

PARKING & TRAFFIC COMMISSION

Minutes of Public Hearing

September 12, 2007

Downers Grove Public Works Facility
5101 Walnut Avenue, Downers Grove

Chairman Johnson called the September 12, 2007 meeting of the Parking and Traffic Commission to order at 7:03 p.m. Roll call followed and a quorum was established.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Commissioners Chairman Johnson, Carlquist, Stapleton, Thurston, Wendt

Absent: Commissioners Kren and Yeksigian

Staff Present: Public Works Interim Dir. Robin Weaver; Asst. Public Works Dir. Mike Millette; Traffic Manager Dorin Fera; Police Sgt. Edward Harrison, Officer Tim Sembach; Staff Engineer Lou Dominguez and Recording Secretary Megan Dugard

Visitors: Mr. Tom Novotny, 4809 Stanley, Daria & Myron Jarosewich, 206 56th St, Donna Zellnr, 246 White Fawn Trail, Dick & Carol Benes, 5236 Fairmount Ave, Jim Crawford, 201 56th, John Nystrom 146 White Fawn, Todd Pagni, 6103 Puffer Rd, Ed Murphy, 5244 Fairmount, Dapodbelsk, 5240 Deerpath, Don Bates, 5313 Fairmount , Debbie & Don Cassier 240 56th St., Richard Ourada, 5304 Fairmount, Gary & Ingrid Goster, 6205 Puffer, Susan Eon, 138 56th St., Stacy & Pan Bogdanski, 142 56th St., Kurt & Michelle Olsen, 221 56th St., Michael Mifflin, 5600 Cumnor Rd, Jim Callahan, 6100 Puffer Rd., Debbie Rumph, 5600 Deerpath Ln, William White, 4729 Seeley Ave, Joyce Allers, 149 56th St., Art & Donna Pudark, 112 56th Ct., Patrick O'Neill, 5543 Benton Ave., Cathy Better, 5248 Fairmount, Tim Galligan, 5253 Fairmount, Les & Nancy Poch, 300 56th St., Andy Clark, 1226 62nd St., Lorraine Smelley 246 56th St., Dawn Tuskey 222 56th St., Bob Barnett, 730 Maple Ave., Mark Maier, 324 56th St., Tom Krumwiede, 5635 Harmarc Pl., Susan Podbelski, 5640 Deerpath Ln., Russell Rydin, 5325 Washington, Chris O'Rourke, 247 56th St.

Chairman Johnson informed the commissioners and the public that the meeting was being recorded on Village owned equipment to aid in the preparation of the meeting minutes.

NEW BUSINESS - A change in the agenda followed:

File 24-07 56th Street – One-Way Designation (Deerpath Lane to Cumnor Rd)

Chairman Johnson stated the item did not come as a request from residents in the area, but during an investigation of streets and neighborhoods conducted by staff. It is his understanding that 56th Street was operating in a less than efficient way from a statistic standpoint from the width of the street and parking on both sides of the roadway. This design issue was discussed before the Commission in the past. This was a decision

by staff to implement the one-way designation on 56th Street and from their observation the street was in effect operating as a one way each direction. Due to the narrowness and parking in the roadway, it was deemed to be the safest way to operate the street. The Commission realizes the street has been operating in this manner for a number of years and perhaps staff jumped to conclusions. It is a bit backwards from our normal procedure. These issues normally come before the Commission by request from a neighborhood or by residents. Staff took this action from purely a safety standpoint. Tonight we would like input from the residents on how the roadway works and are familiar with the way the street works as they travel the roadway daily. Parking is a major issue considering how narrow the road measures. **Chairman Johnson** stated that he visited the site today, and there were three garbage trucks and a mowing crew in the area. He was not able to get through or pass very easily.

Chairman Johnson stated that this Commission receives the information, addresses the issue and makes recommendations to the Village Manager or the Council. We are a recommending body only. **Chairman Johnson** stated many people are present tonight who wish to have an opportunity to speak, and limited amount of time. Please be brief. Please provide your name, address or affiliation so the minutes are taken properly.

Chairman Johnson asked if **Mr. Fera** or **Mr. Millette** wished to add anything further at this time.

Mr. Millette stated he would like to begin by apologizing to the neighborhood for not notifying them about installing the signs. This action was not intentional and it is rare that we do take such action under the signature of the Village Manager authority only. We should have sent a flyer stating our intentions. Staff is tightening up our procedure for public information segment in the future. **Mr. Millette** asked if **Mr. Fera** would like to present the staff report.

Mr. Fera responded that he would prefer to listen to the comments first then respond during the discussion process.

Mr. Millette explained the roadway measures 18' wide, each half, which is not close to present code. Our code states 31' wide, back to back, contemplating two way traffic and parked vehicles. Standard parking lanes measure 8' wide. This would leave 10' travel lane which is insufficient for two way traffic. One incident occurred on May 11th 2007 noting probable cause was someone traveling as the reporting officer's estimation in the wrong way. Primarily the issue on 56th Street is the width of the roadway. Two-way traffic within the village is a minimum of 22' wide roadway and preferably 24' wide.

