

# Village of Lombard

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



## Minutes

**Monday, March 21, 2022**

**7:00 PM**

**Village Hall**

## Plan Commission

***Commissioners:***

***Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston,  
Kevin Walker, Tony Invergo,  
Alissa Verson and Robert Spreenberg  
Staff Liaison: Jennifer Ganser***

## Call to Order

*Commissioner Sweetser called the meeting to order at 7:08 p.m*

## Pledge of Allegiance

*Commissioner Sweetser led the Pledge of Allegiance*

## Roll Call of Members

**Present** 7 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Kevin Walker, Tony Invergo, Robert Spreenberg, and Alissa Verson

*Also present: Bill Heniff, AICP Director of Community Development, Jennifer Ganser, AICP Assistant Director of Community Development, and Anne Skrodzki, Legal Counsel to the Plan Commission.*

*Commissioner Sweetser called the order of the agenda.*

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

## Appoint an Acting Chair

*A motion was made by Commissioner Johnston, seconded by Commissioner Walker to appoint Commissioner Ruth Sweetser Chair. The motion passed by an unanimous vote.*

## Public Hearings

[220096](#)

### **PC 22-06: 320 N. Charlotte Street - Plat of Resubdivision with Associated Lot Width Variance**

The petitioner, John Novak, is requesting approval of a plat of resubdivision with a variation for Lot 1 and Lot 2 from Section 155.407 (E) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum required lot width from sixty feet (60') to fifty-three feet (53') within the R2 Single-Family Residence Zoning District.

The proposed plat of resubdivision would create two (2) buildable lots where one (1) currently exists:

Lot 1, the northern lot, will have a lot width of 53.75 feet and will be 11,848 square feet in area and

Lot 2, the southern lot, will have a lot width of 53.33 feet and be 11,795 square feet in area. (DISTRICT #4)

*Sworn in to present the petition were: John Novak, Fine Home Builders, petitioner, Jennifer Ganser, Assistant Director of Community Development, and William Heniff, Director of Community Development.*

*Acting Chairperson Sweetser read the Plan Commission procedures and asked if anyone other than the petitioner intended to cross examine, and proceeded with the petition.*

*Mr. Novak stated that he has been building houses for over twenty years and is requesting a minor plat of subdivision for 320 N. Charlotte Street. He has built four houses on Charlotte Street at 564, 629, 250 and 240 N Charlotte.*

*The area of 320 N. Charlotte is over 23,000 square feet which is over three times the size required for a lot. For background sake, the property owner initially considered replacing the existing house on the property but changed their mind when they found a house in Glen Ellyn. A former client that lives in Lombard and looking to downsize started the idea to redivide the lots into equal parts. The result are two lots that are one and half times the size of the minimum lot size required. The lot width of 53 feet does not meet the standards, however, they are comparable to the lots in the surrounding area. One planned home would have a width of 41 feet accommodating 3 bedrooms with 1 and ½ story and 2,200 square feet. The other lot's house size is undetermined at this time but would be comparable to houses previously built on lots that have a width of fifty feet. The proposed houses of 41 feet in width is consistent with the character of the neighborhood and the request for the minor plat of resubdivision is reasonable.*

*Acting Chairperson Sweetser asked if any additional person would like to speak in favor or against this petition, or for public comment. Individuals responded that there are people who would like to speak about the petition.*

*Anne Skrodzki, Village Attorney, explained the rules for between cross examination and public participation. Ms. Skrodzki asked if anyone intends to present formal cross examination. Hearing none, the public hearing was opened to public participation.*

*Chris Erb, stated that he is located within the 250 feet notification of the subject property and outlined two concerns. Flooding is a concern and removal of open space will impact the amount of water that can be absorbed. Sump pumps will not solve the problem. The second concern is the confusion of the size of houses presented by the petitioner.*

*Corrine Fable, stated that she is at the end of Charlotte Street on the block and was told when she built her new house that she could not hook up her sump pump to the sewer but Mr. Novak has for a nearby property and represents that his proposed development would. Ms. Fable's property has drainage issues and would like the same connection.*

*Jill Voss, stated that she is a direct neighbor to the subject property. Ms. Voss asked the petitioner directly to provide the square footage of the proposed houses. The concern is drainage and referred to her submitted letter. The drainage issues can affect the value of Ms. Voss's property. The Village engineer met with her recently to discuss options.*

