

MINUTES
Glen Ellyn Plan Commission Meeting
Thursday, April 24, 2025 at 7:00 PM
Glen Ellyn Civic Center
Galligan Board Room

A. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chairperson Tim Loftus called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. and explained the Plan Commission's function and operating procedure as an advisory body. He described the public hearing protocol including for public comment and announced that comments would be recorded.

Roll was called. Chairperson Loftus, Plan Commissioners Arango, Cooper, Morrison, Pesce and Dawson were present; Commissioner Brown, Wyant and Kreuzer were absent.

Also in attendance: Jennifer Hennigan, , Derrick Peebles Assistant Village Engineer, Daniel Harper, Planning Manager, Jordan Fraham, Associate Planner and Adriana Ohl Zamora, Recording Secretary.

B. Public Comment (non-agenda items)

There was no off-agenda audience comment.

C. Approval of Minutes

1. Review and Approval of the March 20,2025, Plan Commission Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Dawson moved to approve the minutes as amended and revised by the 2-page revision. Commissioner Pesche seconded the motion, and the motion passed by voice vote.

Motion to open the Public Hearing by Commissioner Arango, second by Commissioner Cooper. Motion passed by voice vote.

D. New Business

** Sworn In, Daniel Harper, Planning Manager, Village of Glen Ellyn prior to presenting the new business to the Planning Committee stated that there are no findings of fact with the first two items of new business**

1. Public Hearing-Minor Plat of Subdivision, Reader's Acorn Ave. Subdivision, 21W508 Acorn Ave.

Sworn in, Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn, presented on the following:

21W508 Acorn property located near northeast corner of Acorn and Cumnor Ave. intersection, is currently located in unincorporated DuPage County but are subject to an annexation agreement and will be zoned R2 Residential District upon annexation. Parcel is currently developed with 1 single family home.

Parcels have a combined area of 33,532 square feet between 4 lots. Subject to annexation agreement signed by Village Board Trustees on March 10, 2025 Village Board Meeting, the properties are proposed to be re-subdivided into 3 single family lots and will be connected to new village water and wastewater facilities that will be constructed along Acorn Ave. The applicants will be constructing their new personal home on lot 3 of the new subdivision.

Planning committee shown renderings of proposed minor plat of Subdivision Plans, aerial and zoning maps

The proposed minor plat of subdivision and required plans have been reviewed by village staff and have been determined that the three properties will be developed in conformance with the subdivision requirements as set forth in Section 11-3-7 of the Subdivision Regulations Code and 10- 4-8 of the Zoning Code.

One unique feature is that they have very large storm management easements. Larger stormwater assessments required by village engineering. The applicants have been encouraged to coordinate with neighbor to east to ensure all of this work is in compliance with DuPage County Storm Water Management Ordinance.

It is the role of planning commission to review and propose the Minor Subdivision, and make a recommendation to the Village Board for approval, approval with conditions, or denial of the final plat. In reviewing the requested Minor Subdivision, the Commission should consider the criteria in Section 11-1-4 of the Subdivision Regulations Code

Commissioner Questions

Chairman Loftus- With the Neighboring property, which there is a big open land now, once all the houses are gone; They would not be required to fulfill the idea that they work stormwater plans with both sets of properties, is that correct?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager, Village of Glen Ellyn- shown property map to board members and pointed out a property that was annexed to Village Jan 2025, stated that they are going to divide the property as well and are actually going to do a two lot split which was approved administratively by village Staff per subdivision code, they came to us and applied for annexation, applied for a subdivision two lot split and all corresponding engineering stormwater plans and as we were finalizing this, our applicant tonight came to us and said if we are connecting, doing utility lines and I am going to be part of a recapture agreement, I want to get ahead of it and be a part of it as well.

Chairman Loftus: he is going over and above what is required cause now we are going from two houses to five

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager, Village of Glen Ellyn- Correct

Commissioner Cooper- What is specifically the Planning Commission being asked to do and what are the factors and elements we should consider when making a determination?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager, Village of Glen Ellyn- What the subdivision code requires is that the Plan Commission review the documents that I included in the application packet and find that it meets requirements of DuPage County Storm water ordinance, that they meet our subdivision code, our utilities and public improvement requirements and in my staff report it does show it meets all requirements. Part of the way the code is written is that the Plan Commission is to provide recommendation for approval or denial.