Chairman Johnson opened the meeting for public comment.

Patrick O'Neil indicated there is an error in the accident report of May 11th. He stated this did not occur along the boulevard. The accident was specifically in front of 324 56th Street, west of the boulevard, which is a two-way road. It was a hit and run accident. The roadway in this area was passable.

Chairman Johnson again stated the purpose of this public meeting is to gather information on how the residents perceive the use of the roadway. In order to best determine on how we shall go forward with this matter.

William White stated that people inside the subdivision signed a petition and asked him to summarize the information, so people will not have to repeat what he is saying. He added if people feel he has not expressed their opinions to please go ahead and make

their statements. A total of 153 people have signed the petition against a one way street which he handed to **Chairman Johnson**. There are 118 homes within the subdivision. A total of 98 people are included in the petition against the one way roadway. Out of the remaining 20 homes, 8 homes declined the sign, a few said good idea, a few did not wish to get involved, and 12 homes unable to make contact. Well over 85% do not want the one way. There have been no problems with the road as it was prior to the sign. Consensus in the neighborhood was a concern about speeding, but fear with one-way speeding will be worse, not better. People are opposed to the loop around. This may enhance the speeding problem concern expressed by a few people.

Dawn Tusky lived in the area for 11 years, speeding has gotten worse. No reason to slow down going one way. People in the subdivision know garbage collection schedule and school bus pick up schedules. Never had a problem with parked vehicles and passing. Those who have a problem are people using the area as a through street. May 11th accident was no where near the boulevard.

Kurt Olsen stated that the initial comment made by **Chairman Johnson** troubled him indicating that the village in their routine approach suddenly decided this was an issue. He has been resident for 12 years and understands the neighborhood has been around for nearly 40 years. It has never been an issue with the village up to now. Was not quite sure what was referenced by routine and apparently this is a new procedure. As emphasized by **Ms. Tusky**, everyone has different opinions, and he hopes everyone expresses their opinion. Still a neighborhood, a nice quiet neighborhood. The problems which were trying to be expressed simply some speeding issues on the north side of 56th Street which is used by rush hour traffic as a cut through to avoid the traffic light on Fairview & 55th and have asked many times in the past to address that situation. This situation now enhances the situation. There are no parking issues. He is hoping the Commission reconsiders and put the neighborhood back the way it was.

Daria Jarosewick lived in neighborhood 38 years, and is the oldest resident in area. Do not recall any accident being caused as a two way street. As of now driving one way, speeding of people passing through, u turns needed to get to house. She lives on north side. Coming from Fairview one has to drive to the south side and make an inconvenient turn, dangerous turn, two way traffic on Cumnor Rd. and 56th Court to make a U-turn. She compared 56th Street with Washington Street, between 55th & Maple, which is a two-way street with two yellow lines painted down the middle and parking on both sides allowed. When cars are parked on Washington Street, there is no way to drive without crossing the lines and accessing the oncoming traffic. Washington Street appears much more dangerous than 56th Street.

Debbie Rumph, not affected by the one way street, however as the Association President, she did start by contacting **Mr. Fera** to look at the speeding traffic and was wondering if this is what prompted this situation. This was in response to three accidents which occurred on 56th and Fairview.

Chairman Johnson asked if there were recent accidents.

Debbie Rumph replied that accidents occurred within the last three weeks. She spoke to **Mr. Fera** about the situation. He acted right away and asked if this was the deciding factor.

Chairman Johnson replied all questions are directed to him as part of the procedure under the Roberts Rules of Order. **Chairman Johnson** stated that he has been on this Commission for a very long time and does not recall addressing a speeding issue on

56th Street or in the area. It may have been a long time ago. If this is current it may be something we need to take a closer look at the situation.

Debbie Rumph feels the situation is due to a rash of teenagers recently. Her opinion is that this pattern is teenager-related, and this cycle will eventually go away. People come in off Fairview and speed through subdivision. Two trees were hit within a week of each other. Traffic flow is fine even during yearly garage sale in which the neighbors monitor themselves.

Chairman Johnson inquired about vehicles parked on the street, two vehicles can not get past each other, has this been an issue?

Debbie Rumph did not feel this was an issue. No one parks on the creek side obviously. Just like any other streets in Downers Grove, two cars parked on either side, you need to pull over to let someone pass. It is natural in any neighborhood. It only affects those on 56th Street.

Susan Ein resident for 7 years and has not seen any speed issues until the one way sign was put up. Five vehicles came around the corner, saw the signs and had to go all the way around to get to their home. That caused a concern. There is little parking on the street with possibly three cars on the westbound side, north side of 56th Street on a regular basis. Very few people use the street to park vehicles. Not an issue to go around the parked vehicles. She agrees that Washington Street and several other north-south streets between 55th Street & Maple are more a problem where unable to pass a vehicle without going into oncoming traffic. **Ms. Ein** views their neighborhood unsafe now with the one-way signs. If speeding is an issue, there are other ways to address it. A teenager is likely to drive faster on a one-way street than on a two-way. Also, people who are unfamiliar with the neighborhood will drive faster.

