

Village of Lombard

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



Minutes

Monday, July 28, 2025

7:00 PM

THIS IS A SPECIAL MEETING

Village Hall

Plan Commission

*Leigh Giuliano, Chairperson
Commissioners: Ruth Sweetser, Bill Johnston,
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 6 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Robert Spreenberg, Alissa Verson, and Brendan Flanigan

*Also present: Anna Papke, AICP, Planning & Zoning Manager
Community Development.*

Chairperson Giuliano called the order of the agenda.

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

Public Hearings

[250241](#)

PC 25-11: 1014 S. Main Street (Glenbard East)

The petitioner requests that the Village take the following action on the subject property located within the CRPD Conservation Recreation District Planned Development (Glenbard East Planned Development):

1. Pursuant to Section 155.504 (A) (major changes in a planned development) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance, amend the Glenbard East Planned Development, as established by Ordinance No. 6967, to approve the following:
 - a. An addition to a building in a planned development that changes the location of the building by more than 10 (ten) feet;
 - b. A deviation from Section 155.404(G) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to allow a building addition with a height of 32 feet where a maximum height of 30 feet is permitted; and
 - c. A deviation from Section 155.404(H) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to allow a development with 48% open space, where a minimum of 50% open space is required. (DISTRICT#2)

Sworn in to present the petition was Anna Papke, Planning and Zoning Manager, and the following on behalf of the petitioner: Jessalyn Kelly,

architect; Brian Wesolowski, Justin Wendt, Brian Spencer, and Jeremy Roling, design team members; and Antoine Anderson and Craig Lamp, from Glenbard District 87.

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.

Jessalyn Kelly presented the petition. She provided an overview of the school district's goals and initiatives driving the improvements for the Glenbard East campus. She described three additions proposed for the building: an administrative office addition, a cafeteria addition, and a learning commons addition. She noted a greenhouse would also be constructed.

Ms. Kelly described proposed circulation changes. She noted bus traffic would be directed to the parking lot off Wilson Avenue. Visitors would use the entrance on Main Street. She showed interior images of the additions and described intended use of the space. She showed the proposed site plan. She pointed out three planned parking lot expansions and said these were part of long-term plans to alleviate parking challenges along Wilson Avenue. She explained the construction timeline for the various improvements, running from Fall 2025 to Summer 2027.

Ms. Kelly reviewed the requested deviations for building height and open space.

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. Glenbard District 87 is proposing site improvements to the Glenbard East High School Campus. The improvements consist of three small additions to the building, expansion of on-site parking areas, and reconfiguration of the drive aisle on the east side of the building to eliminate several curb cuts along Main Street.

The school campus is a planned development in the CR District. The petitioner is requesting an amendment to the planned development with a building height deviation and an open space deviation to

construct the improvements as proposed. The building height deviation will allow the cafeteria addition to have a height of 32 feet above grade. The permitted height in the CR District is 30 feet. The additional two feet will allow for a smooth transition between the addition and existing building. The reduction in open space will allow for construction of additional on-site parking spaces, which has been identified as a priority for both the school district and the Village as a way of improving traffic circulation and parking along Wilson Avenue. Staff is supportive of the requested deviations.

During the design process, the petitioner worked with the Village and the Village's traffic consultant, KLOA, to identify areas of improvement for traffic circulation on and around campus. KLOA evaluated existing conditions in Spring 2025, and recommended the petitioner's plan should address the following: separate loading areas for passenger vehicles and buses; create dedicated loading area for buses; increase on-campus parking in effort to reduce parking on Wilson Avenue; and improve traffic flow along Main Street by eliminating curb cuts and increasing vehicle storage area in the drive aisle on the east side of the building. KLOA has reviewed the submitted plan against their initial recommendations and finds it is in general conformance with the recommendations in the Spring 2025 existing conditions report. Ms. Papke noted that Brendan May of KLOA was present and available to answer any technical questions about KLOA's findings.

Staff found the petition meets the relevant standards in the Village Code and recommends approval of the request 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 Johnston said he appreciates the efforts the district is making to improve parking on campus and in the neighborhood. He asked if the open space deviation request accounted for all future parking lots. Ms. Kelly confirmed the proposed parking was included in the requested deviation.