Petitioner-Sworn in Benjamin Raeder- Stated he currently lives in Bartlett with family and their intention is to build one of the homes on one of the lots for his family on lot 3, excited to join the Village.

Commissioner Dawson-On the easements for the utilities, are they going to be documented with reciprocal easement documents?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager, Village of Glen Ellyn- The easement is dedicated when the plat is recorded with DuPage County.

No Written Comments received

Chairperson Loftus requested for a motion to close the public hearing. Commissioner Cooper motioned to close the public hearing, Commissioner Dawson seconded the motion, and the motion passed by voice vote.

DELIBERATION-

Chairman Loftus- I see no reason why we should oppose this petition.

Commissioner Cooper- I do want to state for the record that we heard evidence from the Village that the Petitioners have satisfied all of the requirements including storm water easements and other easements to warrant the granting of the proposed minor of the subdivision.

Commissioner Cooper made the Motion to Approve the proposed minor of subdivision, Seconded by Commissioner Dawson. The motion passed with six (6) votes yes.

Motion to open the Public Hearing by Commissioner Morrison second by Commissioner Arango. Motion passed by voice vote.

2. Public Hearing – College of DuPage Comprehensive Sign Update, 425 Fawell Blvd.

Sworn In Jordan Frahm, Associate Planner, Village of Glen Ellyn- College of DuPage submitted a permit application for a wall sign for the student resource center which was flagged due to the requested sign not being included in the currently approved

COD master sign plan. Section 4-5-17 of the Village Sign Code establishes the CC - Community College district as a Special Sign District, which is granted in Section 4-5-18(G)1(c) which means that any property greater than 25 acres, of which is College of DuPage, has the ability to come up with a comprehensive sign plan that captures any kind of variations that they would need for number of signs or number of directional signs. First done in 1994, updated in 2001 and 2002 and most recent update in 2020, Ordinance No. 6770 on March 9, 2020. Mr. Frahm stated that the benefit is that it does not require individual variations on signs, just sets the number of signs and their locations and dimensions and that is what is approved for the zoning district. He stated that there are a few carryover variations that are requested into the next Ordinance:

1. Section 4-5-7(C) to grant the College of DuPage permission to display special event directional signs on the public right-of-way without written approval by the Village Manager.
2. Section 4-5-7(C) to allow the College of DuPage to display special event directional signs (right-of-way) three days in advance of an event instead of one day as required and to remove the sign the next business day after the conclusion of the event instead of immediately after as required.
3. To allow the College of DuPage to alter the wording and/or lettering of any sign shown on the Comprehensive Sign Plan provided such alterations are in substantial conformance with the College of DuPage Comprehensive Sign Plan on file in the Community Development Department, including the size of the sign lettering.

Continued by saying that the sign plan as submitted includes (7) previously omitted signs and then the (1) new sign on the Student Resource Center on vertical stack College of DuPage logo design with symbol and word mark.

Planned Sign for Student Resource, Maps of locations of all other signs including previously omitted were presented to Commissioners

Mr. Frahm continued by stating that on campus there are 72 signs in total, 38 site signs, 34 wall signs; totals over 10,000 square feet. Total square footage of all signs would be 10,000 and not 99 square feet as that does not account for all of the negative space, misreported on packet submitted.

We are asking you to make a recommendation for approval, approval with recommendations or recommendation of denial to an update on the College of DuPage Sign Plan.

Commissioner Morrison- Do you have corrected square footage of that particular sign?

Jordan Frahm, Associate Planner, Village of Glen Ellyn- yes, essentially it is going to be 27'4 by 10'1/2; about 300 square feet.

Commissioner Cooper- will this be in the lozenge signs put within the ellipses as the other COD signs are?

Associate Planner, Village of Glen Ellyn- So it would be a different style, this is so that the logo and lettering are their own individual signs on a track, not the typical signs that you see; the ovular lozenge shape, the big oval with the words pressed into it.

Commissioner Cooper- Will the sign be illuminated, was any notice given to residents north of Fawell

Jordan Frahm, Associate Planner, Village of Glen Ellyn- yes, it is.

Commissioner Cooper- Was any notice given to residents north of Fawell Boulevard concerning the sign?

Jordan Frahm, Associate Planner, Village of Glen Ellyn- Because this is a sign code application, we don't require the 350-foot residential notice.

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager, Village of Glen Ellyn- Staff did do the placards and newspaper notice as required by code.