Susan Podbelski, speeding issues have nothing to do with 56th Street. What occurs is heavy traffic on Fairview. People try to cut through but have to U- turn at the dead end.

Chairman Johnson believes it may be all related, but are two separate issues. The speed, the one way designation was due to the fact the roadway was substandard.

Susan Podbelski, asked if it was precipitated by the fact that three weeks ago a request was made to monitor speed?

Chairman Johnson was uncertain. When staff is asked to look at a particular problem, often they see other problems as well.

Susan Podbelski does not feel the speed issue was addressed and the one-way does not help anything.

Chairman Johnson state the one-way designation was not implemented to alleviate any concern over speeding.

Susan Podbelski does not understand what the one-way alleviated?

Chairman Johnson reiterated due to the narrowness of the street and substandard design of the roadway, the roadway does not properly address two-way traffic.

Susan Podbelski inquired if it is substandard, how many accidents occurred?

Chairman Johnson replied that he understood what Ms. Podbelski was saying. He was suggesting the two are unrelated.

Susan Podbelski stated she is responding to **Chairman Johnson's** comment on the substandard issue, and the accidents which occurred. She is requesting to see the data.

Chairman Johnson moved the discussion forward.

Resident asked to hear from **Mr. Fera**, since he is present. Resident noticed **Mr. Fera** raised his hand to respond.

Chairman Johnson asked **Mr. Fera** if there was anything he would like to say.

Mr. Fera explained to the residents as to what precipitated this whole situation. It was a two part answer. He first received a call from **Mrs. Rumph** to look into the traffic situation, speeding and concerns in the area. Two days prior to the call, **Mr. Fera** was directed internally to collect data on boulevard sections in the Village, for potential implementation of median sections in other areas of town. He had to be in the area and this afforded him the opportunity to respond while reviewing traffic calming and interventions in the village. **Mr. Fera** stated that there are few boulevard streets in town; there are Brookbank Rd and 56th Street. Finley Rd is a four lane arterial divided and does not apply.

Chairman Johnson asked for a few more comments from the public.

Chris O'Rourke address two issues, the vehicle count is 192, there are 83 homes, or 118 homes, does not reflect residents going to work and coming home daily. Example, she works on Washington St., she herself is in/out of the subdivision five times daily. Several homeowners work in the village and go home for lunch. Mothers taking kids to school, the count does not seem accurate to her. She agrees the double yellow on Washington is difficult and traffic crosses into oncoming traffic, same on Franklin, as well as on Prairie. Why is 56th, not a through street, being discriminated? Fix the problem on streets with 900 vehicle count. This problem occurs throughout the village by your own admission.

Stacy Bogdanski appreciates the village has codes addressing the requirements regarding width of roadways. As a mother of three children, she feels there is no problem passing service vehicles and school buses. Even with vehicles parked on the street there is always the courtesy of letting someone else pass first. No problem passing school buses or garbage trucks. The Cumnor side of 56th Street concerned with increase U-turns around the creek. Speeding occurs on Cumnor southbound as vehicles exit the subdivision. This alone is an accident waiting to happen. She is concerned for the safety of the children. A one-way designation is complicated.

Mike Mifflin states the signs need to be enforced. In the morning while walking his dogs, he noticed three vehicles that came off Fairview, traveled eastbound on the north side of the creek paid no attention to the signs. These were people in the neighborhood going to work in the normal manner, and people cutting through trying to avoid the light, speeding through. This alone is an accident waiting to happen.

Jim Crawford appreciated **Chairman Johnson's** opening comments. He feels the residents are "pissed, really pissed". In recognizing this he appreciates the opening comments made. Appreciates that it was recognized the procedure was in error and staff is evaluating the process. The neighborhood has been in existence for forty years.

There are other issues which were being approached for four or five years about the sewer systems, which took another two to three years to be resolved. Discussing the quality of the creek, whether EPA will allow it to be cleaned and have requested assistance from the village on this matter slow to respond. We would like the signs removed tomorrow. Procedure was not followed, it is endangering the neighborhood with increased speeding, have not solved the through traffic problem acknowledging the procedures were not followed, notification to the neighborhood did not exist and a true study was not performed to understand the dangers which exist and endangers increased with the children in neighborhood. Finally, the streets were torn up two years ago, to install in sewer pipe. Crews were in the neighborhood every day watching this occur. If this were truly an issue, then why when I was driving around tractor trailer, why didn't the public works crew mention at that time this was issue? I do not believe this is a problem, I do believe the neighbors handle the situation properly, do not believe there is a parking issue, and do believe there is a limited speeding issue which can be dealt with by installing speed bumps or proper enforcement in the 56th area. He does believe we have increased the dangers of the children currently. He strongly would love to see the signs removed tomorrow morning acknowledging the proper procedure was not followed and a mistake was made.

Chairman Johnson replied this is a definite example of how different departments are doing different things, such as the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing. The residents point is well taken.

Tom Novotny not part of the Deer Path group, just would like to correct one thing. Not the first street in which the Village has made a mistake.

