

# **Village of Lombard**

*Village Hall  
255 East Wilson Ave.  
Lombard, IL 60148  
villageoflombard.org*



## **Minutes**

**Monday, February 17, 2025**

**7:00 PM**

**Village Hall**

## **Plan Commission**

*Leigh Giuliano, Chairperson*

*Commissioners:*

*Ruth Sweetser, Bill Johnston, Tony Invergo,*

*Alissa Verson, Robert Spreenber and*

*Brendan Flanigan*

*Staff Liaison: Anna Papke*

## Call to Order

*Chairperson Giuliano called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m*

## Pledge of Allegiance

*Chairperson Giuliano led the Pledge of Allegiance*

## Roll Call of Members

**Present** 4 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, and Alissa Verson

**Absent** 3 - Tony Invergo, Robert Spreenber, and Brendan Flanigan

*Also present: Anna Papke, AICP, Planning & Zoning Manager  
Community Development, and Anne Skrodzki, Legal Counsel to the  
Plan Commission.*

*Chairperson Giuliano called the order of the agenda.*

*Ms. Papke read the Rules and Procedures as written by the Plan  
Commission.*

## Public Hearings

[250082](#)

### **PC 25-04: 505 W. Roosevelt Road**

The petitioner is requesting the following for a property located within the B4A Roosevelt Road Corridor District:

1. A conditional use pursuant to Section 155.103(F) of the Zoning Ordinance in order to allow a drive through accessory to a restaurant (see Section 155.417(G)(2)(b)(iv));
2. A conditional use pursuant to Section 155.103(F) of the Zoning Ordinance in order to recognize existing off-site parking throughout the shopping center (R1972-041405) and allow the use of parking spaces situated at 505 West Roosevelt Road to support use at 1210 Finley Road and 515 W. Roosevelt Road in conformance with Section 155.602(A)(3)(b) while also allowing shopping center cross-parking as covenanted in 1972 (see Section 155.417(G)(2)(c)(ii));
3. Variations pursuant to Section 155.103(C) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow the continuation of conditions existing since 1977, and later with the expansion of rights of way, to remain:

- a. From Section 155.417(G)(3), and 155.417(G)(5)(c) which impose certain lot size (40,000 SF) and interior side yard (10 feet) standards subject to compliance with the site plan and landscape plan on file with the Village which shall be deemed part of any ordinance authorizing the variations; and
- b. From Sections 155.417(G)(9) and 155.417(G)(12) which impose certain landscaping (Article XI), and parking lot design (Article X) standards subject to compliance with the site plan and landscape plan on file with the Village which shall be deemed part of any ordinance authorizing the variations. (DISTRICT #2)

*Sworn in to present the petition was Anna Papke, Planning and Zoning Manager, Brendan May of KLOA, and the development team: Mark Daniel, attorney; Jeff Miller, engineer; Shilpa Purohit, architect; Scott Birkeland, real estate broker; Mohammad Yaqoob, property owner; Navaid Suria; Farhad Arther; and Joseph Abel.*

*Chairperson Giuliano read the Plan Commission procedures and asked if anyone other than the petitioner intended to cross examine and, hearing none, she proceeded with the petition.*

*Mr. Daniel presented the petition. He introduced the property owner and development team. He described the current conditions on the property, noting that the site was previously developed as a restaurant, with the property to the south (1210 S. Finley) developed as an automotive service business. The shared parking lot serving both properties provides an abundance of parking. Mr. Daniel described the access points into the property from Finley Road and from Roosevelt Road via a curb cut on the neighboring property at 515 W. Roosevelt Road.*

*Mr. Daniel said the property owner also owns the properties at 1210 S. Finley Road and 515 W. Roosevelt Road. The intent is to comprehensively redevelop all three properties as an integrated shopping center. This will occur in phases. Phase 1 is interior renovations and bringing new tenants into a portion of the building at 515 W. Roosevelt. Phase 2 is the renovation and approval of conditional uses for the buildings at 505 W. Roosevelt (PC 25-04) and 1210 S. Finley (PC 25-05). Phase 3 and Phase 4 will involve*

*renovations and alterations to the parking lot at 515 W. Roosevelt and possibly construction of additional buildings. The petitioner expects to request zoning entitlements for Phases 3 and 4 in the future.*

