

Village of Lombard

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



Minutes

Monday, January 27, 2025

7:00 PM

THIS IS A SPECIAL MEETING

Village Hall

Plan Commission

Leigh Giuliano, Chairperson

Commissioners:

Ruth Sweetser, Bill Johnston, Tony Invergo,

Alissa Verson, Robert Spreenberg 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 5 - Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Robert Spreenberg, Alissa Verson, and Brendan Flanigan

Absent 2 - Ruth Sweetser, and Tony Invergo

Also present: William Heniff, AICP, Director Community Development, 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

[240397](#)

PC 24-15: 434 E. North Avenue- Motor Vehicle Sales and Service (Continued from 12-16-24 Plan Commission Meeting)

The petitioner requests that the Village take the following actions on the subject property located within the B4 Corridor Commercial District:

1. Approval of a conditional use pursuant to Section 155.416(C) (15) of the Lombard Village Code to allow for a motor vehicle sales business; and
2. Approval of a conditional use pursuant to Section 155.416(C) (16) of the Lombard Village Code to allow for a motor vehicle service business. (DISTRICT #4)

Sworn in to present the petition were Sam Daya, petitioner; Anna Papke, Planning and Zoning Manager; William Heniff, Director of Community Development.

Mr. Daya stated that they are seeking to re-establish the previously approved use of the retail vehicle sales. He addressed the concern

raised in the staff report about the sales floor in the building by saying that the sales floor will not be used for displaying cars. He also noted that the triple basin sink had been recently inspected and is operational. A fire sprinkler system and fire alarm system was installed in 2007. A new system was installed in 2021. A recent inspection of the system revealed a few minor problems that are currently being fixed by Chicago Metro. They would like to install a second wall sign for the vehicle sales business.

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 IDRC report for PC 24-15, which was entered into the public record in its entirety. There is an existing rim and tire business operating on the subject property at 434 E. North Avenue. The petitioner proposes to add a second business selling vehicles on the property. Motor vehicle service and motor vehicle sales are both conditional uses in the B4 District. The subject property received approval of a conditional use for motor vehicle sales with ancillary service in 2007. The 2007 approval for vehicle sales has lapsed because the motor vehicle sales component of the business ceased operations more than a year ago. The petitioner is seeking to reestablish the conditional uses for both motor vehicle sales and service.

The petitioner does not propose any exterior improvements other than an additional sign. In consideration of the petition, staff notes that motor vehicle sales are common uses along the North Avenue corridor; motor vehicle sales businesses are operating on the properties adjacent to the east and west of the subject property. The subject property has contained motor vehicle service businesses periodically since 1985, with no known adverse impacts to the adjacent properties. Staff recommends approval of the petition subject to the conditions in the staff report.

Chairperson Giuliano asked if there were any questions for staff or the petitioner.

Commissioner Johnston asked if there was going to be a specific showroom for the sale of cars. Mr. Daya responded that they own the dealership next door to the east and to the west. Prior to 2021, the three properties were run as one dealership. Therefore, a showroom in the subject property's building is not necessary.

Commissioner Johnston asked if the new sign mentioned would have both businesses or two separate signs. Mr. Daya responded that they

will propose two separate signs.

Chairperson Giuliano asked if there were any additional comments. Hearing none, she asked for a motion from the Commissioners.

On a motion by Commissioner Spreenberg, and a second by Commissioner Johnston, the Plan Commission voted 5-0 to recommend that the Village Board approve the petition associated with PC 24-15, subject to the following seven (7) conditions:

- 1. That the petitioner shall develop the site in accordance with plans submitted as part of this request**
- 2. That the petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report.**
- 3. The fence along the north property line shall be maintained in good condition at a height of six (6) feet minimum or eight (8) feet maximum.**
- 4. The vehicle display/sales area shall be limited to parking spaces on the parking lot. Moreover, all vehicles parked and/or displayed on the subject property shall be in operable condition.**
- 5. All vehicles are to be loaded and unloaded on the subject property and at no time shall any vehicle be loaded from or unloaded to public right-of-way. Vehicles shall not encroach into the public right-of-way at any time including blocking the sidewalk or designated ADA parking spaces.**
- 6. All motor vehicle service activities shall always be performed inside the building.**
- 7. This approval shall be subject to the commencement time provisions as set forth within Section 155.103(F)(11).**

Aye: 5 - Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Robert Spreenberg, Alissa Verson, and Brendan Flanigan

Absent: 2 - Ruth Sweetser, and Tony Invergo

[250040](#)

PC 25-01: 227 S. Westmore-Meyers Road - Nine-unit multi-family building

The petitioner is requesting the following for a property located within the R4 Limited General Residential District:

1. Variation under Section 155.103(C)(8)(c) from Section 155.409(D)(4) which requires 2,800 square feet of lot area per dwelling unit (15.4 dwelling units per acre), and limits the number of dwellings to seven (7), in order to allow nine (9) three-bedroom dwellings (2,248 square feet per dwelling, 19.35 dwellings per acre).