Don Cassier feels the staff does not believe in one issue, but addresses another issue. There is a lack of communication which was addressed by **Mr. Millette**. There is a communication issue. When this occurred, he left two voice messages and an email, but still had to call again before speaking with **Mr. Fera**. Emails were sent to the Council and other staff members, including the Village Manager, the acting Directors. No one had the courtesy to respond. He feels that village staff works for the tax payers. We are the bosses. If this were private industry, every single person would be fired because you do not respond to your bosses. We need communication. This all would have been taken care of and we would not be here now.

Myron Jarosewich looking at the picture provided shows his vehicle parked on the street due to some patio work being done at his address. He feels there is plenty of room for another vehicle to pass. The school buses and garbage truck had no problem passing today. He is opposed to the one-way situation.

Kurt Olsen asked as a closing remark, the petition signed were not just signatures from residents on 56th Street, but those from residents on streets around the area as well.

Chairman Johnson stated he did notice. For the record there are a number of emails received from people in the area who could not attend the meeting tonight. They are opposed to the one way designation as well. **Chairman Johnson** asked for any further comments from the staff.

Mike Millette responded that the average number of trips per day for each single family home is about 8-10 trips. There are 13 houses on one side and 11 houses on the other side which would generate between 192 to 240 car trips per day. He stated the Staff Report shows 195 on the low end but within the range. This is counter-intuitive to the cut through concept. This is traffic flow expected from just the residents in the area.

Residents voiced their disagreement to **Mr. Millette's** comments. **Chairman Johnson** stepped in and asked that staff be allowed to speak. **Mr. Millette** stated that the second issue regards the comparison made to Washington a couple of times, which is a valid comparison. Washington Street measures 24' to 26' in width between 55th Maple to the downtown area. Proposed parking restrictions have been discussed with the Parking & Traffic Commission in the past. The difference is, driving down a roadway with striping, you are aware of crossing over. With no parking on the creek side, you are swinging into oncoming traffic. Sometimes, our design standards do not apply. Our judgment was made according to our code. The geometry was approved in the late 1960's early 1970's.

Chairman Johnson questioned the volume count. Was the count taken with the actual counters?

Mr. Millette replied that Yes, the counts were taken with the counters.

Chairman Johnson asked if the counts were taken within a 24 hour period?

Mr. Millette replied that Yes, there was a 24 hour period.

Chairman Johnson stated this is a unique area with access from 55th, Fairview and the resident traffic. This is a path with the least resistance entering and exiting the neighborhood. To do something long term, an in depth study needs to be conducted **Chairman Johnson** asked if the commission members would like to add anything.

Commissioner Carlquist stated with the reaction from the residents, one question, the petition signed and the number of 24 homes against big brother taking care of this matter, why were the other people involved in the petition which were not affected? **Commissioner Carlquist** stated this is a rhetorical question. They are not affected. Understands staffs idea of isolating the boulevard for one-way direction by the design criteria. However, the u turn required could be a potential dangerous situation. He believes that speeding is on every street in Downers Grove but there may be other ways to handle the situation. He is not recommending at this point, but a left turn restriction could be posted off 55th Street between 4-6pm. This has worked on the north side of town on Ogden Avenue for other streets with cut through traffic. The boulevard situation normally with this design might have a channelization on the east and west side where traffic can safely be split traffic both ways. He is a believer of "If it's not broken, don't fix it" concept. He drives through this area as a resident and except for garage sale days, never seen a problem with the traffic.

Chairman Johnson stated if there is a problem with bypass traffic, it is a different study which needs to be conducted.

Commissioner Wendt reminded the public that being residents themselves, there is no agenda. We are listening to the public. His suggestion is to restore the roadway back to the way it was and do a proper study in the area of by pass traffic. After 35 years of street functioning in the manner the way they are, no need for big brother to make changes unless through a study results in some unsafe condition that we are not aware of presently.

Commissioner Thurston stated strictly mathematics based on the traffic counts and number of homes in the area between Deerpath and Cumnor Road, the vehicles traveling down both sides of the boulevard, 90% are the residents in the area. The U-turn is probably far more hazardous than making the streets one way. In favor of

returning the area back to the way it was with the proper study of the traffic flow and cut through issues over a much larger area. The design of the subdivision, which was in the 1960's, was not the best. This is not the only street in Downers Grove that measures narrow. He can make a motion that street be returned to its previous status prior to August 27th. Staff should continue to perform a proper study on the cut through traffic and take the needed counts. Does not believe there is cut through traffic in the area.

Chairman Johnson asked if the motion was directing staff on conducting a proper by pass study.

Mr. Millette asked if the motion being made is not to accept staff report.

Chairman Johnson stated that Yes, that would be the Commission's recommendation to the Village Manager, for the interim, until a proper study is conducted.

COMMISSIONER THURSTON MADE A MOTION TO FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE MANAGER TO RETURN THE STREET TO ITS ORIGINAL NORMAL STATUS PRIOR TO AUGUST 27, 2007 AND THAT STAFF CONDUCT A PROPER BY PASS STUDY.

COMMISSIONER STAPLETON SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL CALL:

**AYE: MR. WENDT, MR. THURSTON, MR. CARLQUIST, MR. STAPLETON,
CHAIRMAN JOHNSON**

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 5:0

Chairman Johnson stated the Village Manager has the final say. This was an action by staff and the Manager.

