



Minutes
Village of Glen Ellyn
Village Board Workshop
Monday, April 15, 2024
7:00 PM
Glen Ellyn Civic Center, Galligan Room

A. Call to Order – 7:00 P.M.

B. Pledge of Allegiance

C. Roll Call

Upon roll call by Clerk Cosby, President Senak and Trustees Christiansen, Fasules, Kalinich, Gould, and Thompson answered “Present.” Trustee Simon arrived late to the meeting at 8:12 p.m.

Also in attendance: Village Manager Franz, Planning Manager Harper, Village Attorney Mathews, Economic Development Coordinator Hannah, Village Engineer Daubert, and Deputy Police Chief Vavra.

From CDM Smith, Senior Project Manager Matt Aklan and Lead Architect Sarah Sutherlin were also present.

D. Audience Participation

Ray Conley, resident, spoke about the ongoing issue with the Airbnb in his neighborhood. He said there had been minimal progress with resolving the issue of parties at this location. He reviewed the history of the Village’s actions, stating that he has not received any updates on the situation and would like to know what is holding up resolution of the issue.

Village Attorney Mathews replied that notification had been sent to the owners and no complaints have been received recently. He asked that the residents let the police know when there is a disturbance.

Mr. Conley’s wife, Elina Kasman, related her experience with the current activity. Village Attorney Mathews reiterated that the neighbors need to notify the police of violations and unwanted behaviors, otherwise the Village would not be aware of the zoning violation. The police response would be an investigation into the vehicles at the property to see if further investigation would be in order.

Trustee Thompson asked if the mere fact that a resident has a property listed as an Airbnb, is that a violation of the code. Village Attorney Mathews replied. Trustee Thompson asked what the law says about long term vs. short term rentals. Village Attorney Mathews replied that renters must be residential for extended periods of time. Discussion ensued.

President Senak asked if in a single-family zone area, is there a period of time it can or cannot be rented. Village Attorney Mathews replied. He added that the property in question is owned by a corporation.

Trustee Kalinich asked Mr. Conley who at the Village he had reached out to. Mr. Conley replied and added that he had sent an email to several staff members. Village Manager Franz asked Mr. Conley to forward the email again.

William Weicher, resident, said that he had asked about this two years ago and had gotten a helpful response confirming that a single-family dwelling is not allowed to be rented by multiple families.

E. Hen Ellyn Proposal (Planning Manager Harper)

1) Proposed Text Amendments Regarding Keeping of Chickens

Planning Manager Harper reviewed the history of the proposal to date. He added that the matter had been put on a back burner and it is now being brought to the forefront again.

Trustee Kalinich thought that this was going to go to a workshop at that time, not to Plan Commission in February of 2023. Trustee Gould agreed that she had expected it to go to workshop. Trustee Fasules thought that it needed to go through staff first. That said, this proposal was in this workshop.

President Senak said he desired to get some closure on the issue and that this was the beginning of a process that will ultimately lead to a vote on hen keeping.

Billy Joe Mills, resident, clarified the history of the proposal. He added that zero residents were against hen keeping and that Hen Ellyn is willing to compromise on their requests within their proposal. President Senak asked if he wanted this to go back to the Plan Commission to be worked out. Mr. Mills replied yes.

Trustee Thompson asked if the Hen Ellyn group could just pay the \$500 fee and have the text changed, even if the Board was not in favor. Village Attorney Mathews replied that the group would have the right to do so according to due process but that the Village Board could also approve text amendments.

Mary Eileen Gaudette, resident, asked if the Board does not feel hen keeping is a high enough priority for the staff to work on, what would be the suggested method for this group to see this executed. President Senak replied that if the residents feel it's important, then it is important to the Village and the public comment and staff input was critical to making an educated decision. Ms. Gaudette realized that resources were limited and wondered how Hen Ellyn could help with the process.

Grace Chan, resident, gave her thoughts on hen keeping.

