

MINUTES
Glen Ellyn Plan Commission Meeting
Thursday, February 26, 2026, at 7:00 PM
Glen Ellyn Civic Center
Galligan Board Room

A. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chairman Tim Loftuis called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and explained the Plan Commission's function and operating procedure as an advisory body. He described the public hearing protocol for public comment and announced that comments would be recorded.

Roll was called. Chairman Loftus, Plan Commissioners Arango, Cooper, Kreuzer, Morrison, Pesce.

Commissioners Bromann-Brown, Dougherty, and Wyant were absent.

Also in attendance: Kelli Christiansen, Village Trustee in attendance for Trustee Steve Thompson who was absent; Daniel Harper, Planning Manager; and Laura Musgraves, acting Recording Secretary.

B. Public Comment (non-agenda items)

There was no off-agenda audience comment.

C. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting on January 22, 2026.

Before the meeting, Commissioner Cooper had requested revisions to the draft Minutes. The changes were made and staff provided a copy of the revised Minutes with the changes highlighted. Chairman Loftus asked for a motion to approve the Minutes as amended. Commissioner Cooper motioned. Commissioner Kreuzer seconded. All voted in favor of the motion.

D. New Business

- 1) Public Hearing: 22W584 Ahlstrand Road, Minor Subdivision and Subdivision Variations.

Commissioner Arango made a motion to open the public hearing. Commissioner Pesce seconded. All voted in favor of the motion.

Planning Manager Daniel Harper was sworn in. Mr. Harper made a brief overview of the application, the zoning components, and the proposed site development plan. Dry wells will be required for mitigation of stormwater, and he explained how dry wells work. Mr. Harper addressed the subdivision variations. Normally the request would be a two-lot split, but because the application proposes variations it must be treated as a minor subdivision. The variations are:

1. A variation from Section 11-4-4(M) to not provide streetlights along adjacent portions of Ahlstrand Road and Oaklawn Drive.
2. A variation from Section 11-4-7 to not provide sidewalks along adjacent portions of Ahlstrand Road and Oaklawn Drive.

Mr. Harper explained that the installation of streetlights and sidewalks are required for subdivisions, according to the Village code, and he showed a visual depiction of the sidewalk that the Village requires. The applicant does not wish to have sidewalks because it is not characteristic of the neighborhood and it would require more site engineering on the north side of Ahlstrand. The staff recommendation is to have a sidewalk on north side of Ahlstrand Road that connects to the existing sidewalk infrastructure on S. Park Boulevard, which would give access to existing sidewalks and create residential accessibility.

Regarding the streetlight, the applicant requested that they do not install streetlights due to the costs to the developer, and it is uncharacteristic of the neighborhood. The staff recommendation is to install a streetlight at the 3-way intersection for public safety reasons. There is no power facility to connect the streetlight to existing infrastructure so it would have to have its own generator.

Commissioner Morrison asked what is involved with the generator. Mr. Harper answered that it would not be connected to the existing street light system and that it requires its own power system. Commissioner Morrison asked why to have a streetlight at all. Mr. Harper explained that as a result of the proposed annexation the Village would have control of the intersection and that public safety of the intersection is a concern. The subdivision code also requires that street lighting be installed as part of the subdivision.

Commissioner Kreuzer asked why not have stop signs at the intersection. Mr. Harper said stop signs exist at the intersection now.

Commissioner Arango asked why streetlight is needed if there are stop signs there. Mr. Harper answered because it is a 3-way stop and a public safety issue.

Chairman Loftus asked if the Village has control over the whole street and snowplowing responsibilities. Mr. Harper answered yes, saying full access is needed for snowplowing radius and snow removal. Chairman Loftus asked who would be responsible for future roadway repairs, and Mr. Harper said the Village.

Commissioner Kreuzer asked if the intersection was 3-way. Mr. Harper said it is a T-intersection, and the concern about safety puts the onus on the Village to have the streetlight controlled by the Village and by Village code.

Commissioner Kreuzer asked about the traffic accident history of the intersection and staff did not have that information.

