

**MINUTES**  
**Glen Ellyn Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Thursday, Dec. 11, 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 7:02 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, Brown, Cooper, Wyant, Kreuzer, Pesce.*

*Commissioners Dougherty and Morrison were absent.*

*Also in attendance: Steve Thompson, Village Trustee, Daniel Harper, Planning Manager, Jordan Frahm, Associate Planner, Jennifer Henaghan, Community Development Director, and Laura Musgraves, Acting 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 November 13, 2025, Plan Commission Meeting Minutes*

**Commissioner Kreuzer moved to approve the minutes, Commissioner Arango seconded the motion, and the motion passed by voice vote.**

**D. New Business**

1. Public Hearing: Sign Variations - 486 Pennsylvania Avenue, Maplewood Brewery & Distillery

Commissioner Brown made a motion to open the public hearing. Seconded by Commissioner Cooper.

*Sworn in Daniel Harper, Planning Manager, presented on the agenda item below:*

Mr. Harper provided background information regarding the new tenant at 486 Pennsylvania Avenue, Maplewood Brewery and Distillery, which will modify the space occupied by former tenant Two-Hound Red Brewery and Restaurant. The exterior modifications to the building were reviewed by the Architectural Appearance Commission and approved by the Village Board at their meeting on November 10, 2025.

Mr. Harper gave an overview of the four (4) Sign Variations requested by the petitioner as follows:

1. A variation from Section 4-5-11(A) to allow five (5) signs for the establishment in lieu of the maximum of one (1) sign per establishment.
2. A variation from Section 4-5-6(C) to allow an awning valance sign to have a maximum height of ten inches (0'-10") in lieu of the maximum allowed awning valance sign height of six inches (0'-6").
3. A variation from Section 4-5-4(R)(3) to allow a freestanding sign to be setback six inches (0'-6") from the property line in lieu of the minimum setback of five feet (5'-0").
4. A variation from Section 4-5-4(R)(6) to allow the material of the support structure of the sign to not match the primary material of the front building façade.

Regarding the wall signs, one wall sign located on the south wall of the building facing Pennsylvania Avenue has already been approved. The applicant is seeking additional wall signs located on the East and West walls of the building.

On the West wall, the petitioner proposed a 9' sign of painted acrylic letters to be lighted with either LED lighting behind it or can-lights located above it.

On the East wall sign, the petitioner proposed two options. Option 1 is a logo of Maplewood Brewery located in the center above the main entrance door, illuminated by existing can-lights. Option 2 is the whole word "Maplewood" spelled out in the same manner as the proposed West sign.

Mr. Harper stated the proposed signs meet the existing code requirements for size of the signs, reiterating it is the number of signs that deviate from code and that is the variance being sought.

Regarding the awning sign, Mr. Harper explained that the petitioner's proposal does not meet the code requirements of a valance sign and their request is classified as an awning sign. Village Code allows for signs on valances that hang from an awning, but they are restricted to 6" of text height. The applicant proposes larger size, 10", because of the larger valance.

The fifth sign proposed is a free-standing monument sign in the southernmost island of the parking lot. The sign is 8 square feet on a metal pedestal and non-illuminated. Two variations are needed. One for the setback to be 6" from the property line in lieu of the minimum setback of 5 feet. The second variation is for a metal support structure instead of a masonry support structure. Per Code, freestanding signs must match the same material as the building, and the petitioner is seeking a different material (metal.) Their rationale is that they have experienced parking issues and they want to clarify that the parking belongs to Maplewood Brewery. In summary, the petitioner seeks four (4) signs through variations, as the first sign has already been approved.

Commissioner Cooper asked if the building structure located at 478 Pennsylvania Avenue is a commercial structure.

Mr. Harper answered yes.

Chairman Loftus asked if the proposed repeated wording on the east side of the awning valance is allowed per Village Code.