Commissioner Cooper- the reason I ask these questions is because back in 2011, I was on a Village board when the College of DuPage took itself out of Village Jurisdictions and erected signs outside of the sign code and had large illuminated signs that largely upset residents, that lived north of Fawell Boulevard and I am somewhat concerned about having signs, a large 300 square foot sign that is illuminated for which no specific notice was given to neighbors who might be impacted. So that is my reason for asking these questions.

Commissioner Arango- Is the illumination of the sign we are talking about facing Fawell and on the Student Resource Center? Is that where it is going?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager, Village of Glen Ellyn- It would be directed towards Fawell, and then when I was at the site, there are quite a lot of trees in the courtyard that should provide some screening.

Commissioner Arango- if there is no notification of additional illumination from the College, I fear we are going to have the same issue arise that we had with the Water Leaf sign along the curve of Fawell leading to the College and I think we would like to avoid that at all cost. I don't know how much illumination you are talking about, I don't know whether that has been addressed but there are people living in the raintree neighborhood that that affects.

Jordan Frahm, Associate Planner, Village of Glen Ellyn -With regards to the level of illumination and what that would contribute, what I can refer you to is, this is the Culinary and Hospitality Building here where the Water Leaf signs are, so just even on this map, just from a distance to the street and a distance to those properties, you can see that there is a considerable distance between the the newly proposed sign and existing Water Leaf sign.

Chairman Loftus- we did have comments 2 years ago when they did put up the Video Board for the MAC from the residents, if petitioner knows what the illumination levels are of this new sign, that would be helpful. Do you know the illumination levels and what the lighting on this particular sign are going to be?

Sworn In Petitioner Jay Gargon- Illumination level is standard; I don't have the actual number. I can look it up. It's the standard for all of our signs. This sign being green will not be as bright as the current signs, it will not be as bright.

Commissioner Arango- the Water Leaf sign, is silver, metal not a color and that was a big issue. I don't know if that needs to be presented to the surrounding area in lieu of putting that up or not but I don't know if we as Village we want to face that again.

Petitioner Jay Gargon- are you talking about the lighting along the curve on the grass?

Commissioner Arango- Which is no longer illuminated. Which is interesting, I don't think you want that to happen for the Student Center but I think we need to be concerned about the illumination of that and maybe something we need to know.

Petitioner Jay Gargon- We did engineer for a dimmable, so we can turn it down.

Commissioner Arango- Ok that is a good option.

Chairman Loftus- Well this like any sign would be limited to a 1foot candle at the property line and the property line would be?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager, Village of Glen Ellyn- About 760 feet from the sign.

Morrison- I have a question for staff, do you have a rendering of where the new sign will go on campus that you could show us, where it is in relation to the campus?

Jordan Frahm, Associate Planner, Village of Glen Ellyn - On previously submitted sign plans, they are given in dimensions and are not all provided with renderings so I and staff accepted this mapping of the sign visuals here as consistent with previous entries as sign plans.

Commissioner Dawson- We are being asked to give autonomy to College of DuPage for introducing directional signs for special events; does that allow for new signs in that nature for special events?

Jordan Frahm, Associate Planner, Village of Glen Ellyn - this would be for temporary signs, as permitted within the Glen Ellyn Code as event signs, banners for special events.

Commissioner Dawson- If College of DuPage wishes to have new signage, they would still have to come to the Village? This is not granting total autonomy?

Jordan Frahm, Associate Planner, Village of Glen Ellyn - yes, they would have to; this plan could be used for a planned building expansion, we could work in future looking signs into the plan, with conversations with College of DuPage that is not a requirement, they do not foresee any additional signage

Commissioner Dawson- to what degree can the Village make a comment on your advocacy for giving College of DuPage autonomy to make decisions on special event signs, where they do not have to come and state to the Village Manager.

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager, Village of Glen Ellyn - The way the Ordinance reads is that the College of DuPage has permission to display Special Event directional signage in the public right of way without the approval of the written approval of Village Manager, the second item allows for display of directional signs three days in advance of an event without advance notice

if temporary, they are to remove the signs at the time of the event. That is all that it expresses, if they are doing any directional signage that is temporary, they do not need any Village involvement. But when it comes to the signs that are approved as the Comprehensive Sign Plan, so long as it meets substantial conformance to the plan, and keeps within the same frame they can change it without any of our involvement.