Emily Henkels, resident, pointed the Board to an item in the packet for consideration. She said Hen Ellyn came up questions about possible negative impact and researched the possible answers, sourcing other nearby communities that allow hen keeping and pointing out that complaints are minimal. President Senak asked if there was a particular complaint that came up. She replied that the concern about roosters was number one, as well as if permitting hen keeping took up a lot of staff time.

President Senak followed up by asking if she felt that any one of the communities surveyed had the best ordinance. Ms. Henkels said that in her opinion Lombard has an ordinance worth looking at for Glen Ellyn.

Trustee Kalinich said she would be curious about feedback from the police departments. Ms. Henkels replied that Hen Ellyn members had not looked into police feedback, but the group would be happy to research that.

Patrick Lopardo, resident, said he was at a meeting in support of Hen Ellyn and eventually would like to keep hens.

Ellen Nabetz, resident, brought up the fact that all unincorporated areas of Glen Ellyn already allow hen keeping. She added that she is surprised that Glen Ellyn does not allow hen keeping since many communities do allow hens. Trustee Kalinich clarified that unincorporated DuPage County allows hen keeping, not unincorporated Glen Ellyn.

Jenna Lindman, resident and a supporter of Hen Ellyn, said she has always wanted to keep hens and that it is a great way to learn and control your food source.

Joeff Davis, and his two children, said they have always wanted to keep hens because of the fresh eggs are great and that hens are no different than having a dog for a pet.

Heidi Anderson thanked the Board for being approachable about this proposal. She then went to say that she was frustrated that the subject had been put aside and that Hen Ellyn had done its due diligence to answer any and all concerns. She would like to see it move to the Plan Commission and allow hen keeping in the Village.

Trustee Christiansen thanked everyone for speaking up and that she supports hen keeping. She also talked about what hen keeping is really all about, and issues with other animals that we would not have with chickens.

William Weicher, resident, and his two children, said he thought the issue was really one of broad appeal in that people from different walks of life come together about hen keeping. He realized that some people have negative opinions about hen keeping, but those in favor are family-oriented people looking for positive learning experiences for their children.

Trustee Fasules commented that he felt this issue was moving at lightning speed, given the usual time it takes to go through this process. He then said that many residents who have contacted the Trustees are against hen keeping. He talked about the urbanization of the Village and what the entire community has to say about the proposal needs to be considered. He added that if it does move forward, the Board is the legal body that will approve or deny the proposal.

Trustee Kalinich asked if the Police Department had any opinion on the proposal based on police interaction that may be necessary if approved. Deputy Police Chief Vavra replied it would be treated the same as any complaint from a resident.

Trustee Kalinich said she did a bit of research on hen keeping in the county, and that seventeen have provisions for hen keeping, but these were not all exclusively part of DuPage County.

Trustee Gould asked if the Environmental Commission had any comments about this proposal. Trustee Fasules replied.

Trustee Gould commented said she was not a big fan of zoning text amendments without the context of what the Village is doing in their residential zones. She asked what the maximum number of accessory structures was for residential lots. Planning Manager Harper replied.

Trustee Gould asked if Glen Ellyn had animal control. Police Deputy Chief Vavra replied that the police department handles all Village jurisdiction calls on animals.

Trustee Gould asked what the reasons other communities gave for not approving hen keeping. Planning Manager Harper replied.

President Senak said that there is a process, and a reason for the process, and that reason was to make informed decisions. He suggested that the proposal should go back to the Plan Commission.

Trustee Thompson commented that the process is glacial, and that this is just the nature of the process. He added that citizens have the right to petition the Village. Trustee Thompson noted that some of the objections come from concerns about small yards. He questioned how the Board even knows how the majority of residents feel about hen keeping. He suggested conducting a survey to find out.

Trustee Gould commented that a lack of opposition is not support, and that many residents are not aware of the goings on of the Village government. She was concerned about changing the code without looking at the neighborhoods as a whole. She suggested a straw poll.