Commissioner Cooper asked if a generator is required of all streetlighting in the Village. Mr. Harper said no, almost all Village streetlights are interconnected so they don't have to have their own power source. Commissioner Cooper asked if it was feasible for the builder or the Village to connect so they wouldn't have to have a stand-alone generator. Mr. Harper said the Village would like to have all streetlights on the same system, but it is not always feasible for infrastructure reasons.

Commissioner Cooper asked if there were other instances in the Village where a generator was required and Mr. Harper answered yes, the subdivisions on Acorn Avenue. They are needed during development until the rest of the neighborhood is connected to the Village utility.

Commissioner Arango asked about the location of the streetlight and why it is being proposed now. Mr. Harper answered because the property is being annexed subdivided and developed, now is the time to do it as required by Village code.

Commissioner Cooper asked if the neighborhood residents had asked for streetlights, and no one was aware of any requests. Commissioner Cooper asked about crime statistics of the neighborhood and staff did not have that information. Regarding residents being asked their opinions about sidewalks, Chairman Loftus said the area is unincorporated so it would not be a question posed to the Village nor addressed by the Village.

Commissioner Kreuzer asked if there were other sidewalks in the neighborhood. Staff said the nearest sidewalk is on S. Park Boulevard. Commissioner Kreuzer asked why the Village requires sidewalks. Mr. Harper said it is required in subdivision developments because the Village has pedestrian-friendly policies and wants to encourage sidewalks as amenities.

Chairman Loftus asked if there were any other questions for staff. Seeing none, he thanked Mr. Harper and asked the petitioner to make a presentation.

Andrew Draus, attorney for the petitioner, was present. He introduced Christian Smith, engineer of the project; and Frank La Gambina, owner of the home and the developer. They were sworn in.

Mr. La Gambina made a presentation to the Commission showing the characteristics of the neighborhood in photos. He said he is the owner of the property and has lived across the street from the property for over 10 years. They wish to demolish the existing home and redevelop the existing property into two lots with two single-family homes and bring new water service and wasted water lines extending all the way down Ahlstrand Road. He is requesting two variations: one, not to install sidewalks, and two, not to install streetlights.

His argument for no streetlights was twofold: one, to keep the natural setting of the neighborhood; and two, the neighborhood by Park Boulevard is completely annexed and has no streetlights despite having a T-intersection.

Regarding the sidewalk variation, Mr. La Gambina said that adding sidewalks would severely impact the existing stormwater swales along Ahlstrand Road. He was also concerned with tree removal. He gave examples of neighboring annexations where

sidewalks were not installed, implying that his request was not new to the Village. Mr. La Gambina said he submitted a tree preservation plan to the Village as part of the development project.

Mr. Smith asked staff to show the visual of the staff-recommended sidewalks and asked if they were to scale. Mr. Harper said this is just a graphic depiction and the developer would be required to install Village code-required sidewalks. Mr. Smith spoke to spatial aspects of the sidewalk and implied that the Village-presented visual was misleading. He spoke to the technical aspects of the drainage swales, saying the sidewalks would cause the water to run into the street, and that steep ditches would cause drivers to get stuck in snow or heavy rain. Mr. Smith also spoke to issues of damage to existing trees and removal of trees.

Commissioner Pesce said that every intersection on the west side of Park Boulevard from Roosevelt Road to Butterfield Road has a sidewalk except for this intersection. It is part of the Village rules and Ahlstrand Road would be the only neighborhood connected to Park Boulevard not abiding by the rules.

Chairman Loftus asked about the distance between the lot line and the street, and Mr. Smith answered 21 feet. Chairman Loftus asked if the trees in question were planted by the Village or by the homeowners. Mr. La Gambina said DuPage County was not involved and the homeowners planted the trees in the public right-of-way.