Commissioner Pesche- I understand on the curvature that's basically facing and probably within 100 yards from residential single-family homes. This is pretty much parallel to where the MAC is correct? And the MAC currently has signage up; does the Village receive complaints about lighting issues from the MAC?

Jordan Frahm, Associate Planner, Village of Glen Ellyn - I have not received any complaints in my tenure and in doing research for this, I did not encounter any.

Commissioner Pesche- this is set back further correct?

Petitioner Jay Gargon- Correct this is set back further and as far as any complaints, I am not aware of any.

Chairman Loftus- First of all the next question, I will ask after this, is why you need three days instead of one? But is any of this permission even on display signs part of the PUD that is about 20 years out of date; the Village PUD with COD; the County PUD with COD is more current. But as a former employee of College of DuPage, as Facilities Project Manager, one of my projects that got kind of lost by the wayside during COVID was to update the 20 year and reflect all of the buildings that do not show up on the Village PUD with COD, versus the County PUD. Is any of this part of the 20-year-old village PUD? Which signage is generally part of the PUD, temporary signage is part of a PUD from 20 years ago, if we are just updating a portion of it why are we not updating the entire PUD? Which now we got a disjointed plan unit development with College of DuPage if we just do the sign portion of it verses all the missing buildings from the Village PUD.

Jordan Frahm, Associate Planner, Village of Glen Ellyn -my understanding is that this sign plan is its own governing document for the Community College Zoning district that is not within the PUD and if the campus isn't having large scale building developments, I don't know if opening and revisiting the full PUD is appropriate for adding a wall sign and considering this is per the sign code what is the process for, adding that sign is addressing the Comprehensive Sign Plan is what leads us here verses a larger more comprehensive site document.

Chairman Loftus- I do remember part of the requirements, this is back when Stacy was in your position, that was one of the requirements that we had to update the plat showing all new building, all the other upgrades that were made to the college by the County PUD to try an update that and if I remember correctly signage was part of that project but once COVID hit all the sudden it became a non-issue for the Village to follow through with it. That is why I ask the question because I have some insider knowledge of what happened a few years back. But then the next question for the Petitioners, what kind of hardship is it that you need 3-days to put a sign up, these are just sandwich boards, I am assuming they are sandwich boards that they get put on Park Blvd, on Lambert you know saying "parking here" , "here is the event" you have the video board that announces events and then my recollection or if I understood correctly and by driving by there, what's the hardship of only doing 1-day instead of 3-days?

Jordan Frahm, Associate Planner, Village of Glen Ellyn- If I could interject, the carry over variations for special events and everything were not a driving factor in the update for the plan, so I don't want to catch the Petitioner flat footed because I'm not sure if he even realizes that that was included within the scope of this document. But Jay if you would like to speak on needing special event signs.

Petitioner Jay Gargon- I cannot speak to why we want 3 days instead of one.

Commissioner Arango- I just have a clarification in the statement that was presented. Buildings that were built between 2010-2011, part of college expansion was not reflected in the 2020 comprehensive sign plan. That happened in 2010, 2011, 2020, the sign plan came about. Why was that not included?

Jordan Frahm, Associate Planner, Village of Glen Ellyn - I cannot speak to those omissions from 2020.

Commissioner Arango- Was that something that would have come before the Village again for approval?

Jordan Frahm, Associate Planner, Village of Glen Ellyn- not knowing when those signs were put in place or not having the institutional knowledge I don't know why they were omitted, but we are correcting that version of the Comprehensive Sign Plan, I know Jay worked diligently to document all of the signs onsite and those have been confirmed by staff onsite.

Commissioner Arango- Perhaps that goes back to the PUD question, that the Chairman presented, I just thought it was interesting that it was not reflected 10 years later.

Jordan Frahm, Associate Planner, Village of Glen Ellyn – I also thought it was interesting as well, we want to ensure that we are following best practices and trying to capture the site exactly as it is, it did draw my attention that there were so many signs omitted five years ago.

Chairman Loftus- for the display signage, correct me if I am wrong, I don't remember seeing that in the application packet anywhere, for the special event signage, how that came about? For the variation for the special event signage.

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager, Village of Glen Ellyn - that was part of the most recent 2020 Comprehensive Sign Plan where the temporary signage was included as part of that Ordinance, and the Village Staff saw no reason to remove it and it was not requested to be removed by the College of DuPage as well and so we were just carrying over already previously approved variations to allow for that stipulation to remain.