Mr. Harper answered that, in relation to the awning, it is not in number of words on the valance, but the height of the words that is the variation they are requesting. Mr. Harper clarified the sign dimensions.

Commissioner Arango asked about the wording on the east side of the awning, and was that considered a valance?

Mr. Harper answered yes. Commissioner Arango asked if it met with the code for size. Mr. Harper answered no, the proposed wording is 10" and the Code allowable size is 6" maximum.

Commissioner Brown suggested that the landscape island where proposed monument sign would be made higher, and she thought it would be worth consideration by the petitioner.

Commissioner Arango asked if the monument sign was lit.

Mr. Harper answered no.

Commissioner Pesce asked for clarification of the East and West signs. If they are painted acrylic on the wall and the petitioner is proposing to illuminate the sign with a LED light behind it, would the sign be painted on another material and affixed to the wall?

Mr. Harper answered that if it was a painted sign, the same variations would be required.

Chairperson Loftus asked about the proposed lighting of the West wall sign, would it include LED backlighting and can-light illumination from above?

Mr. Harper answered no, it would be one or the other.

Commissioner Arango asked if can-lighting on the proposed East sign already exists.

Mr. Harper answered yes.

Commissioner Pesce asked if the Commission was being asked to approve the two options presented, or to make a suggestion?

Harper answered that whatever the Commission approves, they may put conditions on it such as the number of signs, the size of the signs, and the illumination requirements.

Commissioner Brown asked about setting precedents for other downtown properties to request sign variations.

Harper answered it is the Commission's responsibility to make that determination. Subsequent cases would be subject to the same conditions in a matter by matter basis.

*Sworn in: Adam Cieslak, representative of Maplewood Brewery & Distillery*

Mr. Cieslak addressed the Commission by thanking them for their consideration. He said the company was happy to entertain suggestions. The previous tenant of the property noted a lack of identity of the restaurant from the east and west sides of the building, and that was part of Maplewood's rationale to appeal for more signage. Another issue raised by the previous tenant was the limited size of the parking lot and that it was often used for parking by surrounding businesses.

Regarding the awning, the existing awning is weathered and tattered, so Maplewood wishes to replace it with a new, fresh awning that is tasteful in appearance. They are requesting a size variation to not only fit the dimensions the awning, but they also wish to provide identity to the restaurant. Maplewood's intent is for the signage to fit the character and feel of Glen Ellyn.

Chairman Loftus asked the Commission if they had any questions for the petitioner.

Commissioner Wyant thanked Cieslak for choosing Glen Ellyn as the location of their new restaurant. He commented that Maplewood's website marketing and branding focuses on the brewery and distillery aspects of the business, but it is not reflected in the signage requests.

Cieslak answered that their initial business identity online focused on the distillery, but Maplewood has opened a successful lounge and restaurant in Chicago that is gaining attention. They want to embrace their identity in dining and not just be known as a brewery and distillery. He said that is the intent by using their logo in one of the sign proposals.

Chairperson Loftus asked about dimensions of the sign lettering above the entrance door.

Mr. Harper confirmed the allowable dimensions are 16 inches in height.

Mr. Cieslak reiterated that Maplewood is amendable to using the Maplewood logo above the door instead of the name.

Commissioner Cooper asked about the purpose of the monument sign. Is it to identify that the parking lot belongs to Maplewood?

Cieslak answered yes.

Chairperson Loftus asked if there are other signs in the parking lot such as "customers only" and towing notices.

Mr. Harper answered that those signs do not count as signage according to Village Code.

Mr. Cieslak said they want to make sure there is adequate parking for their customers.

Commissioner Cooper said there is anecdotal information that customers don't always identify the parking as belonging to Two Hound Red. If the petitioner is concerned about this and anticipating an influx of customers from out of town, he doesn't think a monument sign is going to discourage people from parking there if they are not customers.

Mr. Cieslak disagreed, saying there is already confusion about where to park and the restaurant isn't open yet.

Commissioner Arango asked about the hours of operation.