Chairman Loftus asked staff about the lots on the east side Park Boulevard, and would they be subject to the same sidewalk requirements if they were incorporated into the Village? Mr. Harper said the lots on the east side of Park Boulevard do not currently have sidewalks as the properties have not been subdivided since annexation. The lots are larger and when annexed they were in a separate zoning district that has different requirements for setbacks and total area that would not conform to the properties on the west side of the subdivision. They would conform with the R1 district and the properties on Park Boulevard. They are also affected by differing requirements for new construction vs. subdivisions.

Chairman Loftus asked if the petitioner did not ask for annexation would he have to conform to DuPage County development requirements, and Mr. Harper answered yes.

Commissioner Morrison asked the petitioner why he wanted to be annexed. Mr. La Gambina cited amenities such as library access and park district services. Commissioner Morrison asked if the reason also includes that you can build two homes instead of one, and Mr. La Gambina answered yes. Commissioner Morrison continued this questioning and Mr. La Gambina said he may not seek annexation if the variations are not approved.

Chairman Loftus thanked the petitioners. He asked staff if they had received any other written or emailed public comments, and Mr. Harper said no.

Chairman Loftus opened the public portion of the meeting. The first speaker was James Foley of 22W735 Poplar Road. He was sworn in. He provided an oral history of the development of subdivisions surrounding Ahlstrand Road. He encouraged the Commission to approve the variance requests.

Mark Pfefferman of 22W665 Poplar Road was the next speaker. He was sworn in. He spoke in favor of the sidewalk on the north side of Ahlstrand Road for safety reasons. He said sidewalks are needed and they would benefit the neighborhood and therefore he was opposed to the variance request.

Paul Davidson of 22W738 Ahlstrand Road was sworn in. He spoke in favor of the variances. He asked who would pay for sidewalks and streetlights without the resident's consent.

Ken Wilke of 2S467 Oaklawn Drive was sworn in. He spoke in favor of the variances, saying the streetlight was not necessary.

Gary Gunderson of 22W584 Ahlstrand Road was sworn in. He said he was the former owner of the property in question, and he spoke about the trees. He planted four of them himself in 1977, and he felt strongly they should not be removed.

Francine Long of 22W750 Elmwood Drive was sworn in. She spoke in favor of the variations and especially saving the trees. She said the sidewalk would span 4 homes in the subdivision and the rest of the subdivision contains 75 houses. It would not make sense to install a sidewalk for 4 homes.

Chairman Loftus asked if there were any other public comments. There were none.

Chairman Loftus asked staff to clarify the question as to who pays for the installation of the sidewalks and streetlights. Mr. Harper said the developer, and after installation, the Village would accept the improvements and future maintenance responsibility.

Commissioner Pesce asked about the utility costs, and if this were not a subdivision, would the petitioner be required to pay for them? Mr. Harper answered no, if it was the construction of a new home the petitioner would be required to donate to the Village infrastructure fund. Same for the streetlight.

Commissioner Cooper asked, because the project is a Subdivision that is why the developer is required to pay for the installation? Mr. Harper said yes.

Commissioner Morrison asked about the infrastructure fund and Mr. Harper said that if the project was New Construction, they would have been required to donate to it. Commissioner Morrison asked if the petitioner would have access to the funds, and Mr. Harper answered no.

Commissioner Morrison asked where the closest streetlight was located, and staff answered at Park Boulevard and College Road.

Chairman Loftus asked if there were any other questions. Seeing none, he 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 Pesce commented it is a beautiful community, and the residents have a passion for what they want, but he will vote no if they do not want to follow the Village requirements.

Commissioner Kreuzer said he did not hear any evidence, from neither the petitioner nor the Village, that these variations will affect public safety or welfare. He said he appreciates that communities wish to stay “rural,” so he is in favor of the variations and in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Morrison commented that she felt torn. She said the neighborhood has a rural character and she appreciated that residents support that characteristic. Commissioner Morrison said the proposal to subdivide and build two houses changes the character of the neighborhood in and of itself. She said she was torn on the sidewalk issue, but OK with the streetlight variation.