Jordan Frahm, Associate Planner, Village of Glen Ellyn- Which were carried over from the 2001, so that has been an Ordinance for the last 24 years, our apologies for that.

Chairman Loftus- I just didn't see that in the application, the application was for the new sign on SSC verses the other three sections here on display signs.

No Written Comment

Chairperson Loftus requested for a motion to close the public hearing. Commissioner Dawson motioned to close the public hearing, Commissioner Cooper seconded the motion, and the motion passed by voice vote.

Deliberation

Commissioner Cooper- my general attitude is that the last thing that constituents of Glen Ellyn like to see is to see one branch of government fighting, getting in the way of another branch of the government, so I would want to bend over backwards to not get in the way of College of DuPage which is a wonderful institution and a great part of our Village. I am concerned that neighbors whom this will impact, received no direct notification and an opportunity, could they have discovered it with some research that these things were going to change, yes but I am troubled that people who this will affect directly weren't given any notice. I do recall how upset our neighbors were who were impacted about the illumination of the College of DuPage that it changed the experience looking out their windows. I am concerned that we are increasing illumination without giving notice.

Commissioner Morrison- I did review all of these documents very carefully, I am glad that College of DuPage and Village staff are bringing the signs that are already existing to the Village so that we can formally put our check mark on them. Knowing where this new sign is going, and hearing about the distance from Fawell Blvd., and knowing that there is a bunch of trees in that court yard are. I don't have any concerns that this new sign will be any more invasive than the existing signs.

Commissioner Arango- Living in the neighborhood, I kind of agree with you that it will not be any more invasive but to ride on the coattails of Commissioner Cooper, I think it might be advisable to let the residents know formally from the Village that this is what is going to happen. That the Village can respond to any comments, concerns that may be part of the residential area over there. I don't think as far away on The Student Center that it's going to be that it should be an issue, unlike Water Leaf which was across the street from these people's back yards but I do think that it would be in our best interest to at least advise them that new signage is going in from the Village and College so that I think the residents are aware that the Village is as equally as concerned.

Chairman Loftus- I think we had the same, the people were notified when MAC did the addition and the video board was put up, I think we had folks come in and talk at that time of the concern and I think we heard that the Village has not received any complaints from anybody to do an investigation on the video board on the side of the MAC.

Commissioner Arango- The Student Center is even going to be more removed from that but to do our due diligence, I think it would be advisable to at least let them know.

Chairman Loftus- Well we are an advisory board and I don't think that if we deny the variation the Village is going to make them take down all of the other signs.

Commissioner Arango- Nor do the Village really want them to.

Commissioner Dawson- as a recipient of education from College of DuPage, I consider it a huge asset of Glen Ellyn, outreach could have been stronger here and let's face it they had ample opportunity with the public facing signs to notify the public of this.

Chairman Loftus- I thought we heard that it is outside the range of notification for that, technically the Village was not required to notify.

Commissioner Morrison made the Motion to approve for the COD Comprehensive Sign Plan to be revised for 2025 inclusive of the (3) variations, Seconded by Commissioner Pecshe. The motion passed by a roll call vote with all commissioners present voting “Yes”. The motion passed with six (6) votes yes.

Motion to open the Public Hearing by Commissioner Cooper second by Commissioner Arango. Motion passed by voice vote.

3. Public Hearing- Zoning Variations, Crescent/Glenwood Public Parking Lot, 455 Crescent Ave.

Derrick Peebles, Assistant Village Engineer, Village of Glen Ellyn, Public Works Dept.– Presented slides on the parking lot background and project overview and 2 variation requests

Stated that it was originally constructed 1957 along with retaining wall along the south border with the railroad, 1 of 13 parking lots downtown, lot last resurfaced in 1997, did some pavement coring, got good life of surface pavement, 123 public parking spaces, west section is permit parking up to 11am, then general free parking. To the east northern row is 3-hour free public parking, southern is 6-hour parking which is paid using pay app. Across the street is the new apartment building.

Described the two needs, paving condition has reached its life and overall downtown streetscaping scheme. *Presented to Commissioners map of the street scaping phases which include:*

2022 first phase south of tracks, Second Phase was 2023, and Third Phase 2024, Relevant because the median between crescent Blvd., and parking lot t, was intended to be part of the Phase 2 & 3 but it got pulled because at the time the Phase 2 & 3 were being designed the future of the site particularly the old Machesney Grocery stores and what is now Glenwood Station was in construction and there were some downtown strategic plans that had even potential parking decks in this area, too many uncertainties of what was going happen and so this Crescent Parking Lot got pulled from the Streetscaping plans. We are calling this Phase 3.5 of the Streetscaping plan and filling in as we now know what the land use is in this area.

