Minutes
Village of Glen Ellyn
Plan Commission Meeting
Thursday, January 23, 2025
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, Kreuzer, Pesce, and Wyant were present. Commissioners Brown, Dawson, 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 – Starbucks, 405 Roosevelt Road, Final Planned Unit Development, Special Use Permit, and Variation from the Glen Ellyn Sign Code.

Planning Manager Harper was sworn in and presented Starbuck's application for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) along with a visual depiction of the plans. He noted that the preliminary PUD for the 5-lot commercial development was approved in 2017 by the Village Board, Ordinance 6546. He described the zoning and the traffic circulation pattern of Starbuck's plans, as well as the Village's requirement to have a portion of the site plans as "quasi-public space." Harper explained the Special Use Permit (SUP) application as being required for the drive-thru service use. Regarding the sign-code variation, Village Code limits businesses to 1 wall sign and Starbuck's application requested 4 signs.

Commissioner Loftus asked about customer access to the site via Taft Avenue. Mr. Harper explained that it was a design feature included in the preliminary PUD, Ordinance 6546, and that it was already constructed as part of the site development for the Andy's Frozen Custard and Buona Beef locations.

Commissioner Pesce asked if the lanes near the parking spaces allowed for two-way traffic. Mr. Harper replied that the laned north and south of the Starbucks would remain two-way. The lanes to the west of the Starbucks would be one-way, north to south, in order to accommodate the proposed dedicated drive-thru lane.

Commissioner Cooper asked if the original PUD had expired. Mr. Harper replied that the original PUD was for a drive-thru restaurant.

Commissioner Kreuzer asked about the plans for outdoor seating. Mr. Harper explained that the Preliminary PUD approval required 15% of open space on site and that 10% of that amount must be quasi-public space. The proposal is a paved patio-seating arrangement located west of the building, but Starbucks had not provided details for the seating. This led to a brief discussion of possible vagrancy and how that would be handled by local code enforcement and/or Starbucks as the private landowner.

Chairman Loftus introduced the petitioner Mr. Tad Lagestee, 2050 S. Finley Rd., Lombard, IL. Mr. Lagestee was sworn in. He is the real estate developer of the site working with Starbucks. Mr. Lagestee described access to the site via Taft Avenue as a safety measure in the event of an emergency. He spoke to concerns regarding the public seating area.

Commissioner Arango expressed safety concerns of the public space being close to the drive-thru lanes and inquired about fencing that area. Mr. Legacy stated they would consider other means to create safety measures such as relocating planter boxes.

Commissioner Wyant asked if the Starbucks location will replace the Starbucks at 691 Roosevelt Road. Mr. Lagestee replied no, this is in addition to that location.

Commissioner Kreuzer asked about the color consistency for site lighting and recommended it be consistent with the surrounding restaurant locations. Mr. Lagestee replied that he would discuss it with Starbucks.

Chairman Loftus asked the two members of the public who were present at the meeting if they had any questions. Ms. Clare Hughes, 310 Hawthorn Boulevard, Glen Ellyn, replied no, her questions were answered. Ms. Nancy Bromann, 857 W. Driveway Circle, Glen Ellyn, asked why the sign proposal included 4 signs instead of 2. Mr. Legacy replied that the signage was consistent with Starbuck's location prototypes, and that one of the signs was directional in nature.

There were no more comments from the public. Chairman Loftus called for a motion to close the public hearing.

The plan Commission expressed support of the proposed plan and concurred that the sign variation request would be consistent with the sign variations approved for the neighboring restaurant sites.

Commissioner Wyant motioned to recommend approval of the proposed application based on the adopted findings of fact. Commissioner Pesce seconded the motion.

The Plan Commission voted 6-0 to approve the proposal and it will be sent to the Village Board for consideration.

2) Public Hearing – PGS Gold and Coin, 606 Roosevelt Road, Sign Variation

Planning Manager Harper was sworn in. He reviewed the sign variation being proposed for a 47.5 square foot sign, noting the Village requires that the sign be 22.5 square feet based on the establishment's 22.5 feet of frontage. With visual displays, Harper gave a description of the property; spoke to the elements of the application; and gave an overview of the zoning requirements which were met.

Commissioner Wyant asked if the building's new façade was approved by the Village Architectural Appearance Commission (AAC). Mr. Harper replied yes, the façade of the building was approved on the recommendation of the AAC.