Commissioner Arango said she also felt conflicted. She wants to uphold the Village and its codes but in her familiarity with the subdivision, she will support the variance requests because the alternative will take away from the character of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Cooper said he felt conflicted as well. He personally appreciates sidewalks because he walks a lot in the Village, but he was concerned that the installation of sidewalks will affect stormwater flow. Even though he supports sidewalks, he sees that the community is not appreciative of them. Commissioner Cooper said he supports the streetlight variation but not the sidewalk variation.

Commissioner Pesce said Park Boulevard is a very busy street with a high school nearby, so the safety issues are very real. He argued the neighborhood is not “rural” and safety is important.

Commissioner Kreuzer said there have been no identified safety issues in this area, and the Village has not addressed this.

Commissioner Morrison said she is viewing it from a traffic perspective. 100% of the traffic that accesses homes in that area goes down Ahlstrand Road and that is why she thinks the infrastructure will add more safety.

Chairperson Loftus shared a personal experience in considering a subdivided lot in Glen Ellyn, and he ultimately decided he didn't see the benefit of two homes. The fact is that a subdivision changes a neighborhood, so the petitioner needs to follow the rules of the Village.

Chairman Loftus cited an example of the Village saving trees. When Crescent Boulevard was redeveloped, the Village built sidewalks around trees instead of cutting them down. He reminded the Commission that, regarding this proposal, it is not set in stone that the Village will cut down all the trees.

Commissioner Kreuzer said he was concerned about stormwater issues that Mr. Smith identified. Chairman Loftus said it was similar to the scenario on Crescent Boulevard, and the Village successfully addressed the issues. Chairman Loftus said he was not in favor of the variances.

Commissioner Arango spoke to the traffic from Park Boulevard and that 90% of the cars coming into the subdivision are residents, and not “traffic.” Commissioner Pesce disagreed, saying there are many accessible facilities nearby (high school, College of DuPage) and if drivers miss a turn they must drive down Ahlstrand Road.

Chairman Loftus asked for a motion to approve the variations as requested. Commissioner Kreuzer motioned. Seconded by Commissioner Arango.

The vote was 3 to 3, with the 3 dissenting votes being Commissioners Pesce, Morrison, and Chairman Loftus.

Chairman Loftus said this will be presented to the Village Board. Mr. Harper asked for clarification that it will be communicated as a tie vote with no recommendation.

Commissioner Cooper observed that the Commission must also vote on the subdivision application.

Chairman Loftus asked for a motion to approve or deny the subdivision agenda item. Commissioner Cooper motioned. Commissioner Arango seconded. The motion passed by a vote of 4-2 with Chairperson Loftus and Commissioner Pesce in dissent.

Mr. Draus asked if they will be required to make the same presentation before the Village Board. Mr. Harper said there will be no public hearing at the Village Board meeting, but there will be discussion at the Village Board because it was not a unanimous recommendation by the Plan Commission. Mr. Draus asked if a public hearing could be made at the Village Board, and Chairman Loftus explained that this meeting is the public hearing portion. The public may comment at the Village Board meeting, but it is not a public hearing.

Chairman Loftus said the Village Board will make the ultimate decision. He thanked everyone who attended the meeting.

2) Public Hearing: Glenwood Station Planned Unit Development Amendment.

Commissioner Morrison made a motion to open the public hearing. Commissioner Pesce seconded. All voted in favor of the motion.

Mr. Harper was sworn in. He said the petitioner seeks to amend the PUD to allow for the construction of decks and patios on a portion of the north side apartments at Glenwood Station. The request is an amendment to Ordinance 6834 approved by the Village in 2020.

Mr. Harper described the existing conditions and showed visuals of the deck and patio proposals. A patio is needed on the northwest corner because the landing to the ground would not allow for a deck. The decks will be separated by 6-foot screens. Part of the PUD amendment is to allow for deviations in zoning code for side yards (current code allows only in the back.) The existing ground cover will be removed. Engineering staff reviewed the proposal and determined it will not negatively impact the existing stormwater infrastructure.

Chairman Loftus asked where they are proposing to landscape. Mr. Harper said it is outside the foundation wall and on the north side of the building.