Derrick discussed the following Project enhancements-

Parking Space Length The existing parking lot parcel is curved and irregular in shape at the south side due to the presence of the curved railroad right-of-way. The end result is pinch points at the east and west end of the parking lots that limit the ability to meet minimum parking space length dimensions. This condition has existed since construction of the parking lot in 1957. The proposed design shows seventeen-foot (17'-0”) long parking spaces for the northern parking row. The proposed design improves upon the existing dimensions and configuration by providing uniform spaces and eliminating the need for one-way traffic movement in the eastern portion of the lot. The proposed plan provides a two-foot (2'-0”) overhang in the northern row to effectively meet the 19' minimum parking space length.

Landscape Islands With regard to the south row landscaped islands, the elevated nature of the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) property results in an existing retaining wall at the south side of the lot. This, combined with the mature tree screening between the lot and the railroad tracks (on UPRR property), and the compass orientation, results in a lack of sun in the southern row of the parking lot to support landscaping. With regard to the north row intermediate islands, there are no existing islands and feedback through the conceptual design was that two new pedestrian access points (shown on the plans) would be a higher and better use in place of landscaped islands for this public parking lot, given the extensive landscaping proposed along the length of the lot.

Discussed the pedestrian access improvements include wider sidewalk, street furniture in, crosswalks, flow improvements we are as part of design try to convert to perpendicular parking spots, making more uniform and parking lot lighting, tested lot and this is the darkest lot in the downtown area. The project will introduce 21ft tall parking lot lighting. Will supply Parking Lot compliant lighting, looking at smart lighting, in the process of meeting with different vendors on smart lighting with capability to dim over the night.

Chairman Loftus- Arms on the lighting, the arms are over the parking spaces?

Derrick Peebles, Assistant Village Engineer, Village of Glen Ellyn, Public Works Dept.- yes, they are.

Chairman Loftus- We didn't see any photometric on this but I am curious if one was done, what are lighting levels on the sidewalk?

Derrick Peebles, Assistant Village Engineer, Village of Glen Ellyn, Public Works Dept.- Photo metrics were done, and we are meeting all lighting standards and all the city village code light trespass, below the 3 for parking lot lighting. We do have side walk lighting that are coach lights, now on standalone posts and we will put on Arms at 12ft level.

Chairman Loftus- what is the temperature on proposed lighting?

Derrick Peebles, Assistant Village Engineer, Village of Glen Ellyn, Public Works Dept - 3,000 Kelvin was the target; the lot had to be lit from one side only as one side is railroad property.

Chairman Loftus- comparable to what we have on other main streets. Only question I had on lighting.

Derrick showed the Commissioners a map of the Crescent Parking lot and explained

Derrick went on to say that, the existing lot is pinched between existing Crescent Boulevard and the existing curved railroad right-of-way, limiting the ability to meet the minimum 19' parking space length in the northern row of parking, both under existing conditions and under the resurfaced parking lot conditions. The proposed configuration is an improvement upon existing conditions.

Stated that currently 123 current spaces, we are looking to increase to 124 spaces even with the widen island at end and with addressing the pinch points. Overall improvement from existing conditions in lot

He then described Variation 2, the landscape islands and stated that there has been some design iteration for this project. Project did get some vetting from the Capital Improvements Commission and then the board regarding the concepts. The Islands did get discussed, the southern row does not get sun and deemed to be impractical to put landscaping. We are really wanting to irrigate these areas and it is a whole different challenge to irrigation down to these areas because on one side we do get down to the railroad and it's a different matter to add irrigation to a railroad right of way. Overall, capital improvements commission was not including landscape islands as high and better use to retain the parking.

With the North side, we are achieving landscape islands at end; concerns about too much landscaping in this lot initially, we have a pretty dense planting plan and pretty dense tree planting plan. High priority has been to screen this lot and so in looking at some functional aspects came up, with specifically the pedestrians using the lot, now as pedestrians, they are forced to walk through the driveways to get out to the sidewalk on Crescent Blvd. There are pedestrian cut throughs in the median, however they are not visible, they do break up the planters and we are retaining them and improving on those however there was a discussion at the Capital Improvements Commission to add accessible pedestrian access points that are quickly visible to someone being in the lot, walking down toward train station and having a ramp.