*Mr. Novak responded that he has a preliminary agreement to build a 2,200 square foot house on one of the lots. The footprint of the house would be 1,700 square feet and the balance would be above. On the other lot, the house may be built as a speculation or a client may come forward with a request. However, the likely house will be 3,300 square feet with the same footprint of 1,700 square feet and the balance would be in the second story.*

*Ms. Voss asked what the square footage is at the house under construction located at 240 S. Charlotte Street.*

*Mr. Novak responded that the house is approximately 2,700 square feet.*

*Ms. Voss asked what the square footage of the houses are planned for other properties the petitioner has listed for sale.*

*Mr. Novak responded that the square footages are between 3,300 to 3,400 square feet.*

*Ms. Voss observed that the fifty-foot-wide lots mentioned in the staff report generally have houses that are 1,500 square feet and discussed price per square foot per size of homes. The minimum lot width of sixty*

*feet was decided by the Village for a reason. Ms. Voss stated that she is concerned about drainage issues and trees. Ms. Voss detailed the existing conditions of the trees and shrubs located on the subject property and asked the petitioner how many will be removed.*

*Mr. Novak responded that he does not have the answer to that question at this time.*

*Ms. Voss speculated that six trees would have to be removed which changes the character of the neighborhood.*

*Mr. Novak responded that trees may have to be removed if two or one house is built on the property.*

*Ms. Voss stated that she believes that a fifty-foot-wide lot is too small for a 3,300 square foot house and the area behind the house is unusable.*

*Mr. Novak stated that the size of the lot does help the disbursement of water on the property.*

*Ms. Voss stated that the request for seven feet less in lot width per lot is too much compared to variances requested in the last four years Village wide and believes that the petitioner has not met the burden of proof for the request.*

*Steve Mahal stated that he lives across the street from the subject property and would prefer that the relief requested not be considered based on the previous concerns mentioned.*

*Commissioner Johnston asked about the water disbursement plan on the 240 N Charlotte Street property currently under construction by the petitioner.*

*Mr. Novak responded that the downspouts and sump pump was directly connected to the storm sewer.*

*Commissioner Johnston asked if the 240 N Charlotte was located in a separate or combined sewer system area.*

*Mr. Novak responded that 240 N Charlotte is located in a separate sewer system, as is the subject property one block away.*

*Acting Chairperson Sweetser asked for the staff report.*

*Ms. Ganser presented the IDRC report for PC 22-06, which was entered into the public record in its entirety. The petitioner, acting on behalf of the property owner, proposes to resubdivide the existing 18,387 square foot lot and the 5,121 square foot lot into two (2) buildable lots with approximate equal widths of 53 feet. The proposed resubdivision is deemed a minor plat of subdivision and subject to Plan Commission review.*

*Both of the new proposed lots exceed the 7,500 square foot minimum lot area required by the Lombard Zoning Ordinance with 11,848 and 11,795 square feet each. Many of the surrounding properties within the neighborhood have a lot width less than sixty feet (60'). A common lot width in the area is 50 feet which is less than the proposed 53-foot lot width for the two subject properties.*

*Aside from the previously identified non-conforming lot widths, the site can comply with all other lot, bulk, and setback standards including the required 50% open space per lot established by the Zoning Ordinance in R2 Single-Family Residence District.*

*As noted the petition is for the subdivision of two lots as one of the lots is substandard. All drainage concerns associated with the properties will be addressed during the permitting process. The Plan Commission is not reviewing house plans. If the petition is approved, any proposed house that meets code the building permit will be answered. All projects will be reviewed during the permitting process for bulk, setback and open space requirements.*

*The drainage concerns for the property will be reviewed during the permitting process should the petition be approved. Staff has reviewed the petition and finds it meets the standards for a variation. Staff notes that the lot width is more than a majority of the lots that are fifty feet in width within the neighborhood. Staff recommends approval of the petition subject to the conditions in the staff report.*

*William Heniff, Director of Community Development, stated that the petition under consideration involves the Zoning Code within the Village Code as well as Chapter 154, the Subdivision and Development Ordinance. It inter-relates to other elements associated with the petition. The petitioner intends to meet all bulk requirements. Any zoning relief would have to appear before the Plan Commission*

