Minutes
Village of Glen Ellyn
Plan Commission Meeting
Thursday, October 24, 2024
7:00 PM
Glen Ellyn Civic Center, Galligan Board Room

A. Call to Order 7:05P.M.

Upon roll call, Chairperson Lotfus and Commissioners Arango, Cooper, Dawson, Pesce, and Wyant were present. Commissioners Brown, Kreuzer, and Mukherjee were absent.

Also in attendance were Plan Manager Harper, Community Development Director Henaghan, and Trustee Thompson.

B. Public Comment

There was no off-agenda audience comment.

C. New Business

1) Public Hearing - 1096 Hill Avenue - Special Use Permit, Barkington Pet Hotel & Grooming

Planning Manager Harper was sworn in and reviewed the proposed special use permit. He reviewed the scope, adding that operations would be totally indoors.

Fernando Nunez, the petitioner, was sworn in and presented his case for expanding his existing grooming business into Glen Ellyn. He reviewed the reasons for choosing Glen Ellyn and described how the business would operate. He also spoke about hygiene and noise issues.

Commissioner Arango asked if it would be for dogs only. Mr. Nunez replied yes.

Commissioner Pesce asked if it would be a 24/7 business. Mr. Nunez replied that someone would be on-grounds 24/7 but it would be open to the public during set business hours.

Commissioner Pesce asked about if the waste management was being addressed. Mr. Nunez replied, reiterating that there was a plan for this.

Commissioner Pesce asked if the business was appointment based. Mr. Nunez replied yes with details.

Commissioner Pesce asked if someone could walk in. Mr. Nunez replied no, and explained the process they will use.

Commissioner Arango asked if prospective clients are pre-qualified for enrollment. Mr. Nunez replied yes and explained the process for this

Commissioner Arango asked about medical support. Mr. Nunez replied they are certified in vet CPR and would have local support.

Commissioner Arango asked if Barkington is a chain. Mr. Nunez replied no.

Commissioner Pesce asked about other tenants that occupy the space. Mr. Nunez replied.

Commissioner Arango asked about a different Barkington in another area of the country. Mr. Nunez replied there is no affiliation.

Chairperson Loftus asked what the capacity would be for daycare and boarding. Mr. Nunez replied daycare would be 15 maximum.

Chairperson Loftus asked about the parking spots. Mr. Nunez replied.

Chairperson Loftus asked if any items would be offered for retail. Mr. Nunez replied yes and expounded.

Commissioner Arango asked about the lack of outside run space. Mr. Nunez replied.

Commissioner Arango asked what the size of the kennels would be. Mr. Nunez replied.

Chairperson Loftus asked if the dogs would be in kennels during the day or out in a common space. Mr. Nunez replied.

Commissioner Arango asked if staff will be able to walk the dogs outside of the building. Mr. Nunez replied that they want to keep the dogs indoors.

Commissioner Arango asked what the staff ratio would be. Mr. Nunez replied, adding that it was based on volume.

Commissioner Pesce asked if clients would be able to pick up their dog after hours if boarding. Mr. Nunez replied that this would not be allowed and would occur only during business hours.

Planning Manager Harper received a comment against the proposal from Matt Dirks, resident, and it was read into the record.

Commissioner Cooper asked who the prior tenant of the space was. Chairperson Loftus replied it was an electrical contractor.

Chairperson Loftus gave his thoughts on the proposal and saw no reason the deny the request. Commissioner Arango agreed that it did not seems like this would be a nuisance. Commissioner Cooper thought that the written application was out of order and issues needed to be addressed, as they were during the open public hearing. He felt an adequate written record should be available.

The Plan Commission voted 5-0 to approve the proposal and it will be sent to the Village Board for consideration.

2) Public Hearing - 580 Duane Street - Parking Space Width Variation

Chairperson Loftus read the proposal being considered.

Planning Manager Harper was sworn in and reviewed the parking space width variation being proposed.

Chairperson Loftus asked about the configuration of the handicapped spot and the code requirements involved in relation to the steep ramp. Planning Manager Harper replied. Chairperson Loftus asked follow-up questions addressing his concerns.

Commissioner Cooper believed that the plans to modify the ramp would not be the same configuration and thought the wall of the left side could be an impingement. Discussion continued about the handicapped spot.

Commissioner Cooper asked if there were other parking lots with stalls of the requested size. Planning Manager Harper replied. Chairperson Loftus added that he believed that there were stall of this size.

The petitioner and his engineer for the project presented their reasoning for the requested variance. The petitioner said he was willing to adjust the configuration if needed. The engineer elaborated on the handicap space configuration and legal use, adding that the intent was to keep the current number of spaces available.

Commissioner Arango asked if there was any concern for water runoff and drainage. The engineer replied.

Commissioner Cooper thought that request was not out of line. Chairperson Loftus added his thoughts as well. Commissioner Dawson talked about the average width of a new car and his thoughts on the variance request.

The Plan Commission voted 5-0 to approve the proposal and it will be sent to the Village Board for consideration.