Commissioner Sweetser asked about the removal of curb cuts on Main Street. Ms. Kelly said the intent is to pull more vehicles off Main Street using the northern driveway, then filter them down to the signal on the south end of the site to leave the campus. The intent was to reduce the

number of places where vehicles could enter Main Street.

Commissioner Flanigan asked if future enrollment projections were taken into consideration during the planning process. Ms. Kelly said the school district does enrollment projections and these had been accounted for during the planning process

On a motion by Commissioner Verson, and a second by Commissioner Spreenberg, the Plan Commission voted 6-0 to recommend that the Village Board approve the petition associated with PC 25-11 subject to the four (4) 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, except as they may be changed to conform to Village Code;
3. That the petitioner shall apply for and receive building permits for the proposed improvements; and
4. This approval shall be subject to the commencement time provisions as set forth within Section 155.103(F)(11) of Village Code.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giulano, Bill Johnston, Robert Spreenberg, Alissa Verson and Brendan Flanigan.

[250254](#)

PC 25-10: 1308-1330 S. Meyers Road (Pinnacle)

The petitioner requests that the Village take the following actions on the subject property (1308-1330 S. Meyers Road), located within the Village of Lombard R2PD Single-Family Residence District Planned Development (Pinnacle Planned Development)

1. Amend the approvals previously requested through Plan Commission petition PC 24-07, and granted by Ordinance No. 8292, as follows:
 - a. Pursuant to Section 155.504 of Village Code, approve the following major changes to the Pinnacle Planned Development:
 - i. Amendment to provide for development of 11 detached single-family residences, where the previous approval provided for 22 detached single-family residences;
 - ii. Pursuant to Section 155.407(F)(1)(a)(iv), which requires a front yard of 30 feet, deviations in order to adjust the prior relief granted for 22 lots and allow

front yards of 28 feet on Lots 1-3 and 25 feet on Lots 4-11, as provided for in the Planned Development Site Plan and preliminary plat of subdivision;

- iii. Pursuant to Section 155.407(F)(2), which requires a corner side yard of 20 feet, deviations in order to adjust the prior relief granted for 22 lots and allow corner side yards of nine (9) feet on Lot 4, and ten (10) feet on Lot 11, as provided for in the Planned Development Site Plan (all dimensions measured to the lot line shared with Outlot A);
 - iv. Pursuant to Section 154.506(D), variations in order to permit 11 lots with frontage on the private streets within the subdivision, where the previous approval provided this relief for 22 lots;
 - v. Pursuant to Section 155.210 and 155.210(A)(2)(b), a variation in order to allow an above-ground utility cabinet before the principal building and allow the cabinet in front of the south and east walls of the building on Lot 3, where previously this relief was granted relative to the same location on prior Lot 6;
- b. Elimination of the following relief approved by Ordinance 8292:
- i. Pursuant to Section 155.407(E), deviations to allow individual lot widths less than 60 feet;
 - ii. Pursuant to 155.407(F)(3), deviations to allow interior side yards of less than six (6) feet;
- c. Preservation of the following relief approved by Ordinance 8292:
- i. Pursuant to Section 155.407(G)(2) of Village Code, approve a conditional use for building height not to exceed 38 feet or three stories;
 - ii. Pursuant to Sections 155.510(A)(1) and Section 155.407(H), deviations in order to allow open space to be calculated across all parcels in the planned development rather than on a parcel-by-parcel basis, and to allow a development with 45% open space where 50% open space is required;
 - iii. Pursuant to Section 155.205(A)(1)(c), a variation in order to allow, as shown in the Landscape Plan and Planned Development Fence Plan, a 6-foot fence on Outlot A at all locations (a portion of the north fence extends along the abutting front yard to the north) except near the Meyers Road and 14th