Sworn in to present the petition was Anna Papke, Planning and Zoning Manager, and the development team: Sujath Mohammed, property owner; Mark Daniel, attorney; Jiun-Guang Lin, engineer; Jeff Cook, landscape architect; and Ray H.C. Fang, architect.

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. Mohammed, property owner, addressed the Plan Commission. He had been in construction for over 14 years and constructed multiple projects. He introduced Mark Daniel, attorney
Mr. Daniel presented the petition. He said the petition is seeking a two-unit increase in density. He noted the subject property was a lot platted in 1908. He introduced the project team.*

Mr. Daniel said the property is a rectangular lot, with residential uses located on adjacent lots. He said the home on the subject property is over 100 years old. He said the subject property and adjacent lots were not likely to develop with a single-family detached use. He described several multifamily developments in the immediate area. He described nearby duplexes and commercial uses.

Mr. Daniel showed the proposed site plan and described the proposed apartment building, which would have two- and three-bedroom units. Parking would be provided on a surface lot in front of the building. The building would meet the required 50-foot setback from the rear (east) property line. Mr. Daniel said many of the lots in the area in the R4 District have alleys behind them. The subject property does not have an alley, and this has impacted the rear setback and resulted in the building being three stories tall to accommodate the required setbacks. He noted there are accessible living units in the building.

Mr. Daniel showed the landscape plan. A proposed sign would comply with the Sign Ordinance. The property would meet landscaping and open space requirements. He noted that the narrowest elevation of the building would be visible to the R2 District to the east of the subject property. The east elevation would not have windows, which would benefit the privacy of adjacent property owners.

Mr. Daniel presented a table showing densities of surrounding developments. He described single-family and multi-family developments in the area. He said most of the densities that he had analyzed in the neighborhood exceeded the allowable density in the R4 District. He said many of these developments were on older lots.

Mr. Daniel said the density variance was required to allow additional units to fill out the building envelope. He said it was not practical to have a split-level roof, and the developer did not want to build overly large units. Mr. Daniel reviewed the variance request against the standards for variations. Mr. Daniel said the additional units would not create adverse impacts for the neighborhood and would not create traffic impacts.

Mr. Daniel said that drainage in the area would be improved by the

development, as more rainwater would be captured and conveyed into the stormwater system. He said the development team had reviewed the comments and conditions of approval in the IDRC report and found them acceptable.

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.

Mr. Heniff presented the interdepartmental review committee report, which was entered into the public record in its entirety. Mr. Heniff reviewed the interdepartmental review comments from Village departments. He said the petition was before the Plan Commission due to the requested variance for density. Mr. Heniff said the underlying R4 zoning designation signals the subject property is part of a multi-family area. The Comp Plan recommended low-medium density residential on the property. Mr. Heniff said the proposed density of 19.35 units per acre is consistent with this designation. Mr. Heniff said the proposed development meets all bulk requirements other than density. This meant the envelope of the building could be approved by right, the only issue was how many units would be inside the building. Staff recommended approval of the petition subject to the conditions in the IDRC report, finding that existing development patterns in the area that exceed density in the R4 District were a contributing factor to the variance. Mr. Heniff noted the petitioner hosted a neighborhood meeting the previous week, and staff had not received any official comments on the petition prior to the public hearing.

Chairperson Giuliano asked if there were any questions or comments on the staff report.

Commissioner Spreenberg asked if Mr. Heniff had said that the proposed density was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Heniff said the proposed development was consistent with the density recommended for the property by the Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Giuliano asked about the location of a recently constructed apartment building. Mr. Heniff said that development was at 215 S. Westmore-Meyers Road.

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 Johnston asked about the 50-foot setback on the east side of the property, and whether it would be developed with picnic

tables, recreational equipment, or other recreational areas. Mr. Daniel said the area to the east is intended to remain open space. He said there will be no lighting in that area, it would be a passive open space area.

Commissioner Johnston asked about the landscaping proposed for the east side of the property. Jeff Cook, landscape architect, described the trees, bushes, and other plantings proposed for the east property line.

Commissioner Johnston asked if there is a fence on the rear property line. Mr. Daniel said there are existing fences along the abutting property lines.

Mr. Johnston asked if Mr. Daniel had spoken to the property owner immediately to the east of the subject property. Mr. Daniel said he had spoken to some of the neighbors behind the subject property, but had not been able to talk with the direct abutters.