File #22-07 Fairmount Avenue -Summit St. to Randall St. -Parking Modifications

Chairman Johnson indicated that while the report stated this item was raised in 2003, he clarified that the street has been brought up to the commission many times prior due to its unique geometry. **Mr. Fera** added ,that the street was reviewed a number of years ago, but that traffic has increased significantly. He referenced the steep hill, noting staff was trying to minimize the length of the area for a No Parking restriction on both sides of the street.

Chairman Johnson opened up the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Dick Benes, 5236 Fairmount, resides at the bottom of the hill and stated in the 44years he has resided there, he has never seen a squad car issue tickets for either rush hours. He expressed concern about 490 cars traveling at the 31 mile speed limit, when the speed liimit is 25 MPH and the recommended speed is 15 MPH. He believed speeding cars should be issued tickets. However, he also believed the double yellow line has helped the traffic but speed at 35 MPH over the hill continues to be an issue. Trying to stop the speeding was only harassing the residents. He believed a little common sense was needed among the drivers and the proposal was not being requested by the residents. Residents used the parking spaces for their visitors.

Ms. Cathy Better, 5248 Fairmount, stated the speeding traffic begins at 6:30 AM. More recently, the person who almost struck her coming out of her driveway followed her path same path through the village and was an employee of the village. She agreed the hill should not be taken at more than 10 MPH and the only thing slowing down cars were the parked cars. She believed if those parking spaces were removed, the vehicles would be traveling excessively.

Mr. Tim Galligan, 5253 Fairmount, resides at the top of the hill and recommends that the commission review the matter similarly to the prior petition. He believed the park cars forced speeding vehicles to slow down. He still maintained his offer to use his driveway for a squad car. He clarified the geometries of the hill, noting the hill was the Summit Fairmount intersection and an accident occurred there prior. He pointed out at that time there were no cars on the street when that accident occurred. Mr. Galligan stated staffs recommendation would not only be an inconvenience but create a safety issue for his visitors. He also had concern about staffs comparison of Fairmount Avenue to Prairie Avenue. He did not support staffs recommendation.

Chairman Johnson reiterated staffs concern was safety. As to the head-on collision, **Mr. Fera** stated the head-on was very straight-forward.

Mr. Don Baers, 5313 Fairmount, stated more accidents have occurred at the intersection of Summit and Fairmount than what has been on the hill due to him parking his car there.

Mr. Dick Ourada, 5304 Fairmount, commented that he had about two and one-half days' notice on this matter and in which to gather evidence. He stated he has videotaped about 8 hours worth of tape for five days straight. Every time a car is parked on the street, the cars slow down. When cars are not parked on the street, it invites the cars to speed. He submitted the tape to **Chairman Johnson**. He also stated the village will force vehicles toward the intersections on both sides of the street, thereby blocking the intersection between Summit and Fairmount and Randall and Fairmount. Also because he resides on the hill, he voiced concern that because the sidewalk is on one side of the street, during the winter his friends and relatives will be forced to walk up the street in the snow to get to his home.

Mr. Russ Rydin, 5325 Washington Street, stated he parks his car in front of Mr. Ourada's home and also notes when there are no cars parked, the speeding occurs. Because the issue appeared to be speeding, he suggested that the village hire more police officers for enforcement rather than inconveniencing the residents who live there.

Mr. Ed Murphy, 5244 Fairmount, supported the statements already being voiced. He stated that back in 2003 the issue was speeding. He believed the commuters rather than the teenagers were the problem.

Ms. Carol Benes, 5236 Fairmount, reiterated that in the last six months to one year, she has seen the aggressiveness of vehicles behind her when pulling into her own driveway. She agreed speed was an issue. Regarding the head-on collision, she met with neighbors last week and none of them could remember it. She recalled a young lady hitting a tree last May.

Mr. Carlquist stated that two issues existed: speeding and safety and he understood staffs recommendation. He stated he was the one who compared Fairmount Avenue to Prairie Avenue, i.e., a blind hill exists and construction exists where cars are parked on both sides of the street. He favored staff's recommendation.

Mr. Dan Burgess, 5409 Benton Avenue, believes that restricting the parking would open up the street further.

Ms. Cathy Better 5248 Fairmount, agreed there was the issue of safety but removing the parked cars was not the solution. She asked 'if other alternatives could be explored, such as making the speed limit 15 MPH and enforcing it. Once the commuters know there is no parked cars on top of the hill, it will get worse.

Asked why this issue was raised again, **Mr. Fera** stated staff was trying to look at an intervention for the area understanding that if the parking was restricted it could open up the area for speeding. He also agreed having cars parked there also reduced speeding. However, staff was required to keep the lanes flowing for all vehicles and if parking is located on both sides then an issue arises. While he could not address all of the needs of the village and residents, something had to be done. He suggested looking at a reduced speed limit through the area with additional periodic enforcement. He did consider restricting parking to one side.