*Mr. Daniel described the zoning designations of property surrounding the subject property at 505 W. Roosevelt. He noted the mixture of commercial uses along the Roosevelt Road corridor and the residential uses adjacent to the corridor. He noted Roosevelt Road had been widened subsequent to initial development of the subject property.*

*Mr. Daniel described the petitioner's request for zoning relief. He noted the conditional use for a drive-through is the only new relief. The remaining requests address existing conditions and nonconformities. He displayed the proposed landscape plan and a site plan showing the proposed drive-through. He said the proposed tenant is Bumper 2 Burger, which has a location on Main Street. He showed the Main Street location and noted it only has one lane. This is not ideal for Bumper 2 Burger's operations, and the new location on the subject property will have multiple lanes to facilitate operations. Mr. Daniel said that KLOA had reviewed the site plan and made recommendations for modifications to improve drive-through functions on the subject property; the petitioner agreed with the recommended changes. Mr. Daniel reviewed egress patterns from the drive-through lanes and noted future planned buildings would not alter egress significantly.*

*Mr. Daniel reviewed the conditional use standards as they related to the drive-through. He said there is market demand for restaurants in this area. The petitioner had held a neighborhood meeting prior to the Plan Commission public hearing and no one attended. After the meeting, one person contacted him with a question about cross walks. Otherwise he had not received any feedback from neighbors.*

*Mr. Daniel reviewed the conditional use standards as they related to the request for acknowledgement of existing off-site/shared parking arrangements. He reviewed the standards for variations with respect to existing nonconformities on the subject property. He noted that all proposed changes to the property will improve existing conditions.*

*Chairperson Giuliano asked if any person would like to cross examine or speak in favor or against this petition, or for public comment. Hearing none, she asked for the staff report.*

*Ms. Papke presented the interdepartmental review committee report, which was entered into the public record in its entirety. The subject property is located on the southwest corner of the intersection of Roosevelt Road and Finley Road. The existing building on the property was formerly a bank with drive-through service lanes. The petitioner proposes to renovate the building to create tenant space for a drive-through restaurant and a retail store. The drive-through lanes will be modified to accommodate the restaurant use, but the site improvements will otherwise remain as-is.*

*Drive-through service lanes are conditional uses in the underlying B4A District. The building on the subject property was previously a bank with three drive-through service lanes on the west side of the building. The petitioner proposes to modify the drive-through to allow for vehicle stacking around the north side of the building, with order pickup on the west side. There will be three lanes on the west side of the building to accommodate waiting vehicles and bypass activities. KLOA has reviewed the submitted site plan and made recommendations for minor modifications that would improve drive-through functions. Staff recommends approval of the conditional use subject to KLOA's recommended modifications. Ms. Papke noted KLOA staff was in attendance at the Plan Commission hearing should anyone have questions on these recommendations.*

*The petitioner is also requesting a conditional use to recognize existing off-site parking arrangements, and variances to recognize existing nonconformities for building setbacks and parking lot and landscape design. Given the history of development on the property and its position as an outlot in a larger shopping center development, staff recommends approval of this conditional use and variations.*

*Staff recommended approval of the petition subject to the conditions in the staff report.*

*Chairperson Giuliano asked if there were any questions or comments on the staff report. Hearing none, she opened the meeting to comments from the Commissioners.*

*Commissioner Verson asked if KLOA had any concerns about the large shopping center and the lack of traffic lights for vehicles to make left turns out of the shopping center.*

*Brendan May, of KOLA, said there were no initial concerns given that*

*the property was existing development. He said IDOT characterizes Roosevelt Road as a strategic arterial, so the thresholds for traffic signals at that location will be high. He said KLOA had preliminarily looked at what a traffic light would look like on Finley, across from the Mariano's driveway, and noted some potential challenges related to a nearby residential driveway. He said KLOA does not see any initial issues with the proposed drive-through.*

*Commissioner Johnston noted that when Mariano's opened, they requested a stop light on Roosevelt. He asked if KLOA had looked at the impact of the shopping center occupied at full capacity. He asked if the existing light at Finley and Roosevelt could handle that amount of traffic.*

*Mr. May said KLOA had not projected total traffic volumes at this stage. The evaluation for the petition was oriented around the outlots, including 505 W. Roosevelt and 1210 S. Finley. He said there had been discussion of the traffic impacts of later stages of development, but no formal analysis at this stage. He noted that the different uses proposed for the shopping center usually have peak traffic volumes at different times of the day.*