*again for the public hearing process. This public hearing is for the division of land.*

*Mr. Heniff outlined the three types of plats. Administrative plats that meet all provisions of code and less than an acre minus any public utility additions, staff can approve per the State statute. The petition is for a minor plat that meets all of the provisions but for one, the lot width, that would normally be approved administratively. A major plat is more than an acre, establishing rights-of-way, stormwater detention with more than four lots.*

*The Subdivision and Development Chapter has drainage and stormwater provisions for review during the permitting process. The applicant for the permit will be required to identify how the drainage will be addressed. He said Mr. Novak suggested that he plans to connect to the separated storm sewer that already exists on Charlotte Street. The existing condition of the property is that the water moves in a westerly direction to Terrace View Pond. The connection to the storm sewer causes the water collected to flow north to Pleasant Lane, then to Main Street to Brown Street to end at Terrace View Pond. If the water sheet drains naturally or is directed through the sewer lines, it ends in the same place, Terrace View Pond.*

*The Village's private services engineer looks at the abutting properties. The grading of the subject property would be addressed during the permitting process. The idea is to get as much as the stormwater away from the adjacent properties. This can be accomplished with connecting to the storm sewer and grading swales on the sides of the subject property to direct the drainage also.*

*The fifty percent lot area coverage provision applies to the subject property whether it is developed as one lot or two. The square footage of impervious coverage of structures is approximately 11,000 plus square feet and is the same metric if developed as one single family residence or two. This applies to all single-family residential lots in the Village.*

*The grade change is also reviewed. The elevation of the subject property is nine feet higher on the eastern end compared to the western end of the lot. Therefore, connecting the buildable area at the eastern end to the Charlotte Street storm sewer is anticipated to reduce the overflow water circulating toward the west.*

*To address some of the public comments, there is a distinction between flooding and drainage. The Community Development Department at the Village has a Private Development Engineer on staff that can assist property owners with suggestions or recommendation to address drainage issues. There is also back yard drainage grants available to any property owner concerned with a wet back yard throughout the Village. It applies to standing water on multiple properties for more than 72 hours.*

*Staff is also available to help individual property owners to investigate if they can connect to a separated sewer system based on grading. If the subject area were a combined sewer system the drainage remedies would be more complex as outlined in a previous workshop.*

*As reference based on public comments, the Village does not have a tree preservation ordinance. Property owners have the right to remove trees from their property. Impacting trees on adjacent properties would be a civil matter between the property owners.*

*Acting Chair Sweetser asked if there were any further comments. Mr. Novak stated that he concurred with Mr. Heniff's comments about the drainage concerns.*

*Mr. Erb requested that the petitioner provide a drainage plan for their review and voice opinions during the permitting process.*

*Acting Chair Sweetser responded that more information can be requested directly from the petitioner or Village staff.*

*Acting Chair Sweetser opened the meeting to discussion by the Plan Commissioners.*

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

**A motion was made by Commissioner Verson, and a second by Commissioner Walker, the Plan Commission voted 7-0 to recommend that the Village Board approve the petition associated with PC 22-06, subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. That a permit will be obtained for the demolition of the existing structures and then removed before the plat of resubdivision is recorded if approved; and**
- 2. That any new residences developed on the subject property shall comply with Village Code.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**



**Aye:** 7 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Kevin Walker, Tony Invergo, Robert Spreenberg, and Alissa Verson

[220097](#)

**PC 22-05: 855 E. Roosevelt Road**

The petitioner, SAFA ENTERPRISES, LLC, requests that the Village take the following actions on the subject property located within the B4A Roosevelt Road Corridor District, to provide for the construction of a new principle building:

1. A conditional use under Sections 155.103(F) and 155.417(G)(2)(a)(vii) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a restaurant, including entertainment and dancing when conducted as part of the restaurant operations and secondary to the principal use;
2. A conditional use under Sections 155.103(F) and 155.417(G)(2)(c)(vii) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a building containing a restaurant as a principal use that will exceed 40 feet in height;
3. A conditional use under Sections 155.103(F) and 155.417(G)(10)(b) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow outdoor display and sales on a seasonal or periodic basis in the row of parking along the south elevation of the building and in the rooftop area;
4. A variation under Sections 155.102(B)(3) and 155.103(C)(2)(b) from Sections 155.417(G)(12) and 155.602(C)(Table 6.3) which require 112-132 parking spaces in order to allow 116 parking spaces to serve dining areas not to exceed those shown in the plans and to allow a reduction of eight (8) of these spaces for seasonal outdoor cultural events according to the conditional use noted in Item 3;
5. A variation under Sections 155.102(B)(3) and 155.103(C)(2)(b) from Sections 155.417(G)(12) and 155.603(A) which does not require a loading space, but which requires a voluntary loading space to be constructed with a maneuvering apron (155.603(A)(2)(a)(ii)) in order to allow three (3) employee parking spaces at the entry to a loading zone (155.603(A)(6));
6. A variation under Sections 155.102(B)(3) and 155.103(C)(2)(b) from Sections 155.417(G)(12), 155.417(G)(14) and 155.602(A)(10)(d) which requires parking lot lighting to be directed away from the lot lines and to fall below certain maximum intensities in order to avoid these requirements for lighting adjacent to the access easement serving the subject property and the easterly adjacent property;
7. A variation under Sections 155.102(B)(3) and 155.103(C)(2)(b) from Sections 155.417(G)(12) and 155.706(B)(2)(c) in order to allow landscape islands on the west elevation of the building to host two rickshaws and have less than the number of required shade trees and ground cover;
8. A variation under Sections 155.102(B)(3) and 155.103(C)(2)(b)

- from Section 155.417(G)(14) which requires lighting to shine down in order to permit evening lighting designed to articulate landscape features and the rickshaws as approved by the Director of Community Development and provided that no perimeter landscaping within 100 feet of the south lot line is articulated with such lighting;
9. A variation under Sections 155.102(B)(3) and 155.103(C)(2)(b) from Section 155.707(B)(4)(d) which requires transition yard areas not planted with trees or shrubs to be maintained as lawn in order to permit the south lot line to be maintained with all trees and understory plant material to remain in the wetland, flood way and floodplain reflected in the plans (affects south transition yard except east +/-45 feet);
  10. A variation under Sections 155.102(B)(3) and 155.103(C)(2)(b) from Section 155.708 which requires a ten-foot foundation landscaping area on all sides of a building in order to allow development with a five-foot foundation landscaping area on the north and west sides and no foundation landscaping area on the east and south;
  11. A variation under Sections 155.102(B)(3) and 155.103(C)(2)(b) from Article XI which imposes several detailed landscaping requirements in Sections 155.701 through 155.710 in order to accomplish innovative landscaping shown in the two-sheet landscape plan on file with the Village for the benefit of natural areas on the site and to the south as well as residential neighbors to the south; and
  12. Approval of a site plan and landscaping plan under Section 155.103(I) and Section 155.702 of the Zoning Ordinance (DISTRICT #6)

*Sworn in to present the petition were Jennifer Ganser, Assistant Director of Community Development and the petitioner's team: Mark Daniel, attorney; Jeff Miller, Watermark Engineering; Joseph DaVito, J. DaVito Design; Mohammad Yaqoob, owner; and Rick Scali, RMJ Construction. Members of the public were also sworn in.*

*Acting Chairperson Sweetser read the Plan Commission procedures and asked if anyone other than the petitioner intended to cross examine, and proceeded with the petition.*

*Mr. Daniel introduced himself and shared a power point presentation. He said his client looked at many properties until they found this one. They plan to open in December 2023. He reviewed the restaurant plan and operations. He discussed the conditional use for outside sales and the proposed condition of approval on the time. He showed a map of surrounding land uses, including many restaurants, and building*

heights in the area. He discussed the pond owned by York Center Park District to the south and drainage in the area. He showed a video of the site. He discussed building elevations the work done by a structural engineer. He said the height to the top of the parapet is 45' and the building will be below that.

Mr. DaVito discussed the landscape plan. He noted the wetlands and what trees will be preserved. He said it is heavily wooded and will create a buffer. He discussed the additional trees on the ridge line at the request of the residents. He discussed parking lot landscaping.

Mr. Daniel noted the trees to the south as an addition. He said the plan was discussed with the County and some parking was eliminated. He discussed the landscaping around the rickshaws. He said the lighting meets Code except at the cross access and by the rickshaws.