Trustee Christiansen commented that the Village has ordinances about certain aspect of keeping dogs. She pointed out that every community annoyance cannot be legislated, and that neighbors do things that other neighbors do not like. She added that times are changing and that sustainability should be considered. She would like to see it go back to the Plan Commission.

Ms. Anderson commented that she understood the assumptions about noise and small lots but just because the lot is small does not mean that neighbors will hear the chickens. She added the things that Hen Ellyn has changed in their proposal to address the noise concerns.

President Senak asked the Board to give their opinions on how and if the proposal should proceed. Discussion ensued. Trustee Fasules and Trustee Gould did not want to send the proposal back to the Plan Commission.

Trustee Thompson didn't like the fact that the proposal was not going through the application process and he recommended that they pay the \$500 and go through the process. Discussion continued on this approach. Trustee Thompson asked if the Board said no, could Hen Ellyn still apply through the Village. Village Attorney Mathews replied yes.

Ian Dawson, resident, commented on the Plan Commission's work on this proposal, including the need to set lot size guidelines as well as other specifications.

It was agreed, though not unanimously, that Hen Ellyn's proposal should be sent back to the Plan Commission. Trustee Fasules recommended that the Plan Commission be given specific guidance on what to consider. Trustee Gould asked if the Plan Commission should do likewise for the Board.

F. 473 N. Main - The Learning Studio (Economic Development Coordinator Hannah)

1) Review of Approved Special Use Permit

Economic Development Coordinator Hannah spoke about the permit granted at an earlier meeting and that the business model has pivoted from what was approved. She said staff is seeking guidance if what was submitted meets the criteria and if not, what needs to be done to get the business up and running.

Trustee Simon wanted to confirm that there were no issues with the revised plan. Economic Development Coordinator Hannah replied that there were no issues and the new plan meets more of the retail aspect than originally envisioned.

The petitioner, Katie McDevitt, spoke about the changes in the business plan and her desire to not let the Board down as far as providing the retail she has promised. She felt strongly that the business will be a haven for the children of the Village. She spoke about the sorts of items that will be available for purchase.

Trustee Kalinich wanted clarification on the hours of operation and if they are changing as planned. Ms. McDevitt replied.

Trustee Kalinich asked about the executive functioning materials and other resources and how they will be organized. Ms. McDevitt replied and that she would carry self-published books that would not compete with The Book Store.

Trustee Kalinich asked how the Studio would be marketed. Ms. McDevitt replied.

Trustee Fasules asked if the petitioner had wholesale agreements that were exclusive for Glen Ellyn and inquired into her method of purchasing. Ms. McDevitt replied.

Trustee Simon thanked the petitioner for her honesty and for amending the partnership to fit the Village's approved business model. She added that because of this, she supports the business.

Trustee Thompson appreciated her effort to keep the business as it was originally approved.

President Senak took a poll and the Board had not changed their opinions since the original permit, so it can move forward as is.

G. Glen Ellyn Metra Station and Multimodal Access Improvements Project (Professional Engineer Daubert)

1) Crescent Boulevard On-Street Parking Configuration

Professional Engineer Daubert thanked the Capital Improvement Commission members for their work on this project. He also introduced the other members of the team including, from CDM Smith, Senior Project Manager Matt Aklan and Lead Architect Sarah Sutherlin. He then said that the objective for this meeting was to get feedback and direction on the project elements to date.

Professional Engineer Daubert gave background on the project and issues that the new design addresses. He also reviewed feedback that was given in public workshops. He then summarized the pros and cons of parallel vs. angle parking.

Professional Engineer Daubert reviewed the crash analysis that was done for the Streetscape project. This included examples of crashes and queuing issues in this area.

Professional Engineer Daubert reviewed the history of the project development.