- Street driveways where a 4-foot fence is depicted;
- iv. Pursuant to Section 155.711, variations in order to allow innovative landscaping per the submitted Landscape Plan;
 - v. Pursuant to Section 154.304(D)(2) and Section 154.306(D)(2), variations in order to allow public improvements to the School Street and 14th Street rights-of-way depicted in the preliminary engineering plan, Planned Development Site Plan and Landscape Plan, as determined upon hearing and decision;
 - vi. Pursuant to Section 154.304(D)(3), Section 154.306(D)(3) and Section 154.309, variations in order to allow improvements to the Meyers Road right-of-way depicted in the preliminary engineering plan, Planned Development Site Plan and Landscape Plan, as determined upon hearing and decision;
 - vii. Pursuant to Section 154.407(A) and Section 154.503(D), variations in order to continue the existing widths of all abutting rights-of-way and pavement widths thereof;
 - viii. Pursuant to Section 154.510 and Section 150.301, variations in order to permit the driveways onto Meyers Road and onto 14th Street as depicted in the preliminary engineering plans and Planned Development Site Plan provided that the gate shall remain operable to allow entry by all vehicles without access control so as not to stack vehicles over the sidewalk or cause backing movements;
 - ix. Such other variations from Chapter 154, including those which exclude final landscape treatment from public improvements required to be completed prior to the initiation of the final ten percent (10%) of units but only to the extent required on lots that have not been certified for occupancy, as deemed necessary and appropriate;
 - x. Pursuant to Section 153.232(B), a deviation in order to allow each subdivision sign at a height of six (6) feet, where a height of four (4) feet is permitted; and

2. Approve a revised final plat of subdivision pursuant to Section 154.203(D) of Village Code.(DISTRICT #6)

Sworn in to present the petition was Anna Papke, Planning and Zoning Manager, and the following on behalf of the petitioner: Mark

Daniel, attorney; Ahmed Khan, property owner and developer; Megan Weiss, landscape architect; and Jiun-Guang Lin, project engineer.

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.

Mark Daniel presented the petition. He explained that a 22-unit single-family residential development was previously approved for the subject property. The developer has received market interest in larger houses than those previously approved. Therefore, the petitioner is requesting approval of an amended plan for 11 single-family residences. The amended plan would consolidate pairs of lots in the existing subdivision into larger lots (e.g. Lot 1 and 2 consolidated, Lot 3 and 4 consolidated, etc.). The layout of the utilities and internal access driveway are not changing from the approved plan. Mr. Daniel said the permit for the driveway connection onto Meyers was under review by DuPage County, and the County had indicated they would approve the proposed driveway gate subject to conditions that allow the County to request modifications if the gate creates an issue in the future. The landscaping on the property is largely the same as previously approved.

Mr. Daniel noted that the developer was in discussions with the York Center Park District about possibly constructing a gazebo in a public park as a community amenity.

Mr. Daniel noted the changes between the approved plan and the revised proposed plan. These included: increased distance between the houses, offsetting zoning relief that was needed for the approved plan; and a reduction in density from 5.6 units/acre to 2.8 units/acre. He said the revised plan decreases the amount of zoning relief needed for the development.

Ahmed Khan addressed the Plan Commission. He said all homes would remain single-family residences with five to seven bedrooms. There was no increase in the number of bedrooms compared to the previous plan. The additional size of the houses would accommodate increased living area and more parking

spaces in the attached garages. He noted there would be a 50% reduction in density with the revised plan. The revised plan would provide six indoor parking spaces per unit. Mr. Khan showed the floorplans and renderings for the revised houses.

Chairperson Giuliano asked if any person would like to cross examine or speak in favor or against this petition, or for public comment.

Doris Dornberger addressed the Plan Commission. She said she continues to be concerned about the size of the houses and the number of people living in the houses. She said it was good the number of houses had decreased but she was concerned that the size of the homes had doubled to 12,000 square feet. She said there was a lot of parking on the site but she did not think it would be enough for guests. She was concerned about stormwater and runoff around surrounding properties on well and septic systems. She suggested permeable pavers be incorporated into the development. She said the developer should increase open space on the site. She expressed concerns about traffic congestion, and concerns about the size of the sign that was approved with the previous plan. She said the size of the sign would be a safety hazard.

Kristin Dominguez addressed the Plan Commission. She said she lives across the street from the development. She said the developer has worked with the neighborhood and has made changes in response to these discussions. She liked that the number of homes would be decreasing. She did not think that the size or design of the homes was compatible with Lombard or the surrounding community. She was concerned about the number of people who would be living in the proposed homes. She was concerned that there would not be enough parking for the residents and guests of the development. She expressed concerns about vehicles, scooters, school buses, and bikes on School Street. She was concerned about vehicles parking on School Street. She was concerned about traffic on 14th Street. She said she preferred the smaller rooftop decks on the revised homes, and she preferred fewer houses even though they were larger. She asked the Plan Commission to consider safety, parking, and traffic.