Mr. Cieslak answered they are still working it out, but they are considering being open at brunch and lunch on weekends, possibly opening on weekdays starting at 3:00 or 4:00 p.m. Ideally, they would like to be open for lunch and coffee, then grow into that schedule.

Chairman Loftus mentioned that, historically, two businesses Barone's and Glen Oak Café had issues with a shared parking lot, and they managed it with chains blocking access points during peak traffic hours. He asked if this was by agreement with the Village and did staff have any knowledge of it.

Mr. Harper said he could not speak to how Glen Oaks Café managed their parking.

Commissioner Kreuzer asked Cieslak if they expected a lot of out-of-town visitors.

Mr. Cieslak answered yes, from Chicago and from out of the state based on his experience at their Chicago location.

Chairman Loftus said he mentioned the chain issue as an alternative to managing parking issues instead of having a monument sign. He said parking is only a problem during times when the restaurant is open and an additional sign unnecessary.

Commissioner Kreuzer said this restaurant may distinguish Glen Ellyn from other cities and we want to pull customers from other areas. Great branding and great signage are key to that goal, so he was supportive of the monument sign.

Commissioner Brown asked Mr. Cieslak if they would consider altering their business hours, as having regular hours may solve the parking problem. Mr. Cieslak answered he would have to discuss it with his partners. Their goal is to keep the branding consistent. He added that Maplewood plans to landscape the area of the proposed monument sign to make it more visually appealing.

The Commission observed a scruffy concrete wall in the photo exhibit and asked staff who was responsible for maintaining it.

Mr. Harper said he would have to check, but he believed it belonged to the property to the east.

Mr. Cieslak made a point about the signs, saying Maplewood advocates for themselves and spends a lot of effort on making exteriors look good. The finished product will look better than the photoshopped exhibit. Regarding the monument sign area, they intend to kill the weeds and make a nice landscape. They do not wish to put up a sign that is an eyesore.

Commissioner Arango asked about their landscape plans. Mr. Cieslak answered they wished to clear the weeds and perhaps plant hedges that look nice and have clean lines.

Chairman Loftus asked if there were any other questions. There were none.

Chairman Loftus asked staff if Community Development had received any emails or written comments from the public.

Mr. Harper answered no.

*Chairman Loftus asked for a motion to close the public hearing. Commissioner Pesce motioned. Commissioner Cooper seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.*

Commissioner Cooper expressed concern about the monument sign because it is located on the edge of the property and he did not like the precedence of allowing monuments signs near the lot line. He thought the current confusion of people parking there is because there is no active business there now. Cooper said he is supportive of the business itself, but not the monument sign. He said he will vote to approve the other variations.

Commissioner Kreuzer said he is in favor of all the variations. Maplewood is investing a lot in this venture, and we should support it. He added that he prefers Option 1 of the West sign proposal, which is can-lighting above the sign. He favored that option because it is consistent with the lighting of the other sign, and he did not like the idea of LED lighting with light emitting out.

Commissioner Kreuzer said the petitioner is open to suggestions and if the Commission is being asked to make a condition on the variation, that would be his condition. He added he is not concerned about the variations because they are not ostentatious and the petitioner has shown the need for them. If they were lighted signs and bothersome to neighbors, he would be concerned about the number of signs requested but that is not the case.

Commissioner Arango said she was agreeable to the number of signs. She said they are tasteful in appearance and with the expected traffic to the restaurant, the signs make sense. She said the proposal was well-thought out.

Chairman Loftus said he disagreed with Commissioner Cooper on the condition, and he is okay with the monument sign. He said he agreed with Commissioner Kreuzer's opinion of can-lighting the West sign, and overall agreeable to the variations they are requesting. Loftus added that the monument sign could be effective considering the shared parking problems between Glen Oak Café and Barone's.

Commissioner Brown thanked the petitioner for coming to Glen Ellyn. She was concerned about the monument sign because any business could make the same argument about parking problems. She suggested not having the monument sign, and if Maplewood decided they needed it, they could come back with a variation request later.