Mr. Miller said the property has many constraints. The cross access was approved in 1997 and there is floodway and a wetland. The compact building design was done to stay away from the special management area. They will be expanding the wetland area. He discussed water flow.

Mr. Daniel discussed stormwater. Mr. Miller discussed engineering requirements and noted they will be adding more capacity, or storage, then what's required.

Mr. Daniel discussed water flow and sheet drainage. He said the new drainage will go towards Roosevelt Road. He discussed the photometric code and said it was adjusted to have zero-foot candles at the residential lot line. He discussed the letter received from the York Center Park District and their failure maintenance of their property. He discussed neighbor comments on fencing and guard rails. He said his team met with IDNR regarding endangered species and was cleared thru the Eco Cat document. He discussed traffic flow and the primary routes of Meyers Road and Roosevelt Road. He discussed site lines and views from difference properties. He went thru the requested zoning relief. He discussed why the parking is sufficient and showed ITE data.

Mr. Miller discussed the lighting around the rickshaws and said it will be a small LED light that is up lit.

Mr. Daniel concluded by saying the project meets the standards for

development.

Commissioner Johnston asked if the bald cypress tree is seasonal. Mr. DaVito said yes. Commissioner Johnston clarified that evergreen trees would not survive in the water and Mr. DaVito agreed. Mr. Daniel said those trees are there at the request of the neighbors. Commissioner Johnston asked if the new building would buffer the sound from Pep Boys. Mr. Daniel said not really, the sound may go up. Commissioner Johnston asked if any special construction materials would be used for sound and Mr. Daniel said no.

Commissioner Spreenberg asked about drainage. Mr. Miller said the property sheet drains now and discussed the permeable pavers and how that would help drainage and water storage.

Commissioner Spreenberg asked what the hours of the rooftop patio will be. Mr. Daniel reviewed that section of the presentation and noted it was an area for 28 people.

Commissioner Giuliano asked about light pollution from the patio. Mr. Daniel said they are in compliance for lighting and the landscaping may help buffer or screen. Commissioner Giuliano asked about additional trees and Mr. Daniel said 10 bald cypress trees were added. He has met with some neighbors to the east and may plant trees for them to assist with screening on their property.

Commissioner Johnston asked about parking. Mr. Daniel said they have parking on their property, next door, and the valet plan for a total of 149. Commissioner Johnston asked about parking at their current restaurants and Mr. Daniel said those restaurants are in the City and not comparable. They have paid attention to how people arrive and are noticing that people are arriving together and using Uber more.

Acting Chairperson Sweetser opened the cross-examination section of the meeting.

Ms. Terry Purkart asked if there will be catering trucks. Mr. Daniel said the catering is delivered or can be picked up. Ms. Purkart asked where the employees will park. Mr. Daniel said there are 15 spaces to the west and designated employee parking on site.

Mr. Joe Purkart asked if restaurant owners knew about the variances and restrictions and Mr. Daniel said yes. Mr. Purkart asked Mr. Daniel

*to show the profit numbers from the powerpoint and asked how much they would pay in taxes as he is concerned what Lombard will gain. Mr. Daniel said all the tax numbers have not been estimated yet.*

*Mr. Robert Fritz asked the height of the bald cypress tree planted and the maximum height. Mr. DaVito said it will be planted at approximately 6' tall and grow to be 50' at 8' to 10' per year. Mr. Fritz questioned Mr. Daniel on the York Center Park District meeting.*

*Mr. Tom Novickas said the Code asks for shade trees and asked what type of trees are being planted. Mr. DaVito said ornamental trees with shade trees around the perimeter. Mr. Daniel said a variance is being sought for that. Mr. DaVito said the plan is conceptual and noted that the lights will impact the trees. Mr. Novickas asked if the windows were operable. Mr. Daniel said it was stated on the Zoom call that the doors cannot be propped open and that the windows are not intended to be open. Mr. Novickas asked about baffles on the lights and Mr. Daniel said the plan shows zero-foot candles at the south lot line.*

*Ms. Anne Toby-Garcia said she lives by Lumber Liquidators and their lights shine and reflect into her house. Mr. Daniel said that shouldn't happen. He said this building is not using wall packs to the south and can adjust the light if needed.*