Mr. Wendt stated the neighbors were tolerating the street as it is and the village appeared to be attempting to install something that was against his best judgment and would make it more unsafe. He would not support staffs recommendation. **Chairman Johnson** also agreed it was contradictory but the situation was unique. He had concerns that there was no history of parked cars being hit. **Chairman Johnson** talked about the difficulty of police enforcement. However, he suggested that staff asked the police to place the area on their enforcement list. He did not believe it was necessary to reduce the speed limit. **Chairman Johnson** also summarized the 85% percentile as it relates to the 31MPH operating speed.

MR. CARLQUIST MADE A MOTION THAT 1)STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION BE ACCEPTED; 2) THAT THE POLICE DEPARTMENT BE REQUESTED TO PUT THE MATTER ON THEIR AGENDA FOR CONCENTRATION; AND 3) AT THE VERY LEAST, THAT SIGNAGE ADDRESSING A "BLIND HILL" BE INSTALLED.

MOTION DIED FOR LACK OF A SECOND.

MR. WENDT MADE A MOTION TO REJECT STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION BUT THAT THE POLICE DEPARTMENT PLACE THE MATTER ON THEIR LIST FOR CONCENTRATION TO ADDRESS SPEEDING IN THE AREA AND THAT SIGNAGE ADDRESSING A "BLIND HILL" BE INSTALLED.

MR. THURSTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

Mr. Tom Novotny, 4809 Stanley, suggested the village research portable cameras for the area which automatically issues tickets to violators.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. WENDT, MR. THURSTON, MR. STAPLETON, CHAIRMAN JOHNSON NAY: MR. CARLQUIST

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 4-1

Mr. Carlquist stated he voted Nay because he saw it as a potential safety problem.

File #23-07 Puffer Road at 61st Street -Intersection Control Review

A Neighborhood Petition on this matter was filed to consider a safety issue at the intersection of Puffer Road and 61st Street. Currently a two-way stop exists. **Mr. Fera** had no specific comments. Continuing, **Chairman Johnson** stated staff did review the All-way stop warrants for this intersection and an upgrade was not warranted at this time.

Chairman Johnson opened up the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Todd Pagni, 6103 Puffer Road, initiated the petition and believed the issue was safety due to the amount of speeding that takes place on Puffer. He believes the traffic study was done on a holiday weekend when lighter traffic occurred. No sidewalks exist and pedestrians walk down the road. A hill at 61st Street also exists. The intersection has three school bus stops with many students and general foot traffic from families in the area. He believes adding a stop sign will alleviate some of those concerns. **Mr. Pagni** believed that once the Belmont Underpass was completed, more traffic would be at Belmont and 63rd Street and more vehicle would cut through Puffer Road to make the right turn onto 63rd Street. He stated the neighbors wanted the stop sign.

Mr. Jim Callahan, 6100 Puffer, stated he believes the village should install a stop sign due to the safety of the children in the morning. Currently, the children stand on the street to wait for their buses and have to avoid a three-foot ditch. Most of the times they will stand in his driveway. He discussed the visibility difficulty at the hill coming down Puffer Street. How staff missed the student count in the morning was also a concern and he requested that staff review its figure again. He commented he was seeing more cut-through traffic off of 63rd Street.

Mr. Gary Foster, 6205 Puffer Road, disagreed with the residents. He believed installing an additional stop sign would make it difficult to get up the hill. He believed that since the light on Belmont and 63rd Street had changed, there was less cut-through traffic. He preferred to leave the intersection as a two-way stop.

The **Chairman** recalled a similar discussion took place on the same intersection a few years ago but the issue on the hill was significant. He proceeded to explain how stop signs were not designed to control the speed on a street and can become hazardous if they are installed without being warranted. Commissioners and staff were asked to provide their input.

Mr. Mike Millette commented that this was a case where the residents were concerned about accidents but the data was not supporting it. He touched upon how the formula was calculated based on certain criteria but the volume of traffic was not there to support the warrant. He further noted that Puffer Avenue was scheduled in the sidewalk matrix for 2009 construction and 61st a couple of years later.

Discussion followed whether there was a better location for the bus stop but it was noted the buses were from Woodridge.

Ms. Ingrid Foster, 6205 Puffer, did not have an issue with the intersection. She believes the traffic was better due to the No Left Turn being installed. The bus used to stop for the students at her driveway and there was no problem.

A suggestion was made by **Mr. Wendt** to consider signage or painted lines at the intersection, wherein **Mr. Fera** stated one sign already existed cautioning vehicles that an intersection was ahead but perhaps the sign could be replaced with an enlarged "Blind Hill" sign.

MR. WENDT MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF STAFF AND THAT THE EXISTING TWO-WAY STOP CONTROL REMAIN EXCEPT THAT SIGNAGE BE REVIEWED IN THE AREA AS IT RELATES TO THE "BLIND HILL" AND THAT STAFF CONTACT THE BUS COMPANY/SCHOOL DISTRICT REGARDING PICK UP OF CHILDREN.