*Chairperson Giuliano noted that traffic volumes generated by the shopping center at full occupancy were not within the scope of the present petitions. She said it would be front and center when the development reaches Phase 3 as discussed by the petitioner.*

*Commissioner Johnston suggested various issues that would be investigated when the potential for a traffic signal on Finley, south of Roosevelt, was investigated.*

*Mr. May said that the ultimate provision of a signal at that location would be analyzed in conjunction with IDOT given proximity to Roosevelt Road. Such a signal would not be able to impact operations of the signal at Finley and Roosevelt. These issues would be considered if a study determined the signal on Finley was warranted.*

*Commissioner Sweetser asked what would trigger an evaluation of the need for a traffic signal once a property is developed.*

*Mr. May said there could be a post-occupancy evaluation, which would occur after a project was built out and the initial interest in the development had leveled out, usually six months to a year after full*

occupancy.

*Commissioner Johnston said he supported the idea of improvements to the parking lot that would improve the area. He asked what would happen if it was determined there was an issue with traffic circulation after the development was completed. He asked if traffic should be modeled before the existing buildings in the shopping center were fully occupied. He said it seemed prudent to model traffic at this stage.*

*Mr. Daniel said that Commissioner Johnston raised an important issue. He said that the developer had discussed the possible need for a traffic signal on Finley Road with the Village as a potential future need. He said the developer would cooperate with future studies about warrants for traffic signals, though he noted that it may be difficult to meet warrants for a light on Roosevelt.*

*Commissioner Johnston summarized some of the traffic signal and lane improvements that were made when Mariano's developed in 2016. He said those improvements addressed current conditions, but not necessarily the expansion of development on or near the subject property. He said the shopping center could be busier than Mariano's at full buildout.*

*Mr. Daniel said the land uses on the shopping center site would likely not all peak at the same time that traffic in the area peaked during rush hour. He said that may mean the project would not meet warrants for additional traffic signals.*

*Mr. Johnston said he wanted to be careful that the development would function well and that the traffic issue was given due diligence.*

*Mr. Daniel said the Phase 3 application would be submitted to the Village in the near future. There would be more discussion of traffic associated with the overall shopping center at that time.*

*Chairperson Giuliano said that she did not see an issue with traffic as it related to the petition for the subject property. She said traffic may be more of an issue when Phase 3 comes before the Plan Commission.*

*Mr. May said his comments about the traffic signal were related more to overall operation of the shopping center. KLOA's analysis of the outlots that were before the Plan Commission currently indicated there was adequate site access to support those developments.*

*Chairperson Giuliano asked about Mr. Daniel's comment that there would not be an opportunity to add a traffic signal on Roosevelt. Mr. May said it would be difficult to get approval from IDOT for an additional signal due to proximity to the Finley/Roosevelt signal.*

On a motion by Commissioner Verson, and a second by Commissioner Sweetser, the Plan Commission voted 4-0 to recommend that the Village Board approve the petition associated with PC 25-04 subject to the six (6) conditions in the staff report:

1. That the petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report;
2. That the petitioner shall develop the site in accordance with the plans submitted as part of this petition and referenced in the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report;
3. That the petitioner shall modify the drive-through lanes in accordance with the recommendations of KLOA in the Site Plan Evaluation, dated February 6, 2025;
4. That the refuse disposal area on the subject property shall serve the subject property and the property located at 1210 S. Finley Road, unless and until such time as arrangements are made for refuse collection on each property individually;
5. That the petitioner shall apply for and receive building permits for the proposed improvements; and
6. That this approval shall be subject to the commencement time provisions as set forth within Section 155.103(F)(11).