Chairman Loftus asked the petitioner to make a presentation. Drew Mitchell of Holladay Properties was present with three others: Lori Kappel, Project Manager; Autumn Damico, Property Manager; and Don Tomei, Engineer. They were sworn in.

Mr. Mitchell described the stretch of on the north side of the building that was unattractive and in need of more landscaping or amenities. They wish to beautify the space and make it more attractive to residents. The apartments near this space are unleased and undesirable because of the patch of land. He consulted with the Village and came up with a concept of arborvitae trees and patios.

Mr. Mitchell showed samples of the materials to be used for the decks, the deck separators (mesh material), and artificial turf. In its current state, the area is an eyesore for the residents living around it. He said we did not anticipate this problem, and we would like to fix it.

Chairman Loftus asked about access to the space. Mr. Mitchell said it is not a common area. Mr. Tomei pointed to a visual depicting the area that would be replaced.

Commissioner Pesce asked if it would extend right up to the property line. Mr. Tomei answered no, only a 6-foot extension. He said there will be a gap between the patio/decks and the property line. The space is private and only residents can access it.

Commissioner Cooper said that the original PUD did not include balconies. Mr. Mitchell said the balcony concept was pulled in favor of decks, mostly due to a supply-side issue. This resulted in giving little thought to the side yard.

Commissioner Cooper said his impression was that decks and patios were proposed before and then modified, and now the developer is trying to get them back. Mr. Mitchell said he could understand why the Commission had that impression, but that is not the case. It was a misstep in the development. We are trying incrementally to improve the building and to correct what we missed the first time around.

Mr. Tomei said we are adding 7 balconies to these specific units, not trying to go back on something we wanted before. He said this is thoughtful design and development.

Chairman Loftus said the Village had a previous experience with a developer who asked for a PUD amendment twice before and blamed the Village codes for being too rigid.

Commissioner Arango asked if the residents above the area were complaining about the space. Mr. Mitchell said no, there is a drastic difference in views between the second and third floors.

Commissioner Kreuzer asked about the issues with arborvitaes. Mr. Mitchell said they would provide privacy screening, which is why he would like to install them, but they are outside the scope of the PUD amendment.

Commissioner Kreuzer asked if there was an issue of car lights from the parking lot shining into the units. Mr. Mitchell said no, they want to avoid installing a privacy fence. The goal is to solve the issue of the incomplete space and to invest more in landscaping.

Mr. Harper said the Village code is very specific in that a landscaping plan would require a separate PUD amendment.

Chairman Loftus asked how much the of building was rented. Mr. Mitchell said the building was 85% leased and the residents seem happy. Chairman Loftus asked what the percentage would be if the eight units in question were leased, and Mr. Mitchell said 8% more.

Commissioner Morrison said that the Commission was informed that landscaping was not thriving in the area in question, so would it be feasible to plant more trees? Mr. Mitchell said that arborvitaes were recommended by the nursery. Commissioner Morrison asked if the lilac bushes (currently planted) were thriving. Mr. Mitchell said yes, they are doing well but do not provide privacy in winter when they are not in bloom.

Commissioner Morrison asked staff if the Commission could approve amendment with the condition that arborvitaes be planted, thus negating the need for the petitioner to submit a separate amendment request later. Mr. Harper said no because the public notice did not include trees. It only spoke to the deck and the patios and did not mention plants.

Commissioner Cooper said it would behoove the petitioner to get more information on the plantings before the Commission considered it anyway.

Commissioner Kreuzer said he noticed that Glenwood Station was installing more lights on the exterior of the building. Mr. Mitchell said that lumens-output testing was conducted on the new sconces and they are dark-sky friendly. Commissioner Kreuzer complimented the look of the sconces and Mr. Mitchell said he appreciated the feedback.

Chairman Loftus asked about public access to the area in question, and Mr. Mitchell confirmed it was for resident-only access.

There were no further questions. Chairman Loftus asked staff if any members of the public had submitted email or written comments to the Village. There were none.

Hearing no other questions, Chairman Loftus asked for a motion to close the public hearing. Commissioner Pesce motioned. Commissioner Morrison seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.