Ken Franklin addressed the Plan Commission. He asked if there was a restriction in Lombard that allowed only one family to occupy a home. Ms. Papke said that there was a definition of the term "family" in the Zoning Ordinance. Each dwelling unit in the Village could be occupied by one family, as defined in the Zoning Ordinance.

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 if the petitioner would like to respond to the public comments.

Mr. Daniel said the definition in the Village Code for the term "family" was intended to be compliant with federal regulations concerning housing and family status. He said there would be only one family living as a household in a dwelling unit. He noted the floorplans showed the entire house would be one dwelling unit. There were no areas carved out to allow for separate dwellings.

Regarding traffic and safety, he noted that there will be a sidewalk on School Street and a crosswalk on 14th Street, which would increase pedestrian safety.

He acknowledged that there was some cut-through traffic from Roosevelt into the neighborhood. The limited driveway connections between the development and Meyers and School were intended to address this. He said that there were up to 110 parking spaces available within the development. He said there may be some off-site parking from time to time, but that this was standard for a residential neighborhood. He said the Village had jurisdiction to regulate parking on School Street if necessary.

Regarding the sign variation, he said the increased area of the sign would increase visibility and reduce the need for drivers to detour and turn around if they missed the driveway into the development. He said the sign would not create a traffic issue.

Regarding stormwater, he said the development would comply with all DuPage County stormwater regulations. He said stormwater on the site would flow into an underground stormwater system. He said permeable pavers would be a maintenance concern for future

property owners, and should be optional not required.

Mr. Khan said that the two houses that were sold were for empty nesters. He said the primary market for the development was empty nesters.

Lin, project engineer, described the stormwater management design. He said it follows the DuPage Stormwater Management Ordinance. The system will hold water underground and slowly release it into the public stormwater sewers. He said the stormwater management system would improve upon existing conditions by controlling stormwater runoff.

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 the Pinnacle at Meyers Planned Development. In 2024, the Village approved zoning entitlements for a development consisting of 22 detached single-family residences in a gated community (PC 24-07). The approval included improvements to the School Street and 14th Street rights-of-way. Work on the site infrastructure, including internal roadway and utilities, is ongoing. The petitioner proposes to amend the previously approved plan to allow for development of 11 detached single-family residences instead of 22 detached single-family residences. The layout of the site infrastructure (internal roadway and utilities) will not change. No changes are proposed to the improvements previously approved for the School Street and 14th Street rights-of-way. The amended plan requires review and approval through the Plan Commission public hearing process.

Staff reviewed the revised plan in comparison to the previously approved plan, and notes the following:

- The density of the development will decrease from 5.6 units/acre to 2.8 units/acre.*
- The distance between the houses will increase from six feet to 12 or more feet.*
- Height of the proposed buildings does not change from*

- previously approved peak height of 38 feet.*
- Setbacks of the houses from the perimeter of the development are equal to or greater than the perimeter setbacks on the approved plans.*
- No changes are proposed to perimeter fencing or landscaping.*
- No changes are proposed to overall site layout or utility infrastructure.*
- No changes are proposed to site access; there will be one driveway connection on Meyers Road and one connection on 14th Street.*
- Open space in the development does not change from previously approved 45%.*

The revised plan is largely consistent with the existing zoning entitlements. Staff did a detailed comparison of the bulk measurements of the approved and revised plan, and found that several pieces of zoning relief granted for the approved plan are not required for the revised plan. Some of the previously granted zoning relief is still needed, but the degree of nonconformity to the underlying zoning district requirement is reduced. Overall, staff finds the revised plan lessens the amount of zoning relief required for the development.

Ms. Papke noted that the 11 residences in the revised plan will provide space for up to six cars inside an attached garage, with space for additional vehicles in the driveways. This exceeds the code requirement for two parking spaces per single-family residence. KLOA reviewed the approved 22-unit plan in 2024 and concluded there was adequate roadway capacity to handle the amount of traffic generated by 22 single-family residences. They have reviewed the revised plan and find the 11 units will generate even less traffic. Ms. Papke noted Brendan May of KLOA was present and available to answer technical questions about the traffic analysis.