CDM Smith Lead Architect Sarah Sutherlin reviewed the existing conditions on Crescent. She said that the current standards are not met by the parking as it is today.

Lead Architect Sarah Sutherlin then spoke about the 10% plan stage that the project is at that needs direction to continue. Trustee Thompson asked about the sidewalk width. CDM Senior Project Manager Matt Aklan and Professional Engineer Daubert replied.

Trustee Kalinich asked what the total parking space count was in the plan. Lead architect Sarah Sutherlin replied, continuing with alternatives to maximize all parallel and angle parking options. She added that they investigated options based on Capital Improvements Commission input, showing examples of these options.

Professional Engineer Daubert shared the recommendation that was approved by the Capital Improvements Commission. Consideration was given to how the lots are used.

CIC Chairman Szymanski said that this recommendation should be viewed in light of the future plans for the underpass and train station. The commission's goal is to make the Village more walkable and improve safety.

CIC Commissioner Zuccherro complemented Professional Engineer Daubert and then commented that his goal as a member of the CIC is to make the town more walkable, bikeable, and livable. He commented on the width of the sidewalks on Main Street and that there is an opportunity to make the sidewalks wider and better on Crescent. He also felt that this plan addresses the traffic and parking issues on Crescent as well.

Professional Engineer Daubert summarized the parking alternatives, comparing the 10% plan, the maximizing plans, and the CIC recommendation.

President Senak confirmed that guidance was being sought on parking on Crescent as well as the West and East lots.

Trustee Thompson asked about the restrictions on the outdoor dining on Crescent. Planning Manager Harper replied. Trustee Thompson thought that the purpose to widen the sidewalks was to accommodate sidewalk dining, as well as parking, of which he did not approve. Discussion ensued.

Trustee Fasules asked if the merchants and Downtown Alliance had seen this plan. Economic Development Coordinator Hannah replied that they had not seen it but

were aware that it was coming.

Trustee Simon said that the Board should stop catering to cars so much and consider the sidewalks as more important. Discussion ensued about the sidewalk width.

Trustee Kalinich brought up the crash rate and discovered the information on the accident report and that she prefers updated data. She thought that the parallel parking was a cultural shift but a good idea. She also thought the sidewalks needed to be widened and should be inviting for the restaurants. She continued by saying that short term parking should be considered.

Trustee Christiansen agreed with the recommendations of the CIC, citing that there is a safety issue to consider, in regard to parking and the sidewalk width.

Trustee Gould asked about the West lot as planned and hoped for a few more angled spots in the lot.

Trustee Thompson asked about the combination of angle and parallel in the west lot and wanted to know the width of the sidewalk at the pinch point that was being recommended. Lead Architects Sarah Sutherlin said she would need to confirm. Trustee Thompson also wanted to see more angled parking in the west lot. Discussion continued about the plans for this lot.

Village Manager Franz said that the west lot is owned by Union Pacific and that needs to be taken into consideration.

Trustee Simon was concerned about diminishing the station platform sidewalk.

Trustee Thompson stated that keeping the sidewalks wide on the east side was good. He was concerned about the reaction that changing the Crescent parking from angle to parallel parking would cause. He cited the parking change in front of the Civic Center. That said, he wanted to keep the angle parking on Crescent while maximizing the sidewalk.

Trustee Gould said that with the train station design there was a lot of amenity space. She wondered how necessary expanding the north sidewalk would be.

In summary, a majority of the Board felt parking on Crescent should be parallel based on safety concerns.

For the west lot, a majority of the Board felt parking as designed in the West lot alternative should be pursued. Two trustees favored the 10% plan.

For the east lot, a majority of the Board felt parking as designed in the East Lot Alternative 2 should be pursued.

H. Reminders

- 1) Village Board Meeting Monday, April 22, 2024 at 7 p.m.

I. Adjourn – 10:30 P.M.

Mover: Trustee Kalinich; Second: Trustee Simon. Unanimous vote to adjourn.