Commissioner Pesce said the petitioner should have thought about appearance and engineering issues before, but that doesn't matter now and they are moving forward. He said he would approve the amendment.

Chairman Loftus said he is shell-shocked by former developers repeatedly asking for PUD amendments, so he felt leery of the request. He said this is different from that experience, and they are not trying to pull the wool over our eyes, so he is supportive of the amendment. Chairman Loftus said if they were requesting balconies on the whole north side of the building, he would say no to that.

Commissioner Kreuzer said this is an opportunity to improve the property, and he supports the amendment.

Commissioner Cooper said he will vote no because he doesn't want it to be on the consent agenda for the Village Board. He complimented Holladay Properties, but the current PUD took a long time to get to. He thinks the Village Board should talk more about it, so he will vote no.

Seeing no other comments, Chairman Loftus asked for a motion to vote on the PUD Amendment. Commissioner Pesce motioned. Commissioner Kreuzer seconded. The Commission voted 4-2 in favor of the motion with Commissioners Cooper and Arango dissenting.

Chairman Loftus requested a motion to approve the Finding of the Facts document. Commissioner Morrison motioned. Commissioner Pesce seconded. Commissioner Morrison read the Finding of Facts aloud. The motion was passed by a vote of 4-2, with Commissioners Cooper and Arango dissenting.

3) Pre-application of 451 Duane Street.

Mr. Harper presented the pre-application of 451 Duane Street. Developer and owner of the property, John Messina, proposed a residential building concept in 2025 and he has returned with a proposal for an office building concept. The proposed 3-story office building would be made primarily of masonry, and the height would be well below the maximum height limit in the downtown district.

Mr. Harper cited two areas of concern. One is that the Village has requirements for visibility triangles on corner lots, and about 57 feet of the building is located in the triangle. This is not uncommon. The other issue is that code requires new impervious surfaces to be set back 2% of the lot width and this proposal has the impervious surface at the lot line. The landscaping islands will require a modification to be smaller than required by Village Code. The Code requires that coverage of all buildings and structures does not exceed 50% of the lot area and this proposal is 51% of the lot area. Mr. Harper showed the building elevations on the PowerPoint display.

The staff report noted that the concept would require 29 parking spaces by Village Code. Harper said this will be moot starting June 1, 2026, when a new Illinois state law takes effect that supersedes local parking ordinances if they are within a half mile of a public transportation hub. This would be the Village's first case of a development in the downtown district that is affected by this new law.

Commissioner Pesce asked how this request was different from the developer's proposal in 2025.

The petitioner, John Messina, was present at the meeting with Jeff Budgell, Architect. Mr. Messina spoke to the proposal saying the stormwater works better and there is a larger footprint for the building. He added that he has a client who sells medical equipment and has needs for storage, and that is what generated this concept.

Chairman Loftus asked how not requiring parking would affect the back of the building. Mr. Harper answered no impact because of the lot coverage. Mr. Messina said there is public parking across the street, and he has studied the traffic there. He reported that at peak times the parking lot is 80% full.

Chairman Loftus asked who was the target audience of the office space? Mr. Messina said that the medical supply client was interested in leasing the whole building.

Commissioner Arango asked if retail space was included, and Mr. Messina answered no. She asked about parking for employees. Mr. Messina said they could park across the street in public parking, noting the client has 6-7 employees.

Chairman Loftus asked about commuter parking and Blue Dot parking, and Mr. Harper answered.

Commissioner Pesce commented that the current mix of the neighborhood is both office and residential.

Chairman Loftus asked the petitioner if he will sell the building. Mr. Messina answered possibly, as he works in real estate.

Commissioner Cooper commented that the Village's Comprehensive Plan favors the C5B district to be residential. Mr. Harper said the Village strategic plan calls it "transitional" and recommends that residential lots be considered as a use in C5B.

Mr. Messina passed out paper copies of the building concept. Chairman Loftus commented that the building was handsome and the Village could possibly get some tax dollars from it.