MR. STAPLETON SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. WENDT, MR. CARLQUIST, MR. STAPLETON, MR. THURSTON, CHAIRMAN JOHNSON NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 5-0

OLD BUSINESS

Chairman Johnson appreciated receiving a set of maps of the school route. A brief review of the future agenda items followed. **Mr. Fera** stated the Middaugh Avenue at Franklin matter would have to be postponed due to the construction. The Belle Aire School matter will likely be taken off the list. As to other issues, he will be attending a scheduled neighborhood meeting on 61st Street addressing some of the previously installed speeding interventions. He also envisions speaking about the update to the Traffic Calming program at that meeting. Speeds also appear to be increasing on 68th Street Fairmount to Fairview and, therefore, he plans to schedule a neighborhood meeting for that section also.

Interim Public Works Dir. Robin Weaver also mentioned that the one-way matter on Linden Place was another topic that would be addressed.

An update followed on the streets being considered for the Traffic Calming program, i.e., Claremont, 71st Street and 61st Street. Roslyn has been addressed but staff will also re-visit the College and Katrine intersection. Details followed on some of the interventions that took place. Asked if there was feedback from the residents on 71st Street, **Mr. Millette** stated he had not heard anything. **Dir. Weaver** indicated that the Traffic Calming program was still on board with the Village Council. **Mr. Millette** indicated that staff was to be ready to have an enhanced Traffic Calming program to include interventions on collector streets. He was also reviewing the timeframe for local streets.

A dialog followed on whether the thresholds were set too high on the original Traffic Calming matrix. **Mr. Wendt** preferred to see an intervention in place just to measure the results. Adding to that, **Mr. Millette** explained that along with the Community Investment program draft was a project entitled "Traffic Calming Initiatives" to move a project along. He also suggested that the portable systems may have to be considered.

Conversation was raised on the previous 56" Street agenda item and the fact that better communication was necessary.

On a different matter, **Mr. Tom Novotny**, a resident, commented that the commission may want to place on a future agenda a review of traffic sensors off of Prairie Avenue going west across Main Street and the sensor on Prairie Avenue going east across Fairview, which do not pick up his motorcycle. **Mr. Fera** stated the sensors for both locations will be investigated. **Mr. Novotny** also stated the count down on Fairview Avenue appeared to be speeding up vehicles and rushing them through the intersection.

MR. CARLQUIST MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.

MR. THURSTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:25 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Celeste
Weilandt,

Recording
Secretary

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING, SEPTEMBER 10, 2007, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Pro Tem Waechtler called the September 10, 2007 meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and asked for a roll call:

PRESENT: Mr. Beggs, Mr. Cozzo, Mr. Matejczyk, Mr. Quirk, Mrs. Rabatah, Mr. Waechtler

ABSENT: Mrs. Hamernik, Mr. Webster, Chairman Jirik

STAFF PRESENT: Senior Village Planner, Jeff O'Brien; Village Planners Mr. Stan Popovich, and Mr. Damir Latinovic; Village Attorney Beth Clark; Development Engineer John Hall

VISITORS: Lu Branda, 5300 Walnut 20C, Downers Grove; Chris Tseunis, 5300 Walnut 11D, Downers Grove; Dolores Porter, 5300 Walnut 14C, Downers Grove; Emily Rakas, 5300 Walnut 6C, Downers Grove; Barbara McHellan (SP?), 5300 Walnut 13D, Downers Grove; Lorraine Tresnak, 5300 Walnut 14D, Downers Grove; Rachel Toberman 5300 Walnut 16E, Downers Grove; Charlotte Davidge, 5300 Walnut 19C, Downers Grove; Marilyn Hannapel, 5300 Walnut 11C, Downers Grove; Helen Kuta, 5300 Walnut 5C, Downers Grove; Shirley Weiss, 5300 Walnut 23C, Downers Grove; Shirley Remes, 5300 Walnut 24C, Downers Grove; Dorothy & George Daly, 5300 Walnut 12C, Downers Grove; Katherine Oliverio, 4225 Saratoga 301B, Downers Grove; Ross Gray, Condo President, 2900 Maple, Downers Grove; Lucie Berkieh, 2900 Maple, Downers Grove; Paul Simonek, 6250 Leonard, Downers Grove; Steve, Kathy, Nicole & Trisha Harmon, 6275 Janes, Downers Grove; Rick & Maureen Fear, Petitioners, 5155 Cornell, Downers Grove; Eric Wendell, Petitioner, 1121 Warren, Downers Grove; Steve Wendell, Petitioner, 1121 Warren, Downers Grove; Thomas Schultz, 6100 Janes, Downers Grove; Robert Craig Bowlin, 6251 Leonard, Downers Grove; Joseph Brdlik, 6111 Leonard, Downers Grove; Jason Siever, 6251 Leonard, Downers Grove; Tom & Diane Kowalski, 6200 Janes, Downers Grove; Helen Nothdurft, 2449 Hobson Rd., Downers Grove; Fernando Lagunas, 2S10 W. 63rd, Downers Grove; LeeAnn Gutzwiler, 6255 Leonard, Downers Grove; LeeAnn Clary, 6200 Leonard, Downers Grove; Raymond J. Bagdonas, 6036 Leonard, Downers Grove; Joseph & Mary Kay Rauens, 6260 Janes, Downers Grove; Rudolph & Jeanne Boehm, 6065 Chase, Downers Grove; Jim Callahan, 6100 Puffer, Downers Grove; Robert B. & Barbara Jane Messler, 6245 Leonard, Downers Grove; Joseph Pappalardo, 6261 Fairmount, Downers Grove; Shirley Sennebogen, 6227 Chase, Downers Grove; Mary Ann & Leonard Atkins 6204 Janes, Downers Grove; Teri & David Heugh, 6261 Janes, Downers Grove; James Miller, 6209 Janes, Downers Grove; Marcelline Ricker, 6120 Woodward, Downers Grove; Bill Lapacek, 6150 Leonard, Downers Grove; Dawn Stella, 6250 Leonard, Downers Grove; Phil Barr, 4605 Puffer, Downers Grove; Phil Clary, 6200 Leonard, Downers Grove; Mark Toman, 1109 61st, Downers Grove; Tom Sisul, 5120 Main, Downers Grove; Annie Jagielski, 6060 Chase, Downers Grove; Jim Russ, Jr., 4915 Main, Downers Grove; Gordon L. Goodman, 5834 Middaugh, Downers Grove; F. Falesch, 820 Prairie, Downers Grove; Andy Clark, 1226 62nd, Downers Grove;