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 4 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, and Alissa Verson

**Absent:** 3 - Tony Invergo, Robert Spreenber, and Brendan Flanigan

### [250083](#)

#### **PC 25-05: 1210 S. Finley Road**

The petitioner is requesting the following for a property located within the B4A Roosevelt Road Corridor District:

1. A conditional use pursuant to Section 155.103(F) of the Zoning Ordinance in order to allow a smoking establishment that complies with the Illinois Smoke Free Act (see Section 155.417(G)(2)(b)(xi));
2. A conditional use pursuant to Section 155.103(F) of the Zoning Ordinance in order to recognize existing off-site parking throughout the shopping center (R1972-041405) the use by 1210 Finley Road of off-site parking spaces situated at 505 and 515



West Roosevelt Road in conformance with Section 155.602(A)(3)(b) (see Section 155.417(G)(2)(c)(ii));

3. A conditional use pursuant to Section 155.103(F) of the Zoning Ordinance in order to allow outdoor services, subject to Section 155.210(C)(2)(b) (see Sections 155.417(G)(2)(a)(vi) and 155.417(G)(10)(b)), provided that no seating area for a smoking establishment shall be placed within thirty (30) feet from the west lot line;
4. Variation pursuant to Section 155.103(C) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow one marquee sign on the building canopy facing Finley Road (east elevation) and one marquee sign on the south elevation in order with a combined area not to exceed 100 square feet to comply with prior and current staff interpretation of Section 153.505(B)(17)(a)(i)(a) which limits the area of marquee signs by regulating them as wall signs and limiting them a combined area of one times the lineal front footage of the property per façade of street front exposure or a maximum of 100 square feet;
5. Variations pursuant to Section 155.103(C) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow the continuation of conditions existing since 1977, and later with the expansion of rights of way, to remain:
  - a. From Section 155.417(G)(3), Section 155.417(G)(4), and Section 155.417(G) (5)(c) which impose certain lot size (40,000 SF), lot width (150 feet), and interior side yard (10 feet) standards subject to compliance with the site plan and landscape plan on file with the Village which shall be deemed part of any ordinance authorizing the variations; and
  - b. From Section 155.417(G)(9) and Section 155.417(G) (12) which impose certain landscaping (Article XI) and parking lot design (Article X) standards subject to compliance with the site plan and landscape plan on file with the Village which shall be deemed part of any ordinance authorizing the variations. (DISTRICT #2)

*Sworn in to present the petition was Anna Papke, Planning and Zoning Manager, Brendan May of KLOA, and the development team: Mark Daniel, attorney; Jeff Miller, engineer; Shilpa Purohit, architect; Scott Birkeland, real estate broker; Mohammad Yaqoob, property owner; Navaid Suria; Farhad Arther; and Joseph Abel.*

*Chairperson Giuliano read the Plan Commission procedures and*

*asked if anyone other than the petitioner intended to cross examine and, hearing none, she proceeded with the petition.*

*Mr. Daniel presented the petition. He said the petitioner proposes to operate a smoking establishment on the subject property. The establishment will comply with the Smoke Free Illinois Act. There will be no food preparation on site, in compliance with Smoke Free Illinois and DuPage County Health Department permitting regulations. An outdoor service area on the west side of the building will allow patrons to sit outside.*

*Mr. Daniel said the property was formerly an auto glass business. Proposed changes include building façade renovations and signage on the canopy. Per staff interpretation of the Sign Ordinance and past practice, the canopy signage is regulated as wall signage.*

*Mr. Daniel said customers must be 21 or older to enter the smoking establishment. He detailed operational practices, including checking identification of customers. Customers must enter the building to gain access to the patio.*

*Mr. Daniel showed a floor plan and landscape plan. He reviewed the conditional use standards as applied to the smoking establishment and outdoor service area. He noted that operational practices would promote public safety, and the uses would not create detrimental impacts. He reviewed the standards for variations as related to the requested signage variance, noting that the variance request was based on the uniqueness of the front lot line.*

*Chairperson Giuliano asked if any person would like to cross examine or speak in favor or against this petition, or for public comment. Hearing none, she asked for the staff report.*

*Ms. Papke presented the interdepartmental review committee report, which was entered into the public record in its entirety. The subject property is located on Finley Road south of Roosevelt Road. The existing building on the property was formerly a motor vehicle service business. The petitioner proposes to renovate the building for use as a smoking establishment. The petitioner will make façade improvements. No site improvements are proposed.*

*Smoking establishments are conditional uses in the underlying B4A District. The petitioner proposes an interior renovation of the building*

*with the final layout providing a 2,000-square-foot seating area, counter space and back of house areas. The submitted plans show a fenced patio area on the west side of the building for use by customers. Outdoor service areas are also conditional uses in the B4A District. Staff notes that smoking establishments are operationally similar to other uses permitted by right in the B4A District.*