Commissioner Pesce said he was excited about Maplewood and it will complement other restaurants. Although the proposed monument sign looked professional, he foresaw the location close to the street being an issue. He agreed with Kreuzer's can-light suggestion on the West sign.

Commissioner Cooper asked the Commission if they had an opinion of sign over the entrance being the logo or the name?

Commissioner Kreuzer said the logo is aesthetically pleasing and Maplewood should go with that.

Commissioner Arango agreed with Kreuzer. She shared her concern about setting a precedent by approving the monument sign variation, and Chairman Loftus said it is not a precedence. Any and each request for a variation must be considered on its own merits and it does not necessarily set a precedence.

Commissioner Cooper said he preferred Option 1 over Option 2 for the West wall sign, but that should not be a condition of approval. Let Maplewood make the decision. Mr. Cooper said he did not think he had the votes to support omitting the monument sign, so he would amend his recommendation to omit it.

Commissioner Kreuzer motioned to approve the petitioner's request for all the sign variations, including the number of signs, with the one condition that the sign on the West side of the building have can-lighting and not LED lighting.

Commissioner Wyant seconded. All voted in favor of the motion.

Chairman Loftus requested a motion to accept the Finding of Facts document in the agenda materials. Commissioner Kreuzer motioned to accept with the conditions already agreed to.

Commissioner Wyant seconded. All voted in favor of the motion.

**Chairperson Loftus requested a motion to recommend approval of the the variations, Commissioner Kreuzer made motion to approve the requested variations with the following condition:**

1. *The sign located on West side of the building be illuminated with can-lighting and not LED lighting.*

**Commissioner Wyant seconded the motion, and the motion passed by voice vote Yes (7) No (0).**

**Motion to accept Findings of Fact by Commissioner Kruezer, Seconded by Commissioner Wyant, Motion passed by voice vote Yes (7), No (0).**

2. Public Hearing: Special Use Permit - 499 Anthony Street, Single-Family Detached Home.

Commissioner Cooper made a motion to open the public hearing. Seconded by Commissioner Arango

*Sworn in Jordan Frahm, Associate Planner, presented on the agenda item below:*

Mr. Frahm presented an overview the Special Use Permit (SUP) application for 499 Anthony Steet. It is in the C5B residential district, and he showed the zoning area in a visual rendering. The petitioner wishes to convert a commercial portion of the single-family residence.

Mr. Frahm reported that the building is currently occupied as the Mansio Center, a therapy office, located at the site that also includes an upper-story residential apartment unit. In order for the building to be used entirely as a single-family detached home, a Special Use Permit is required per Section 10-4-17-2 of the Village Zoning Code. There are no proposed exterior alterations to the building.

Mr. Frahm stated that staff analysis of the property indicates that the lot is nonconforming due to the total area of the property and the building is nonconforming due to its rear yard setback. Per Section 10-4-17-2(D)5(e) of the Village Code, lots being used as a single-family detached home are required to have a minimum area of 8,712 square feet. 499 Anthony Street is 6,970 square feet in area per County records. Section 10-4-17-2(D)5(c) requires single-family detached residential use lots to have a minimum rear-yard setback of 30 feet (30'-0"). The existing rear yard setback for the principal structure at 499 Anthony Street is approximately eight feet (8'-0"). The applicant has acknowledged that upon the granting of the special use permit, the business signage would be removed and that professional activity would be limited to what is permissible for home occupations in the Village Code.

The property has a driveway in the front yard of the property that is currently used as off-street parking for office and residential use. The property meets the required minimum of two (2) off- street parking spaces for residential use, but the property does not have a garage on the site. If, at some point in the future, the property owner wishes to construct a garage accessory structure or

addition to the home, the proposed garage will be required to be in conformance with either Sections 10-4-17-2 or 10-5-4 of the Village Code.