Exhibits were then shown to Commissioners

Chairman Loftus- With respect to handicap parking, is it equal to or less than?

Derrick Peebles, Assistant Village Engineer, Village of Glen Ellyn, Public Works Dept- equal too, not adding or decreasing, moving to more accessible locations. Currently 5 and will be restoring 5. Two EV spaces retained

Chairman Loftus- from code standpoint that meets or exceed?

Derrick Peebles, Assistant Village Engineer, Village of Glen Ellyn, Public Works Dept - yes

Chairman Cooper- Looking at the slide, one of my concerns as I looked at this, in the shorter parking spaces is over to the far eastern portion on the 3 handicap slots, the parking lot is the most-narrow, handicap spots are 17ft, I was concerned with people entering through the far-right entrance way and clipping the cars?

Derrick Peebles, Assistant Village Engineer, Village of Glen Ellyn, Public Works Dept.- That is an exit was only. We will have additional signage reinforcing as one way only. I will point out there are some other improvements going on and right now the access point is not accessible and we are reconstructing that area. That is also why we are bumping in median and landscape island will provide more protection, the existing spaces over here are 17 feet as well.

Commissioner Dawson- on the far eastern exit, does this plan with the resurfacing and layout improve the width of the exit?

Derrick Peebles, Assistant Village Engineer, Village of Glen Ellyn, Public Works Dept - it is, the radii are improving, and I believe it's a fair question and I don't know that I have that on hand in the latest iteration but there was an addition to shifting a little bit there was a bit of a widening.

Chairman Loftus- other than exit only, are there any other restrictions on from all three exits? Any right turn only?

Derrick Peebles, Assistant Village Engineer, Village of Glen Ellyn, Public Works Dept – There are currently non-existing and non-proposed. Generally, I have not seen a lot of issues so no current restrictions, we worked with police on the site plans, we could always adjust if any items do come up.

Chairman Loftus- Reason why I ask is that the only stop sign on Crescent is going south on Glenwood, basically a nonstop street from Prospect all the way to Main.

Derrick Peebles, Assistant Village Engineer, Village of Glen Ellyn, Public Works Dept – That was discussed with Police and Public Works as far as during construction this was a 4 way stop, really made sense to stop people; there is a know we have to keep an eye on it but the desire was to restore the conditions that existed before. The discussion leaned to retaining the through traffic on Crescent. But with a note that if we have issues, it is something that we can revisit.

Chairman Morrison-I wanted to give Kudos to the Staff Village, I park in this parking lot a lot, I think these are some really nice improvements both aesthetic and also pedestrian safety, I saw that you are adding bollards on sidewalk and also just making the lot safer for cars as well as pedestrians trying from there to all the shops, so thank you it's a nice project.

Written comment:

No comments

Chairperson Loftus requested for a motion to close the public hearing. Commissioner Dawson motioned to close the public hearing, Commissioner Morrison seconded the motion, and the motion passed by voice vote.

Deliberation

Commissioner Cooper made the Motion to approve the variations, 10-5-8 (H) to allow zero landscape islands for every twenty consecutive parking spaces in a row in lieu of the required five landscape islands and section 10-5-9(I) to allow parking spaces to be seventeen feet in length in lieu of the required nineteen feet in length. Seconded by Commissioner Morrison

The motion passed by a roll call vote with all commissioners present voting “Yes”. The motion passed with six (6) votes yes.

Motion to accept the Findings of Fact by Commissioner Cooper second by Commissioner Dawson. Motion passed by voice vote.

The motion passed by a roll call vote with all commissioners present voting “Yes”. The motion passed with six (6) votes yes.

E. Trustee Report

Trustee gave his report to the Commission as follows:

1. Glen Ellyn Park District held a Public Meeting at the Police Department Community Room and discussed the Master plan for Panfish Park. About 20 residents, Village Link Staff, Myself and Nate Troia, Director of Development was there. Explained a lot about the transition of the Village of Park District have our agreement, approved by both boards, it includes US Bank site, Panfish Park and Manor Woods. There is going to be I think sometime in May movement of money and ownership will occur. Master Plan was discussed along with the ponds, vegetation. Playground is being built up, a little elevated, new equipment, a little shelter, new surface. On roadmap to be replace, getting done early in season. Trees, wild species, vegetation and trails that are there, a whole project to make it a whole community influenced project. Will provide more amenities and attention to that park.