*The petitioner is requesting a variance to allow 100 square feet of wall signage on the building, where a strict interpretation of the Sign Ordinance based on the frontage of the property along Finley Road would permit 73 square feet. Staff is supportive of the requested variance based on the unique layout of the property, which has a front property line that is substantially narrower than the buildable area of the property. Ms. Papke said that a diagram in the staff report illustrated the impact the unusual lot shape had on the amount of signage allowed on the building.*

*The petitioner is also requesting a conditional use to recognize existing off-site parking arrangements, and variances to recognize existing nonconformities for building setbacks and parking lot and landscape design. Given the history of development on the property and its position as an outlot in a larger shopping center development, staff recommends approval of this conditional use and variations.*

*Chairperson Giuliano asked if there were any questions or comments on the staff report. Hearing none, she opened the meeting to comments from the Commissioners.*

*Chairperson Giuliano asked for more information about the outdoor service area. She also asked if the smoking establishment would allow hookah only, or if cigarettes and cigars would be permitted.*

*Mr. Daniel said that the smoking establishment operator preferred not to permit cigarette smoke inside the building. He said that the outdoor service area may allow space for cigarette smoking.*

*Chairperson Giuliano asked for clarification that the requested variance would allow 100 square feet of wall signage, where the Sign Ordinance would allow 73 square feet. Ms. Papke said this was correct.*

*Mr. Daniel noted that the outdoor smoking activity would be at least 30 feet off the west property line.*

*Commissioner Verson asked about the location of the outdoor service area for the smoking establishment relative to the restaurant at 505 W. Roosevelt.*

*Mr. Daniel said the patio would be on the south side of the building at 1210 S. Finley. The door into the restaurant at 505 W. Roosevelt would be on the northeast side of that building.*

*Commissioner Johnston asked about airflow and ventilation, and whether odors would be emitted from the business.*

*Mr. Daniel said that the ventilation from the building would need to stay away from intakes for other buildings. He said the outdoor service area should not have impacts to nearby properties. He noted the inside of the building will include ventilation designed by the architect to meet building codes.*

*Chairperson Giuliano noted there were not a lot of other businesses immediately around the building, so the potential for odor impacts to other businesses would be minimal. She asked about hours of operation and whether the sign would be illuminated 24 hours per day.*

*Mr. Daniel said the smoking establishment might be open 10 am to midnight or 2 am. He said the sign would be illuminated 24 hours a day but would be dimmed down as appropriate.*

*Commissioner Verson said she appreciated the sustainability of re-using an existing building.*

**On a motion by Commissioner Verson, and a second by Commissioner Sweetser, the Plan Commission voted 4-0 to recommend that the Village Board approve the petition associated with PC 25-05 subject to the five (5) conditions in the staff report:**

- 1. That the petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report;**
- 2. That the petitioner shall develop the site in accordance with the plans submitted as part of this petition and referenced in the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report;**
- 3. That the refuse disposal area on the property at 505 W. Roosevelt Road shall serve the subject property, unless and until such time as arrangements are made for refuse collection on each property individually;**
- 4. That the petitioner shall apply for and receive building permits for the proposed improvements; and**

5. That this approval shall be subject to the commencement time provisions as set forth within Section 155.103(F)(11).

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 4 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, and Alissa Verson

**Absent:** 3 - Tony Invergo, Robert Spreenber, and Brendan Flanigan

## **Business Meeting**

### **Approval of Minutes**

A motion was made by Commissioner Verson, seconded by Chairperson Giuliano, that the minutes of the January 27, 2025 meetings be approved.

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 4 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, and Alissa Verson

**Absent:** 3 - Tony Invergo, Robert Spreenber, and Brendan Flanigan

### **Public Participation**

There was no Public Participation.

### **DuPage County Hearings**

There was no DuPage County Hearings.

### **Chairperson's Report**

There was no Chairperson's report

### **Planner's Report**

There was no Planner's Report

### **Unfinished Business**

There was no Unfinished Business.

### **New Business**

There was no New Business.

### **Subdivision Reports**

There was no Subdivision Reports.

## **Site Plan Approvals**

There was no Site Plan Approvals.

## **Workshops**

There was no Workshop.

## **Adjournment**

A motion was made by Commissioner Sweetser, seconded by Chairperson Giuliano, to adjourn the meeting at 8:40 p.m. The motion passed by an unanimous vote.