Commissioner Johnston asked if staff had talked with the neighbor abutting the east of the subject property. Mr. Heniff said that notices had been send out for the public hearing as well as the neighborhood meeting, and staff had not received any feedback from that property owner as a result of those notices.

Commissioner Flanigan asked if the petitioner had considered using excess space in the building envelope for a shared amenity rather than additional dwelling units. Mr. Daniel said the petitioner had considered an amenity but had decided against this approach.

Commissioner Spreenberg asked if the building would be rental or condo units. Mr. Daniel said they would be apartment units.

On a motion by Commissioner Verson, and a second by Commissioner Johnston, the Plan Commission voted 5-0 to recommend that the Village Board approve the petition associated with PC 25-01 subject to the four (4) conditions in the staff report:

1. That the petitioner shall develop the site in accordance with plans submitted as part of this request;
2. That the petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report;
3. The petitioner shall record a one-lot plat of subdivision of the subject property prior to obtaining a building permit for the proposed apartment building; and
4. 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: 5 - Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Robert Spreenberg, Alissa Verson, and Brendan Flanigan

Absent: 2 - Ruth Sweetser, and Tony Invergo

[250041](#)

PC 25-02: Text Amendment - Electric Vehicle (EV) Parking & Director Title

The petitioner, the Village of Lombard, is requesting text amendments to the following Sections of Village Code:

1. Create a new Section 155.228: Electric Vehicle Parking to establish regulations on requirements such as location and design
2. Amend Section 155.802 to add definitions related to electric vehicle parking
3. Amend Sections 153, 154 and 155 to remove “Director of Community Development” and replace with “Director of Economic Development and Planning” and/or “Director of Building” as applicable
4. Any other relevant sections for clarity and consistency.
(DISTRICT ALL)

Sworn in to present the petition was William Heniff, Director of Community Development.

Mr. Heniff presented the petition and staff report. The IDRC report for PC 25-02 was entered into the public record in its entirety. Staff is proposing two items as part of the petition. The first is Electric Vehicle charging stations. Approximately one year ago, a petition was approved for a charging station located in the Yorktown Target parking lot.

At that time, regulations were not available for the specific use and the petition was used as a test case. The charging station is expected to be installed in early 2026. The Secretary of State’s Department of Motor Vehicles new office at Eastgate Shopping Center is expected to install a bank of EV charging units. Staff proposes zoning provisions to address the emerging land use of electric charging stations.

The proposed text amendment would replace the existing term “gasoline sales” with “fuel center” in anticipation of evolving advancements of fuel technology. The “fuel center” use will remain a conditional use as the activity of purchasing fuel of any kind would require Plan Commission review. A new section specifically outlining electric vehicle charging activities is also proposed. Three stages of electric charging are defined relative to basic terms as the technology

will most likely develop in unknown methods. Level one and level two charging stations are proposed to be permitted as an accessory use to a home or business in every zoning district. Level three is proposed as a commercial fuel center similar to the existing conditional use of gasoline sales in commercial, office and industrial districts. The Village of Schaumburg's EV charging regulations provided a template to include unanticipated guidance such as ADA parking, lighting, notifications, etc. Staff recommends approval of the proposed EV charging regulations.

An additional proposed text amendment addresses a change of job titles. The entire Village Code including the Zoning Code maintains the job title "Director of Community Development" that will need to be replaced with either the title of "Director of Economic Development and Planning" and/or "Director of Building." Mr. Heniff noted that the structure of the Community Development Department will be updated in anticipation of his retirement.

Chairperson Giuliano opened the meeting to public participation. Hearing none, she asked if there were any questions for staff.

Commissioner Johnston asked how the fees and maintenance of a charging station differ from a standard gas station. Mr. Heniff responded that the activity is similar to using a gas pump however the level one and two EV chargers are generally slower than rapid charging units at fueling centers. There is a fee similar to a gas pump as well. He mentioned EV charging stations in Oakbrook and Villa Park as examples of fuel centers that function much like a gas station.

Commissioner Johnston thanked Mr. Heniff for his assistance throughout the years.

Commissioner Spreenberg asked if EV charging stations and gas stations would be grouped together as a conditional use even though an EV charging station is less hazardous than a gas station due to the volatility of gasoline thereby creating unintended burdens for EV charging stations. Mr. Heniff responded that the accessory use of charging stations would require a permit only. The principal use of a EV charging station would still be a conditional use however less involvement of the Fire Marshall would be expected. The Plan Commission should review circulation and access. After a few petitions, the Plan Commission could consider changing the conditional use to a permitted use.

Commissioner Flanigan asked if the ADA standards would apply to level one and two charging stations. Mr. Heniff responded that ADA standards would not apply to residential homes however a commercial

entity providing a few charging units as an amenity should provide enough space for access.