3) Public Hearing - 880 Roosevelt Road - Sign Variations

Chairperson Loftus read the proposed sign variation for the property.

Planning Manager Harper was sworn in and reviewed the proposed sign variations. He added that the original signs had been installed without a variance approval, and the petitioner was now taking the proper channels to obtain the variance for the signs.

Chairperson Loftus asked about the reference to the electronic board on the charging stations and if these are the same in the sign code or different when considering the allowed sign count. Planning Manager Harper replied.

Commissioner Dawson asked about the 15 second section and how this was arrived at. Planning Manager Harper replied he wasn't sure but thought it might be connected to limiting the amount of distraction in relation to safety.

The petitioner was sworn in and then gave some background on locations that are owned by Starlight (the group the petitioner was representing) and how the signs are used for messaging including promotions, events, or emergencies. He said that the 15 seconds was a DOT regulation but the industry standard is 8 seconds.

Chairperson Loftus asked if these were mall specific or could have other uses. Petitioner replied.

Commissioner Pesce asked how these two locations were decided upon. Petitioner replied. Commissioner Pesce followed up with a question about the timing. Petitioner replied.

Commissioner Arango asked if the mall businesses would be required to purchase advertising on these boards. The petitioner replied no.

Chairperson Loftus asked about Starlight and their use of digital screens. The petitioner replied that these screens were an affordable means of advertising.

Commissioner Cooper asked about the special needs cited for the variance in the proposal. He asked what the unusual circumstances were that would satisfy the variance need. The petitioner replied.

Chairperson Loftus asked about item 3 in the application, and if the number of screens was two or three. Planning Manager Harper replied it would be two only.

Chairperson Loftus asked about the turning off of the signs and what time that would happen, seeing that some of the businesses in the mall are open very late. The petitioner replied that the signs would comply with requirement of the code.

Commissioner Cooper asked about enhancement and revenue. The petitioner replied. Discussion continued.

Commissioner Pesce asked what the policy is for repair of the screens if needed. The petitioner replied repairs would be addressed within 48 hours.

Chairperson Loftus asked how this type of sign is equated in comparison to other signs in the Village that pertain to the specific business operating them. Planning Manager Harper replied.

Commissioner Pesce asked if this company had any other installations in the Village. Planning Manager Harper replied.

Commissioner Cooper asked what the features were as far as broadcasting emergency public messages. The petitioner replied, explaining the network access.

Commissioner Arango asked if the solicitation of the boards was being driven by the property owner or Starlight. The petitioner replied.

Chairperson Loftus asked if the Village would make any revenue on the installation. The petitioner replied that there was value in the public access.

Commissioner Dawson asked if the other screen installations across the country run on an 8 second cycle. The petitioner replied yes. Commissioner Dawson wanted to know what the theory was behind the 8 seconds ad cycle. The petitioner replied.

Commissioner Dawson asked if there was an 8A-8P on and off window, could emergency access be gained in off hours. The petitioner replied.

Commissioner Dawson asked if the display would only contain static ads or if they would have motion. The petitioner replied. Discussion continued about the need for another variance for motion messaging.

Chairperson Loftus asked about the pole mounted vs. wall mounted screens, the latter being the focus of this petition. He wanted to know what the unique circumstances were involved in these wall mounted screens. The petitioner replied. Chairperson Loftus thought that the application was heavy handed, and not an enhancement for the shopping center because anyone, anywhere, could buy time on them. The petitioner replied.

Commissioner Cooper asked Planning Manager Harper if the sign code defines a billboard, feeling that these screens were really just compact billboards. Planning Manager Harper stated that a billboards would be under the code of an off-premise sign. Discussion continued.

Commissioner Arango reiterated her concern that the Village would not be receiving any revenue for the screens. Commissioner Cooper wanted to be careful that this was not a consideration of granting a variance. Chairperson Loftus wondered if a condition could be put on the content. The petitioner replied.

Chairperson Loftus spoke about the charging station signs and how that code works with the petitioned variance.

Commissioner Pesce said he did not see the value of the screens, based on his knowledge of the area.

Commissioner Cooper read the definition of an outdoor sign which is prohibited and stated that it seemed these screens would be contradictory to that as far as content. He also did not see any evidence of hardship and that the only purpose was to increase revenue for the property owner.

Commissioner Dawson liked the idea of the low-profile technology. He said there are many controls that would need to be specified for him to get behind the variance and that he was not in favor of it as it was currently presented.

The Commission voted 5-0 to deny the request and it will be sent to the Village Board for consideration.

.

D. Trustee Liaison's Report

Trustee Thompson have his report to the Commission. Chairperson Loftus asked if Trustee Thompson know anything new about Butterfield and Route 53. Trustee Thompson replied.

E. Chairman's Report

Chairperson Loftus had nothing to add.

F. Staff Report

Planning Manager Harper gave his staff report and what the Plan Commission can expect to see in the near future.

G. Other Business

No other official business was discussed.

H. Adjourn – 8:52P.M.

Mover: Commissioner Arango; Second: Commissioner Dawson. Unanimous vote to adjourn.