Finally, Ms. Papke said the petitioner held a neighborhood meeting in early July to present the proposed revisions to neighborhood residents. Staff received two written comments on the petition. One was attached to the staff report and the second had been distributed to the Plan Commission the previous week.

Staff found the petition meets the relevant standards in the Village Code and recommends approval of the request 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 Spreenberg asked about open space. He said the previous approval was for 45% open space where 50% would be required by the Zoning Ordinance. He asked Mr. Daniel to explain the initial justification for the open space deviation.

Mr. Daniel said the open space deviation was somewhat related to the setbacks of the houses on the individual lots. He said there were site constraints to adding more open space. If the developer were to add 5% more open space, it would end up in ineffective areas in the development.

Commissioner Spreenberg said he recalled there was an effort to keep the houses back from the roads. He could see the commercial reason for reduced open space with 22 units. Now that the number of units was decreasing, he wondered if the open space deviation was justified.

Mr. Daniel said the entire perimeter of the development was open space. He said the open space was calculated on a lot-by-lot basis, and the inclusion of the outlot in the calculations would increase the amount of open space. He said the outlot had the bulk of the development's open space for maintenance purposes.

Commissioner Johnston asked about the timing of the gate opening for traffic entering from Meyers Road. Mr. Daniel said the gate would recognize a vehicle approaching and open immediately. There was no keypad. Delivery vehicles and guests could enter. The gate was a metering device rather than a restricting device.

Commissioner Johnston asked about the number of vehicles that could stack in front of the gate while it opened. Mr. Daniel said the gate would not close between a second vehicle entering right

behind another vehicle. Mr. Daniel said the County had a few design requests for the gate during the permit review process.

Commissioner Johnston asked about the distance between the gate and the right-of-way and whether that was an issue for DuPage County. Mr. Daniel said DuPage County had not had an issue with the gate for the 22 house plan.

Commissioner Johnston said he was concerned about multiple delivery vehicles trying to enter at the same time. He was concerned about stackability and the distance between the gate and the right-of-way.

Lin said there was 40 feet between the curb and the gate.

Commissioner Johnston asked for more information about the design of the water retention system. He asked where the drywell would be on the property. Lin said the drywell would sit underneath the underground detention storage system. This was under the internal drive aisle running north and south.

Commissioner Johnston asked if the new stormwater system would supersede requirements. Lin said the design would meet stormwater standards.

Commissioner Johnston asked about the height. He said that he had agreed there was a hardship for height when there were 22 units on smaller lots. He thought there was not a hardship now that the buildings would be larger and more spread out.

Mr. Daniel said the 38 feet height was a peak height. There were variations in the peak height of the proposed houses. He noted the height measurement under code would be to median height, not peak height. He said some of the height of the buildings was to allow the enclosure of rooftop space. This enclosure had been important to the neighborhood. He noted the rooftop space was not spread across the entire footprint of the building. The bulk of the houses were not at 38 feet. He said the height request was not a variance, so a hardship analysis would not apply. He noted the request to allow 38 feet to the peak of the roof was for ease of measurement, as compared to having to measure to median height

on varied house plans.

Commissioner Flanigan asked about the height of the various floors of the houses. Mr. Daniel showed the front and rear elevations and read the measurements of the various floors of the houses.

Mr. Daniel said the intent was to allow a peak height of 38 feet to account for varied rooflines throughout the development.

Ms. Papke clarified that the increased height was a conditional use in the R2 District. Therefore, the analysis of the requested entitlement should be relative to the standards for conditional uses rather than the standards for variations.

Commissioner Sweetser asked about the topography of the subject property and the impact on building height and drainage. Mr. Daniel said the subject property is relatively flat. The request for the additional height was driven by the desire for varied rooflines more than topography.

Commissioner Flanigan asked if there are other gated communities in Lombard. Mr. Daniel said there are no existing gated communities in the Village. He said the developer desired the gate to prevent cut-through traffic. He noted that the homeowners' association would be responsible for maintenance, so wanted to limit cut-through traffic that might add wear and tear on the drive. The gate also promoted safety.

Commissioner Flanigan asked how much time would be added for vehicles making a turn into the driveway with the gate in place. Mr. Daniel said there would be a pause but noted that the gates would also meter traffic leaving the development onto Meyers Road or 14th Street.