*Ms. Doris Dornberger asked when the picture of her house was taken. Mr. Daniel said it is a picture from Google Street View. She stated that today the trees on her property do not have leaves due to the season and in the winter the neighbors will see the building. Mr. Daniel said the wetland trees are dense and will help block the building.*

*Mr. Adam Johnson asked if materials will be added to prevent sound from transmitting. Mr. Daniel said they are not planning on it and he does not believe it will be a problem. Mr. Johnson asked for clarification on the foundation landscaping. Mr. Daniel said it can't be provided on the east side due to the loading zone and he noted the 10' was for width. Mr. Johnson asked if this is tied to water retention and Mr. Daniel said no, it's part of landscaping. He said the gutters are tied into the system. Mr. Johnson asked about the two rickshaws and Mr. Daniel said there are two total and both have LED up lighting. Mr. Johnson asked the hours of the lighting and rating. Mr. Daniel said the lights will be on when the restaurant is open and dimmed when closed. He said the elevation is below the residential property and the lights are part of the zoning relief. Mr. Johnson asked if the plan was reviewed against*

*the winter months. Mr. Daniel said he applied in February and did review the property in the winter. Mr. Johnson asked about the outdoor sales component and Mr. Daniel said that would be Saturday and Sunday from noon to 7pm. Mr. Johnson asked about the guard rails and what else can be done to shield head lights. Mr. Daniel said he is not proposing a fence above the guard rails as that would cause sound to be reflected and it's not possible to plant evergreens. He said the restaurant wants to enjoy the wetland as well.*

*Mr. John Severance said he lives to the south and is concerned about stormwater. Mr. Daniel said he can't change the volume. Mr. Severance asked how is that monitored. Mr. Miller said the ordinance regulates the release rate and flow rate. A restrictor will be installed and control run off. Mr. Miller discussed the natural creek, waterway, and native plantings. Mr. Severance said he has discussed the issue with IDOT and asked if this development was trenching. Mr. Miller said no and that they will remove dead trees and review the outlets. He said they may have an easement for DuPage County or the Village to access the wetland. Mr. Severance referred to a previous slide and asked who to contact on stormwater and Mr. Miller said the County and York Center Park District.*

*Ms. Patricia Sanborn asked if climbing plants would be used and Mr. Daniel said no. Ms. Sanborn asked what's the method of wetland restoration. Mr. Daniel said they are enlarging the area and using certain plantings. Mr. DaVito said they are adding wetland grasses. Ms. Sanborn asked how it will be maintained and Mr. Daniel said the permit involves a three year look back and letter of credit as well as the ordinance referencing the plans. Ms. Sanborn asked why other property couldn't be purchased and Mr. Daniel discussed the other property they looked at.*

*A resident said he is concerned about fire suppression.*

*Ms. Pat Shapera said the snow may impede runoff and asked if dead trees will be removed. Mr. Miller said dead trees will be cleaned up and discussed snow. Ms. Shapera asked about the culvert under Roosevelt. Mr. Miller said it's a 36" concrete pipe. Ms. Shapera questioned the years of flood and engineering data and said the pond has been rising every year.*

*Ms. Lila Gourveia asked if there would amplified sound for weekend outside events. Mr. Daniel said no and that it could be a condition of*

*approval.*

*On a motion by Commissioner Guiliano, and a second by Commissioner Johnston, the Plan Commission voted 7-0 to continue the petition associated with PC 22-05 to the April 18, 2022 Plan Commission meeting.*

**On a motion by Commissioner Guiliano, and a second by Commissioner Johnston, the Plan Commission voted 7-0 to continue the petition associated with PC 22-05 to the April 18, 2022 Plan Commission meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 7 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Kevin Walker, Tony Invergo, Robert Spreenberg, and Alissa Verson

## **Business Meeting**

### **Approval of Minutes**

**A motion was made by Tony Invergo, seconded by Bill Johnston, that this be approved. A motion was made by Commissioner Johnston, seconded by Commissioner Giuliano, that the minutes of the February 21, 2022 meeting be approved.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 7 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Kevin Walker, Tony Invergo, Robert Spreenberg, and Alissa Verson

### **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 Planners 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 Workshops

### **Adjournment**

A motion was made by Commissioner Johnston, seconded by Commissioner Invergo, to adjourn the meeting at 10:26 p.m. The motion passed by an unanimous vote.