The applicant describes the purpose of the change of use as to, "preserve and enhance the character of the property while maintaining its compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood and commercial district." Dr. Arute cites a reduction of traffic to the property, reduced density, and improved long-term maintenance and stewardship of the property has positive impacts of the proposal. No exterior structural changes are proposed, and the applicant maintains that any modifications will be consistent with the Village's building and zoning standards and receive all required permitting.

Commissioner Kreuzer asked if the upper portion of the home (the commercial part being vacated) was going to be rented.

Mr. Frahm answered it will be a single-family home, not a rental property.

Chairman Loftus asked staff to clarify the requirements to run a business out of a home.

Mr. Frahm explained the Home Occupation requirements.

Chairman Loftus asked if we approve it as a single-family home, they can still run a business if it meets those requirements?

Frahm answered yes.

Commissioner Kreuzer asked if parking located to the west of 499 Anthony Street was public parking.

Mr. Frahm answered yes.

Commissioner Cooper asked if, historically, the building had been a single-family residence.

Frahm answered yes that it had been in the past. In 2017, it was approved to have a business located on the first floor and a residence on the second floor.

Commissioner Kreuzer asked if the Village ever considered the property for public parking. He asked if the owner could potentially sell the property as a residential property, have it demolished, and build a structure significantly bigger.

Mr. Frahm answered it could not be bigger because of the lot coverage. Some dimensions would be limited to the useable area of the lot. They do have a considerable lot width, but it would require repositioning on the lot.

Commissioner Kreuzer asked if it could be residential and allow for multi-family use.

Frahm answered yes, but they would have to apply for a SUP.

Commissioner Brown referenced an historical SUP in which a business on Duane Street was converted to residential and asked if the owners would be able to sell it unless this SUP was approved.

Mr. Frahm answered they have the option to be residential with the SUP.

Mr. Harper explained that the SUP would stay in effect unless the use changed after (a minimum of) 6 months in which case it converts back to the allowed uses in the zoning district.

Commissioner Brown clarified that her question related to the owner listing it as residential and only living on the first floor of the house. Harper said that would be an ethical issue for the realtor to address.

Chairman Loftus asked if there were other questions for staff.

Commissioner Arango asked if we approved of the SUP as a residential property and because of the zoning, can they run a business?

Mr. Frahm answered that Home Occupation businesses are permissible anywhere in the Village and not constrained by zoning.

Commissioner Wyant asked about the usage of the neighboring public parking lot in staff's estimation.

Mr. Frahm answered that he had no traffic analysis.

Wyant said parking is very busy there at weekends.

Commissioner Brown added there is a parking lot close to the home and it is not available for public parking.

Chairman Loftus asked about public parking near the church.

Mr. Harper googled the sign which read it was for permit-parking only.

Commissioner Wyant said there is a need for parking in Downtown Glen Ellyn, and he thinks the best use of this space is not a single-family home. His concern is the overall future of land use in Glen Ellyn related to master planning, and less about what the petitioner is seeking.

Chairman Loftus asked if there were any other questions for staff. There were none.

*The petitioners, David and Iryna Arute, were sworn in.*

Mr. Arute said it has been an honor to serve Glen Ellyn as a business, and we have decided to transition our business from the current location. We consider the house in Glen Ellyn as home, and we do not wish to move from Glen Ellyn. He said they do not wish to change the outside or do construction on it. The practice will be dissolved.

Chairman Loftus asked if the Commission had questions for the petitioners. There were none.

Chairman Loftus asked staff if Community Development received any public emails or written comments.

Mr. Harper answered no.

*Chairman Loftus asked for a motion to close the public hearing. Commissioner Pesce motioned.*

*The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bromann-Brown. All voted in favor to close the public hearing.*

Chairman Loftus said he had no issues with the SUP request.

Commissioner Pesce said because it's an existing use and it goes along with the layout of Glen Ellyn; he would support the application.