Commissioner Kreuzer asked if the AAC had reviewed this sign proposal. Mr. Harper replied no, the AAC has no authority to recommend conditions on signage.

Commissioner Arango commented that the prominence of the façade may be problematic for other tenants at the property and asked if the other tenants had made requests for signage. Mr. Harper replied not to his knowledge.

Chairman Loftus asked about the size of the tenant space, wondering how far the sign would cover if it were 22 feet. Mr. Harper explained using the visual display of the property.

Commissioner Kreuzer asked who owned the building and who were the current tenants. Mr. Harper replied he did know who owned the property, and that one space was rented by a print shop and the other spaces were currently vacant but had interested future tenants.

Commissioner Kreuzer expressed concern that future tenants of the shopping center would want sign variations as well if the application was to be granted.

Commissioner Kreuzer asked about photometrics of the sign. Mr. Harper replied there were none and any elements must comply with Village code.

Petitioner Mr. John Mark, 830 West Northwest Highway, Palatine, IL, was sworn in. Mr. Mark stated he had no formal presentation, but he would answer questions.

Commissioner Kreuzer asked why PGS wanted a large sign. Mr. Mark answered that PGS was trying to be proportionate to the space.

Commissioner Pesce asked if they had an example of the allowed sign area to show to the Commission. Mr. Mark replied no.

Chairman Loftus inquired about the square footage of the tenant space. Mr. Mark replied that the space is about 1,500 square feet with width of the space is narrow at 22.5 feet wide.

Commissioner Arango expressed that the proposed sign size would fit proportionally with the facades design.

Commissioner Cooper commented that he did not like the size of the proposed sign, but he sympathized with the petitioner's plight in filling the large façade space.

Commissioner Pesce asked, when considering signage, does the Village typically take into account the size of the façade, and wouldn't other tenants want their signs to be proportionate in size as well?

Mr. Harper stated that the code does not take into account the scale of each property's individual façade and that signage size is regulated by the frontage of the space.

Commissioner Pesce expressed concerns of a domino effect that approving this particular sign variation would incentivize the other tenants of the property to request similar variations.

Commissioner Wyant asked if the petitioner could go back to the building architect and ask him to redesign the façade. Mr. Mark replied no.

Commissioner Arango asked about public notice on the sign application. Mr. Harper answered that the Village publishes a notice in the Daily Herald regarding the public meeting as required by Village code but did not circulate a mailing.

Commissioner Cooper asked the petitioner if the Commission does not approve the proposed sign, where would they place a sign? Mr. Mark replied slightly lower on the façade and dead center in order to minimize the difference in scale.

Commissioner Cooper asked if they would keep the letters about 9-feet from the bottom of the façade feature. Mr. Mark said they would like to keep the letters proportional because Roosevelt Road is a busy throughfare, and they would like the presence of a large sign to attract business.

Commissioner Kreuzer asked why PGS's plight was unique. Mr. Mark replied that they rely on drive-by business, and they want the sign to be prominent to attract customers.

Chairman Loftus reiterated the Commission's opinion that the extent of the sign variation is quite large and asked the petitioner if they would be willing to come back with another proposal for a smaller sign. Mr. Mark replied yes.

Chairman Loftus opened the meeting to public comments. Norris Ebert, 702 Kingsbrook Glen, had several questions for the petitioner. Mr. Mark answered them. Mr. Ebert asked staff about zoning of the business. Mr. Harper replied it was correctly zoned in C3.

There were no more comments from the public. Chairman Loftus called for a motion to close the public hearing.

The Plan Commission voted 6-0 to approve moving the agenda item to the Plan Commission meeting dated February 27, 2025, to allow the petitioner to present other renderings of the sign for the Commission's consideration.

D. Trustee Liaison's Report

Trustee Thompson gave his report to the Commission. Commissioner Cooper asked about development of the Stacy's Corner property. Trustee Thompson replied.

E. Chairman's Report

Chairperson Loftus had nothing to add.

F. Staff Report

Planning Manager Harper gave his staff report, summarizing past Commission actions and items the Plan Commission can expect to see on upcoming agendas.

G. Other Business

No other official business was discussed.

H. Adjourn – 8:57 P.M.

Mover: Commissioner Wyant; Second: Commissioner Pesce. Unanimous vote to adjourn.