Questions:

Chairman Loftus- Was there any, from the layout of the amenities like benches things like that, is there any concentration from the north side of park to accommodate possibly more people coming from Full Circle across the street?

Village Trustee Thompson- Talk of improving the trails that come into the park, so that is a good point, there will be an entry point into that Park where as right now it seems like most of the entry comes from west and south but the northern side of that do have entry point to the park.

Chairman Loftus- Tied into that, do you know of any further discussions to add stop signs on Taft St, after full circle gets built. To access the park?

Village Trustee Thompson- A stop sign will be at Exmore and Taft, I will get back to you and let you know.

Chairman Loftus- Taft would need to slow down, not necessarily Exmore.

Village Trustee Thompson- We will take that back and I will get back to you.

Commissioner Cooper- I believe that actually stop signs need to be put on by ordinance?

Village Trustee Thompson- I believe that they have to recommend it to us.

Chairman Loftus- My only concern is that they will say we have had no accidents.

Commissioner Cooper- any discussion of public art in that park, what are we doing with removed work of art?

Village Trustee Thompson- public art will be removed, new art installation going in, some people like it and some do not.

Commissioner Cooper- What are we doing with the removed work of art?

Daniel Harper, Planning Manager, Village of Glen Ellyn – I heard that we had attempted to contact the artist and claim it back, I don't know how those discussions went.

Village Trustee Thompson- would you like me to look into that?

Commissioner Cooper- this was a work of art of a recognized artist, it was an admired work of art, I don't want it put in the landfill because people across the street don't like the look of it.

Chairman Loftus- the project in the tunnel was a great piece of art, if you can allocate funding for that in the future, I know it's not part of the project for the Crescent Street.,

Village Trustee Thompson- there is an art group within the funding, when they get funding from private sources for art in the Village we go after the money and they pick a project. If anyone would like to be on that group please let me know and I will put your name forward.

Derrick Peebles, Assistant Village Engineer, Village of Glen Ellyn, Public Works Dept.- To the Chairman's point, I did not mention but we do have, part of our design project is an evaluation of the railroad retaining wall. It's not failing but it just need maintenance, not something the public would see, we are putting attention to it but not from an art standpoint but, it has come up and often during the days, there are a lot of cars so you cannot see it but we are not completely ignoring it.

2. Voting Monday night on grocery tax, government has removed grocery tax under state control and moved to municipalities.
3. Water rates and lead line replacements, discussed Monday night during workshop. Lead lines in over 1,000 homes in Glen Ellyn, working on identification of where the issues are with the lead lines. Project to identify all these through mapping and home resident with compliance. If you have not done it, we asked for residents to take picture of water connection and send into Village, we need to find funding for this, it is approximately 11million dollars that are needed for project. We don't know the timing, EPA giving municipalities until 2037 to get completed.

F. Chairperson's Report

Nothing to report.

G. Staff Report

Planning Manager Daniel- discussed the following items:

1. Launched permitting software, all permitting submitted digitally online. Plans not accepted at desk. 23 applications created today, 72 permits open right now, software began on Monday, it's been very busy, successful thus far, working out the kinks.
2. Downtown Event Park application given approval by Village Board of Trustees as well as Ackerman Community Garden Plots.
3. 451 Duane St. attached Single Family home, receiving calls from other people that that is now on the market, may not see that project again.
4. March 20, EZ Tech sign variation on Roosevelt, application approved by Village Board, have not submitted for sign permit yet
5. Pre- application for Glenbard West, looking to have on May Planning Commission agenda, Jordan will be on that meeting as well.
6. Food Pantry requested to have a sign on building, sign variation went to Village Board and they requested a monument sign, they are coming back for a sign variation for a monument sign
7. Sign Variation for Five Corners Cleaners, want to construct a monument sign, monument sign has a landscaping and set back requirements that the site would not be able to meet.
8. Working with a grocery store to try to get into conformance with an item, see them in June hopefully.
9. Looking at a restaurant to go where the Tide Laundry mat was, Fresh Market Shopping Center as part of application traffic impact study is required, and provide documentation justifying as a good use of space.

H. Other Business

No other business

I. Adjournment

Member Dawson made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Member Pesche seconded the motion and the motion passed by voice vote at 8:50 PM

Respectfully submitted,
Adriana Ohl-Zamora