Commissioner Kreuzer said he didn't have any concerns about development of the space and the limitations are there for future use. He had no issues with the application.

Commissioner Brown said she agreed with Commissioner Kreuzer and it is difficult to buy a home in Glen Ellyn, so she supports this.

Commissioner Kreuzer commented on the black-top pavement in the front yard and asked if there were expectations to change it. Mr. Frahm answered there are no restrictions on impervious surfaces in single-family homes. Chairman Loftus clarified that this question should have been directed to staff and not to the petitioner.

**Chairperson Loftus requested a motion to recommend approval of the special use permit, Commissioner Brown made motion to approve the requested special use permit.**

**Commissioner Cooper seconded the motion, and the motion passed by voice vote Yes (7) No (0).**

**Motion to accept Findings of Fact by Commissioner Cooper, Seconded by Commissioner Pesce, Motion passed by voice vote Yes (7), No (0).**

#### **E. Trustee Liaison's Report**

Village Trustee Steve Thompson reported on the following items:

- The Taft Avenue demolition was proceeding, and DuPage County recently approved demolition of the building on the east parcel.
- Construction of Starbucks at 405 Roosevelt Road was proceeding.
- The Village Board approved variations for parking requested by the Legacy Shops at 1184 Roosevelt Road.
- The Village Board approved the Historical Preservation Commission's Pilot Incentive Program.

Trustee Thompson welcomed questions. Commissioner Cooper commented that many merchants are selling goods outside of the store, and he was concerned about icy sidewalks and the safety of pedestrians. Of particular concern were merchants on Roosevelt Road and a large Christmas tree on the sidewalk near Pete's Market.

This led to a discussion of flashing lights, LED lights, and non-approved lighting in businesses along Roosevelt Road. Mr. Harper said vape shops, smoke shops, and some other shops are continually cited for these violations, but they eventually put up the lights again anyway.

Commissioner Wyant asked if any modifications had been made regarding the Glenbard West High School Addition project. Thompson answered not that he was aware of and encouraged those who are interested in the project to attend District 41 Board meetings.

Commissioner Brown asked if the construction office was permitted by the Village. Village Staff were unaware of a construction office being set-up.

Commissioner Brown commented that there is limited parking in Glen Ellyn and the Village should support businesses in their efforts to alleviate problems. Trustee Thompson reminded the Commission that grant monies are available for businesses to spearhead projects and they may apply every three years.

Trustee Thompson said he would like the Village Board to support higher fees for demolition projects in the Village, and there was a brief discussion of this.

Trustee Thompson concluded his remarks.

#### **F. Chairman's Report- None**

#### **G. Staff Report**

MR. Harper reported that the Community Development Department recently requested RFPs for consultants to assist in updating the Village Zoning Code. The department's selection was discussed with Village Manager, Mark Franz, and he agreed with the recommendation. The consultant will be announced in January, and the project will begin in February. Mr. Harper said the project will include focus groups, including input from the various Village Commissions.

Chairman Loftus asked if this input will be conducted during regular meetings of the Plan Commission, and Mr. Harper answered and that it may require special meetings outside of regular PC meetings.

Mr. Harper reported on the Village Board approval of the Legacy Shop's parking variations, and a Village code amendment to allow restaurants in the C4 office district. He reported that the Architectural Appearance Commission approved exterior modifications to the property located at 505 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Chairman Loftus asked if there would be agenda items for consideration by the Plan Commission at their January 2026 meeting. Mr. Harper said some projects were in development, but he could not say with certainty that documents would be ready for the Commission's review in January. Mr. Harper said the public notification deadline is January 7, 2026, and if the required documents are received by the deadline the items would be pushed to the February Plan Commission meeting.

#### **H. Other Business - None**

Seeing no further discussion, Chairman Loftus requested a Motion to Adjourn. Commissioner Pesce motioned to adjourn.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cooper. All voted in favor of the motion.

#### **I. Adjourn 8:17PM**