Commissioner Arango asked about outside illumination. Mr. Messina said they would meet Village requirements.

Commissioner Cooper asked to clarify the Commission's role in considering this proposal. Mr. Harper said that any new building in the district requires a PUD. Cooper asked what is the standard by which the Commission may make a determination. Mr. Harper called up the Code and read the evaluation factors.

Chairman Loftus asked if a traffic study was required. Mr. Harper answered that it is not specified, noting that the Community Development Director has authority to waive certain supporting documentation requirements if it is not pertinent to the development proposal.

Chairman Loftus said he thinks the Commission should move the proposal forward and he liked the look of the building.

Commissioner Cooper said he thought the building was attractive, but he would like to see the lot used for residential purposes.

Chairman Loftus asked what would be required to convert the proposal to residential. Mr. Harper said the new state law about parking near transportation hubs applies to residential buildings, too. Mr. Messina added that his previous proposal was residential, but it was not feasible for the lot.

Commissioner Morrison complimented Mr. Messina on the look of the building, but she did not think the elevations resemble what it is depicted the rendering. She said she would like to see how this building will impact the residential home next door. Being 4 feet from their property line, that is a concern to her. She would like to see how this building will be in relation to the buildings surrounding it. Commissioner Morrison thinks it may dwarf the other buildings, but other than that, she was OK with the concept.

Commissioner Morrison said it would be helpful to get approval from the neighbors. Mr. Messina said he was working with St. Petronille Church and was waiting to hear from them.

E. Trustee Liaison's Report

In Mr. Thompson's absence, Trustee Kelli Christiansen reported highlights from the February 23, 2026, meeting of the Village Board:

- Eighty (80) homes were completed in the Lead Service Line Replacement program since January 1.
- The Board approved the 2026 streetscape work throughout the Village.
- The Board completed their third meeting to discuss the Strategic Plan; the next steps involve meeting with Village staff.
- The Board approved banning e-bikes on any sidewalk throughout the Village. E-scooters are banned based on the type of e-scooter which presents a complication for enforcement.

F. Chairman's Report.

None was presented.

G. Staff Report.

Mr. Harper reported:

- The March Plan Commission meeting will consider a salon proposal.
- The March Historic Plan Commission will review signage for an historic plaque to be displayed at the new Metra Station.
- The March Zoning Board of Appeals will consider a garage issue.

- The official Zoning Map will be presented for approval on the March 9, 2026, meeting Village Board. The map includes zoning changes for Ackerman Park and the Full Circle Communities development on Taft Avenue.
- The Zoning Code revision project will invite groups of stakeholders for interviews in 3 sessions. The sessions will take place in March. Two are residential-focused, and one will focus on the commercial zoning code.

Commissioner Cooper asked how the stakeholders are determined. Mr. Harper said the first group includes professional residential builders and engineers who work extensively in Glen Ellyn. The second residential group will include members of different commissions and people who have taken an interest in zoning code issues based on project experiences they had with the Village. The commercial group will include commercial property developers and owners that the Village has worked with in the past 5 years.

Commissioner Cooper asked if they are focused on facilitating the process as opposed to overall land-use. Mr. Harper said this phase sets the stage for the next round when the Village will open it to input from the public.

Commissioner Morrison asked if minutes or reports would be available that the Plan Commission could view. Mr. Harper said he didn't know, but the meetings will be recorded. Commissioner Morrison asked if the interviews will be conducted during the day or evening. Mr. Harper said two during the day, and one in the evening.

Chairman Loftus said the Glen Ellyn Historical Society is erecting four exhibits along the Illinois Prairie Path and asked if the Village was involved. Mr. Harper said that whoever is installing the signs will be required to have a sign permit.

Chairman Loftus asked if the Glen Ellyn Arts Council Mural Competition installation would have to be considered by the Plan Commission for variations. Mr. Harper said the Village has other codes that address murals and beautification displays.

There was no other business before the commission. Chairman Loftus asked for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Kreuzer motioned. Commissioner Arango seconded. All voted in favor of the motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:32 p.m.