Commissioner Verson asked if there seemed to be a threshold for creating burdensome conditions to provide affordability and accessibility to EV charging. Mr. Heniff responded that he would anticipate after a few petitions, it may become clear that there are no adverse impacts to amending the use from a conditional use to a permitted use.

Chairperson Giuliano asked if there were any additional comments. Hearing none, she asked for a motion from the Commissioners

On a motion by Commissioner Johnston, and a second by Commissioner Spreenburg, the Plan Commission voted 5-0 to recommend that the Village Board approve the petition associated with PC 25-02.

Aye: 5 - Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Robert Spreenberg, Alissa Verson, and Brendan Flanigan

Absent: 2 - Ruth Sweetser, and Tony Invergo

[250042](#)

PC 25-03: Text Amendment - Clear Lines of Sight Areas

The petitioner, the Village of Lombard, is requesting text amendments to Sections 155.802 (Definitions) and 155.207 (Regulations) as it pertains to clear lines of sight (CLOS) areas. (DISTRICT ALL)

Sworn in to present the petition was William Heniff, Director of Community Development.

Mr. Heniff presented the petition and staff report. The IDRC report for PC 25-03 was entered into the public record in its entirety. Staff is proposing a clear line of sight discussion. An exhibit showing a commercial driveway compared to a residential driveway and a street intersection was displayed.

Mr. Heniff outlined a recent circumstance where an installed sign was projecting into a clear line of sight area of a commercial driveway and St. Charles Road. Though site visits, it appears that the sign did not appear to present a hazard. Exploring this issue further, staff undertook a review effort of the Village's Code provisions to determine if the overall clear line of sight provisions should be amended in similar circumstances.

The Village's traffic consultant, KLOA was engaged in this review effort, and the Public Works Department identified a few intersections that were previously managed with signs to identify a clear line of sight caution that were then considered not necessary. Staff reviewed specific cases in which an amended provisions could be considered in

a easy to apply fashion and based upon some of the recommendations offered within professional traffic publications.

He then stated that the proposed amendments are intended to serve several purposes. First, edits for clarity are offered. He stated that the current code provisions have the regulations within the definition of clear line of sight, which is not a good practice. So the first set of amendments are to remove the regulatory provisions in the current definitions and place the provisions within Section 155.207.

He then displayed an exhibit noting various intersection scenarios and how the amended code would apply. For two interesting rights-of-way, the existing codes do not change. In these cases, the line of sight is based upon the outer edge of the public right-of-way. Nor will the code change for rights-of-way and private residential driveways, as vehicles may be parked in any direction and on any side of the given driveway, so the need to maximize visibility bat these location is desired.

The primary change pertains to commercial driveways entering into public rights-of-way. Currently the line of sight area would be based off of the edge of a commercial driveway. However in these limited cases, the proposed line of sight would be based off of the location where the driver of the vehicle would be located, which would be toward the center of driveway aisle, provided that a stop sign and stop bar are provided at the commercial driveway entrance point to the street. In closing, he stated that a code amendment is a better way to address the issue rather than processing a series of variations that may not meet the standards.

Chairperson Giuliano opened the meeting to public participation and there were no comments offered.

Chairperson Giuliano asked if there were any questions from the Plan Commissioners.

Sprenberg sought confirmation regarding the code change for commercial driveways and the proposed center point of the driveways. He then questioned how this would be applied for driveways with multiple lanes and for two-way driveways. Through discussion, he suggested that perhaps additional language within subsection D should include the term" multi-directional" to provide clarity as to how it would be applied in these circumstances.

Chairperson Giuliano asked if there were any additional comments. Hearing none, she asked for a motion from the Commissioners.

On a motion by Commissioner Sprenberg, and a second by Commissioner

Johnston, the Plan Commission voted 5-0 to recommend that the Village Board approve the petition associated with PC 25-03, with subsection D being amendment to add the term “multi-directional” into the proposed regulation.

Aye: 5 - Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Robert Spreenber, Alissa Verson, and Brendan Flanigan

Absent: 2 - Ruth Sweetser, and Tony Invergo

Business Meeting

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Verson, seconded by Commissioner Spreenber, that the minutes of the December 16, 2024 meetings be approved.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Robert Spreenber, Alissa Verson, and Brendan Flanigan

Absent: 2 - Ruth Sweetser, and Tony Invergo

Public Participation

There was no Public Participation.

DuPage County Hearings

There was no DuPage County Hearings.

Chairperson's Report

The Chairperson deferred to the Director of Community Development.

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 Johnston, seconded by Commissioner Verson, to adjourn the meeting at 8:29 p.m. The motion passed by an unanimous vote.