick up schedule will be. Chairman Michaelsen asked about the noise level of the compactor and was told that it would be a low volume. In response to the question, Mr. Sparesus said that the donation area will be inside of the store at the front. Chairman Michaelsen asked how the truck door would be used and was told that the delivery trucks would park at the truck door and fork lifts would move material to and from the truck.

Commissioner Manzzullo moved and Commissioner Vora made the second to approve a minor modification to a Planned Unit Development for Goodwill Industries at 520 S. Schmale Road. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes:	5	Commissioners Manzzullo, Christopher, Smoot, Spink, Vora and Michaelsen
Nays:	0	
Absent:	1	Commissioner Hundhausen

At 8:15 p.m. Commissioner Manzzullo moved and Commissioner Vora made the second to adjourn. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

FOR THE COMBINED BOARD

: