

Village of Lombard

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



Minutes

Monday, January 26, 2026

7:00 PM

This is a Special Meeting

Village Hall Board Room

Plan Commission

*Leigh Giuliano, Chairperson
Commissioners: Ruth Sweetser, Bill Johnston,
Alissa Verson, Robert Spreenberg,
Brendan Flanigan, Farrah Ali,
Bill Ware, and Michelle Johnson
Village Staff Liaison: Anna Papke*

Call to Order

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

Pledge of Allegiance

Chairperson Giuliano led the Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call of Members

Present 8 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Robert Spreenberg, Alissa Verson, Brendan Flanigan, Farrah Ali, Bill Ware, and Michelle Johnson

Absent 1 - Bill Johnston

***Also Present:** Anna Papke, AICP Planning and Zoning Manager, Trevor Dick, FAICP, LEED AP, Director of Economic and Community Development, and Jason Guisinger, Legal Counsel to the Plan Commission.*

Chairperson Giuliano called the order of the agenda.

Ms. Papke read the Public Hearing Procedures and Rules of Decorum as written by the Plan Commission.

Public Hearings

[260019](#)

PC 26-03: 68 Eisenhower Lane North - Learning Center

The petitioner requests the Village grant a conditional use, pursuant to Section 155.420(C)(17) of the Zoning Ordinance, to allow for a Learning Center (indoor soccer training facility) within the I Limited Industrial District. (DISTRICT #3)

Sworn in to present the petition was Anna Papke, Planning and Zoning Manager, and Ryan Keefe, the petitioner.

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. Keefe introduced himself as the director of Flow Academy, LLC., and presented the petition. He explained that Flow Academy plans to offer one-on-one and small group soccer training classes on the subject property. There would be no tournaments and all activities

would be inside the building.

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 petitioner proposes to operate an athletic training center offering indoor soccer instruction on the subject property, which is a warehouse and office building located in the I District. The business will offer instruction to small groups and individual students. No tournaments will be held on site.

Athletic training facilities are classified as learning centers, which are conditional uses in the Industrial District. Fire, Public Works, Building, and Engineering have reviewed the plans and have no comment on the petition. The Planning Division notes that athletic training facilities are typically low-impact with respect to traffic and noise. The Village has previously approved six athletic training facilities in the Eisenhower Lane business park. Staff finds the petition meets the standards for conditional uses in the Village Code and recommends approval of the petition subject to the standards 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 Ali asked about the ratio of teachers to students, and the age of the students. Mr. Keefe said teacher: student ratios would be 1:1 or 2:3. Students would be six to 18 years old.

Commissioner Sweetser said the proposed business was a worthy endeavor. She asked about plans for athlete development. Mr. Keefe said the business would present coaching philosophies and concepts to students as part of the training program.

On a motion by Commissioner Spreenberg, and a second by Commissioner Sweetser, the Plan Commission voted 8-0 to recommend that the Village Board approve the petition associated with PC 26-03 subject to the three (3) 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 apply for and receive building permits for

proposed improvements that requires a permit; and

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

Aye: 8 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Robert Spreenberg, Alissa Verson, Brendan Flanigan, Farrah Ali, Bill Ware, and Michelle Johnson

Absent: 1 - Bill Johnston

[260024](#)

PC 26-01: Text amendment - Pet shops with dogs and without dogs

The petitioner, the Village of Lombard, is requesting approval of a text amendment to chapter 155 of the Village Code (Zoning Code) to (i) define and distinguish pet shops that do not offer live dogs for sale or transfer from pet shops that do offer live dogs for sale or transfer, and (ii) revise the applicable Business District use regulations to classify pet shops without dog sales as permitted uses and pet shops with dog sales as conditional uses in the zoning districts where pet shops are currently allowed. (DISTRICTS - ALL)

Sworn in to present the petition was Anna Papke, Planning and Zoning Manager.

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.

Ms. Papke presented the petition and staff report. The IDRC report for PC 26-01 was entered into the public record in its entirety. Staff is proposing a text amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to classify pet shops without dogs as permitted uses and pet shops with dogs as conditional uses in the B2, B3, B4, B4A, B5 and B5A Districts.

Currently, the Zoning Ordinance lists "pet shop" as a permitted land use in the B2, B3, B4, B4A, B5, and B5A Districts. The term "pet shop" is not explicitly defined in the Zoning Ordinance. Under the current regulations, all businesses that offer animals for retail sale or adoption are considered "pet shops". There is no distinction between pet shops that offer dogs and those that do not offer dogs.

Recent changes to licensing of pet shops at the state level and increased interest in how municipalities regulate businesses that offer dogs for sale or adoption have prompted staff to review the Lombard Zoning Ordinance with respect to businesses that offer dogs for sale or adoption. Staff finds that pet shops with dogs may produce land use impacts that are typically reviewed through the conditional use approval process. Such impacts include sanitation, ventilation, noise,

animal housing, and outdoor animal care areas. Moreover, staff finds that other businesses that involve the housing and care of dogs are classified as conditional uses in the Lombard Zoning Ordinance. Such land uses include animal hospitals, animal kennels, animal day care, and animal training businesses.

The proposed text amendments will clarify the zoning requirements for pet shops that sell or make live dogs available for adoption to the public. The amendments will promote consistency across land use categories by ensuring that all types of businesses that house and care for dogs are classified as conditional uses. Ms. Papke said that the amendment included the addition of three new terms to the Definitions section of the Zoning Ordinance to provide additional clarity. Staff recommended approval of the text amendment as presented in the staff report.

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

Ana Soskic addressed the Plan Commission. She said she is the owner of Furry Babies, a store that sells puppies in Yorktown Center. She said Furry Babies has been in operation since 2009, and provides purpose-bred dogs to customers. She said the business works with Carriage Animal Hospital to ensure all dogs on the premises are in good health. She said the proposed text amendment had been initiated after she approached the Village about the possibility of moving Furry Babies to a new location. She wanted to ensure that the proposed text amendment would not impact her ability to relocate. She shared additional operational details of her business.

Chair Giuliano invited staff to respond to Ms. Soskic's comments. Ms. Papke said that PC 26-01 is a proposed text amendment that, if adopted, would apply to all businesses selling dogs in the Village. If the amendment was adopted, future petitions for conditional use approval for a business that sold dogs would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis by the Plan Commission. This evaluation would include consideration of many of the operational details mentioned by Ms. Soskic in reference to her business.

Ms. Soskic said that Furry Babies was originally in Bloomingdale but had relocated to Lombard in 2020. She said the operations of the business had not materially changed since the business was granted a certificate of occupancy in 2020. She said she understands the need to

clarify the regulations in the Zoning Ordinance but wants to ensure the text amendment does not become a hinderance to her business.

Chairperson Giuliano asked if there were any questions or comments on the petition and staff report. Hearing none, she opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners.

Commissioner Spreenberg asked if dog boarding businesses are currently classified as pet shops. Ms. Papke said they are classified as either animal kennels or animal hospitals in the case of a veterinary office that offers boarding.

Commissioner Johnson asked if the Fire Marshal's comment about fire sprinklers would apply to any business with animals or just to businesses with dogs. Ms. Papke said she believed it applied to any business with animals, and certainly to any business with dogs.

Commissioner Verson asked if a pet shop with dogs would be included under the definition of a boarding facility but a pet shop not selling dogs would be classified differently.

Ms. Papke said the proposed text amendment included a new definition for "pet shop, dog sales". Under the proposed regulations, a pet shop selling dogs would be classified as a pet "shop, dog sales" for purposes of certificates of occupancy and zoning entitlements.

Commissioner Spreenberg noted that the Plan Commission is tasked with reviewing land uses and potential impacts to surrounding properties. Ms. Papke agreed.

On a motion by Commissioner Spreenberg, and a second by Commissioner Ware, the Plan Commission voted 8-0 to recommend that the Village Board approve the petition associated with PC 26-01.

Aye: 8 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Robert Spreenberg, Alissa Verson, Brendan Flanigan, Farrah Ali, Bill Ware, and Michelle Johnson

Absent: 1 - Bill Johnston

[260032](#)

PC 26-02: Text Amendments to Chapter 155 - Fence Materials and AC Setbacks for Single-family Residential Properties

The Plan Commission transmits for your consideration its recommendation regarding the above-referenced petition. The petitioner, the Village of Lombard, is requesting text amendments to Village Code Chapter 155, Zoning Code, and any other relevant sections for clarity and consistency.

Proposed amendments include the following:

1. Amend Section 155.205 of the Village Code, Fences, wall, and hedges, to incorporate regulations for fencing materials.
2. Amend Section 155.212 of the Village Code, Permitted obstructions in required yards, to reduce the side yard setback for new central air-conditioning systems. (DISTRICT ALL)

Sworn in to present the petition was Anna Papke, Planning and Zoning Manager.

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.

Ms. Papke presented the petition and staff report. The IDRC report for PC 26-02 was entered into the public record in its entirety. Planning staff periodically reviews the Zoning Ordinance to ensure that the Village's land development regulations reflect the priorities of the Village as well as current best practices. Following a recent review, staff is proposing three amendments:

1. Fence materials

Proposed amendments to add provisions for permitted fence materials. Permitted fence materials will include decay-resistant wood, vinyl/PVC, aluminum, masonry, and chain link in side and rear yards. This amendment is being proposed in combination with Building Code amendments to address construction of fences. Both amendments are intended to provide clarity to residents and fence contractors about the types of materials permitted to be used as fences and appropriate construction practices.

2. AC units in side yards of single-family residences

The current side-yard setback for new AC units on single-family residential lots is 6 feet. Staff has received feedback from the Building Division that residents have requested the ability to place new AC units in side yard setbacks. Residents would like to avoid placing AC units behind the house where there may be a patio or other area in active use by the resident. Building staff has advised that advances in AC technology have resulted in quieter models, reducing concerns that units in side yard setbacks will create noise impacts for neighboring properties. Therefore, staff recommends reducing the side yard setback for AC units on single-family residential lots from six feet to four feet. This will provide increased flexibility for homeowners while ensuring there is adequate space between the unit and the property

line for maintenance and replacements.

3. Metal siding on building in Office and Business Districts

Staff proposes a new section in the General Provisions of the Zoning Ordinance to prohibit metal siding on buildings in the Office and Business Districts. Recently, staff has received several inquiries from individuals considering constructing prefabricated metal buildings (pole barns, Quonset huts) along commercial corridors in the Village. Staff believes the increased interest in these types of buildings is due to changes in construction and materials costs as well as marketing efforts by building manufacturers.

Staff notes that these metal-sided buildings are not consistent with the existing aesthetic characteristics of the Village's major commercial corridors, particularly St. Charles Road and Roosevelt Road. Adopting regulations to prohibit this type of building façade in the Office and Commercial Districts will promote new construction that complements and enhances existing development in these districts.

Staff recommended approval of the text amendments as presented in the staff report.

Chairperson Giuliano asked if there were any questions or comments on the petition and staff report. Hearing none, she opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners.

Commissioner Johnson asked if the proposed permitted fence materials were consistent with existing fences in the Village. Ms. Papke said 99% of the fences in the Village are constructed of the materials on the list. Occasionally, Code Enforcement staff receives calls about properties where non-fencing materials, such as pallets, tires, or crushed glass melded together with mortar, have been used to build fences. The text amendment would clarify that those materials should not be used for fences.

Commissioner Johnson said that of the two examples of metal-sided buildings provided in the staff report, she agreed that the all-metal building was not compatible with existing development, but she could see that the second example showing a building with some metal siding and brick accents might be appropriate in some applications. She asked if it would be possible to allow buildings with some metal siding, either through a variance process or revised regulations. She also asked about prevalence of these buildings within the Business

and Office Districts.

Ms. Papke said that as written, the regulations would prohibit all metal siding. Anyone wanting to use metal siding in Business or Office Districts would need to seek a variance. Ms. Papke said it may be difficult to prove a hardship that would justify a variance to a regulation that is essentially a design requirement. She suggested other approaches to address Commissioner Johnson's concerns might include revised regulations that allow some portion of the façade to be metal, or perhaps regulating metal-sided buildings as conditional uses. She said that metal-sided buildings were not prevalent in the Business and Office Districts, but that the Building Division had noticed increased interest in the construction industry in using these building outside their traditional industrial applications. This had prompted staff to propose regulations to limit their use in districts where they may be aesthetically incompatible with existing development.

Commissioner Spreenberg asked if the proposed fence regulations would assist Code Enforcement staff. Ms. Papke said they would.

Commissioner Spreenberg asked if the current regulations allow metal-sided buildings. Ms. Papke said they do.

Commissioner Flanigan asked if the list of fence materials would limit using new materials, and if it would be possible to have language that would allow for use of non-listed materials if deemed appropriate. Ms. Papke said that it is challenging to regulate for hypothetical conditions/materials. She said the Village tries to limit the number of regulations that require a member of staff to make an interpretation about an appropriate material, as it introduces a degree of subjectivity. She said staff would be happy to research additional materials if there were specific materials Commissioner Flanigan had in mind.

Commissioner Flanigan asked about extruded aluminum fences. Ms. Papke said that they would be permitted as an aluminum fence.

Regarding the metal-sided building amendments, Commissioner Flanigan said that as written, it would exclude buildings with 10% metal siding. Ms. Papke agreed.

Commissioner Flanigan said that he agreed a full building with metal siding would not be compatible, but he would support finding a way to allow some metal siding.

Commissioner Ali asked for more information about the number of inquiries the Village had received about constructing metal-sided buildings. Ms. Papke said there had been a couple of calls about potentially constructing a metal-sided building on a property on St. Charles Road. The Building Director also had received general inquiries from contractors about whether Lombard would allow those types of buildings.

Commissioner Ware asked for clarification that any metal-siding would be prohibited under the proposed regulations. Ms. Papke confirmed it would.

Commissioner Verson asked if there was a distinction between metal siding and metal trim. Ms. Papke said there was no distinction.

Commissioner Spreenberg said he sensed a reluctance on the part of the Plan Commission to approve the metal-sided building amendment as written, but that they were on board with the fence and AC amendments. He suggested the fence and AC amendments be moved on for Board consideration but that staff and the Plan Commission look at revised regulations for metal-sided buildings. He asked if staff was aware of other communities regulating metal-sided buildings based on a percentage of the façade.

Ms. Papke said there are examples of such regulations, or regulations that would prohibit metal-siding on some facades (front, or street-visible) but allow it on others. Staff would research options and bring them to the Plan Commission for further review.

Commissioner Flanigan agreed that he would be open to regulations that might allow metal siding on less prominent facades, with stricter regulations for street-facing facades.

On a motion by Commissioner Spreenberg, and a second by Commissioner Ware, the Plan Commission voted 8-0 to recommend that the Village Board approve the text amendments for fence materials and AC unit setbacks as presented in petition PC 26-02. The Plan Commission requested that staff conduct further research on metal-sided buildings and bring revised regulations back to the Plan Commission for review.

Aye: 8 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Robert Spreenberg, Alissa Verson, Brendan Flanigan, Farrah Ali, Bill Ware, and Michelle Johnson

Absent: 1 - Bill Johnston

Approval of Minutes

On a motion made by Commissioner Verson, seconded by Commissioner Ali, followed with an unanimous vote. The Plan Commission has approved the Minutes from the November 17, 2025 meeting.

Aye: 8 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Robert Spreenberg, Alissa Verson, Brendan Flanigan, Farrah Ali, Bill Ware, and Michelle Johnson

Absent: 1 - Bill Johnston

Public Participation

There was no Public Participation

DuPage County Hearings

There were no DuPage County Hearings

Chairperson's Report

There was no Chairperson's Report

Planner's Report

There was no Planner's Report, Ms. Papke offered a reminder of the upcoming Plan Commission Training on Monday February 2, 2026.

Unfinished Business

There was no Unfinished Business

New Business

There was no New Business

Subdivision Reports

There were no Subdivision Reports

Site Plan Approvals

There were no Site Plan Approvals

Workshops

There were no workshops

Adjournment

A motion was made by Commissioner Ware, seconded by Commissioner Giuliano that this meeting of the Plan Commission be adjourned at 7:45 p.m. The motion followed by an unanimous vote.