Commissioner Flanigan asked if there would be any way of redesigning the driveways to remove the gate. Mr. Daniel said removal of the gate would be a dealbreaker.

Commissioner Flanigan asked for additional explanation. Mr. Daniel said it was a private street being maintained by homeowners. The developer did not want it to become a public

street because it would cause maintenance and insurance issues. He said the appearance of the private street was also a selling point for the development. He said the gate was not intended to be exclusionary. He said the developer was willing to provide pedestrian access into the development.

Commissioner Johnston asked if the gate would be operable 24 hours per day. Mr. Daniel said it would be.

Commissioner Johnston asked if pedestrians could walk from School Street to Meyers Road through the development. Mr. Danial said yes.

Commissioner Johnston said he was concerned about the height of the buildings. He understood the desire to have taller houses from an aesthetic standpoint, but he did not think it met the standards for a hardship.

Commissioner Verson said she had fewer concerns overall about the revised development than she had about the previously approved development. She said overall there were fewer variations.

Commissioner Spreenberg was concerned about dropping the number of units by half but not increasing the open space. He said he had mixed feelings about having a gated community. He acknowledged that it was a private street. He asked if a resident could put a gate across a driveway. Ms. Papke said they could, so long as it met relevant fencing height and location requirements.

Commissioner Flanigan asked about previously granted relief to allow lots without frontage on a public street. Ms. Papke said the Subdivisions and Development Ordinance requires platted lots to have frontage on public streets. The relief was required for this development because the lots were fronting on a private street. This relief was granted for the original development proposal and would not change with the revised plan.

Commissioner Flanigan said it seemed like the development would set a precedent to allow private streets and gated communities. He suggested there could be some amendments that would remove the

gate from the plan.

Mr. Daniel said the 22-lot approval with access from a private drive was the result of community, Village and County preference to avoid multiple driveways onto Meyers Road and School Street. He said the development could be revised to place individual driveways onto Meyers Road and School Street, but this would not make the neighborhood happy, and it would remove the benefit of the landscaping around the perimeter of the development. He said the 22-unit plan was entitled. The proposed revised plan for 11 houses would reduce the number of units. He said if there was a desire to remove the private street, it would result in the development being turned toward the surrounding streets, with additional driveways. He said this was not preferred.

Chairperson Giuliano said the site was already approved for 22 homes with a gate in place. She said if the Plan Commission wanted to modify the gate with the 11-unit plan, the developer could still proceed with the 22-unit plan with the gate.

Commissioner Johnston said the analysis of the height of the buildings was different now that the plan was for 11 rather than 22 units. He said the scope of the project had changed from the plan that was presented and approved in 2024.

Commissioner Spreenberg asked for clarification that if the revised plan were not approved, the developer could proceed with the previously approved 22-unit plan. Ms. Papke said this was correct.

Commissioner Spreenberg said he did not like the gate and did not understand the need for the gate.

Commissioner Verson said the revised plan required less relief than the approved plan, and she thought the revised plan was a better option.

Commissioner Spreenberg agreed.

On a motion by Commissioner Verson, and a second by Commissioner Spreenberg, the Plan Commission voted 6-0 to recommend that the Village Board approve the petition associated with PC 25-11 subject to the four (4) 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, except as they may be changed to conform to Village Code;
3. That the petitioner shall apply for and receive building permits for the proposed improvements; and
4. 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: 6 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Robert Spreenber, Alissa Verson, and Brendan Flanigan

Business Meeting

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Verson, seconded by Chairperson Giuliano, that the minutes of the June 16, 2025 meetings be approved.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Robert Spreenber, Alissa Verson, and Brendan Flanigan

Public Participation

DuPage County Hearings

There were no DuPage County Hearings

Chairperson's Report

There was no Chairperson's Report

Planner's Report

Ms. Papke informed the Plan Commission that the Village Board voted to increase the number of Plan Commissioners from seven to nine. There are now three open seats on the Plan Commission. The Village Board will work with the Village Manager's office to identify and appoint new Commissioners.

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 Spreenberg, seconded by Commissioner Sweetser, to adjourn the meeting at 9:24 p.m. The motion passed by an unanimous vote.