Marshall Schmitt, 4923 Seeley, Downers Grove; Richard W. Mueller, Petitioner, 1410 Concord Dr., Downers Grove; Nathan Bryant, Petitioner, Bradford Real Estate; John Schoditsch, Petitioner, Bradford Real Estate, 10 S. Wacker Dr., Chicago; Mike Ford, Petitioner, Mill Creek Development, 8104 W. 119th St., Palos Park; Laura Shafer, Petitioner, V3 Companies Ltd., 7325 Janes, Woodridge; Matthew Champine, Petitioner, V3 Companies Ltd, 7325 Janes, Woodridge; Matt Wisz, Petitioner, Interplan Midwest, 1S280 Summit Ave., Oak Brook Terrace; Katrina McGuire, Petitioner, Schain, Burney, Ross & Citron, 222 N. LaSalle St., #1910, Chicago; Mtlope Witfield, Petitioner, Schain, Burney, Ross & Citron, 222 N. LaSalle St., #1910, Chicago; Eric Styer, Soos & Associates, Inc. 105 Schelter Rd., Lincolnshire; Michael Achim, Petitioner, Starbucks Coffee Co., 550 W. Washington St., Chicago; Scott L. Sanders, Sanders Design Group, 333 E. State St., Rockford; Lua Abodna, KLOA, Inc., 9575 W. Higgins Rd., Rosemont; James Neils, 6237 Chase; Kathleen Harmon, 6275 James Avenue, Downers Grove, Patricia McGrath, 6000 Janes, Downers Grove,

Chairman Pro Tem Waechtler led the audience in the reciting of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Minutes of the August 6, 2007 meeting were approved on motion by Mr. Matejczyk, seconded by Mrs. Rabatah. Motion carried by voice vote of 6-0.

Minutes of the August 20, 2007 meeting were approved on motion by Mr. Beggs, seconded by Mr. Cozzo. Motion carried by voice vote of 6-0.

Chairman Pro Tem Waechtler explained the protocol for the meeting and explained the final two items on the agenda would be switched.

FILE NO. PC-26-07 A petition seeking: 1) Rezoning from R-1, Single Family Residential to B-2, General Retail Business; 2) Special Use Drive-Through Uses; 3) Special Use Outdoor Café; 4) Variations; 5) Final Planned Development Approval; 6) Final Plat of Subdivision Approval; 7) Text amendment of Section 28.405 Minimum Areas for Zoning Districts for properties located at the Northeast Corner of 63rd Street & Janes Avenue, commonly known as 2440 63rd Street and 6295 Janes Avenue, Downers Grove, IL (PIN's 08-13-414-019,-020,0021,-022,-023; Bradford 63rd LLC/State Bank of Countryside T/U/T 11-25-02 #02-2469, Petitioner; Mark T. Newey, Owner

Chairman Pro Tem Waechtler swore in those individuals who would be speaking on File No. PC-26-07.

Mr. O'Brien, Senior Planner for the Village of Downers Grove, discussed the site is located at the northwest corner of Leonard Avenue and 63rd Street and is a proposal for redevelopment of two (2) single-family properties. A public, unimproved alley runs north of the site. The proposal will include the subdivision for two new commercial lots for a Chase Bank on the eastern lot and a Starbucks on the western lot. Details of the site layout followed. The petitioner will improve the Village's alley with paving and curb. A widening of Leonard Avenue is also proposed at the intersection with 63rd Street for a right turn lane. Per the Village's Subdivision Code, staff is requesting a fee in lieu of sidewalk for Leonard Avenue. Additionally, stormwater detention will be contained in an underground system. A number of variations are being requested and include a parking setback of less than 25 feet along 63rd Street and along Leonard Avenue; a reduction in the

front yard setback from 25 feet to 15 feet for the building and the drive aisle along the western side; and a rear yard setback for the buildings. The petitioner is requesting to have parking in front of the building and away from the residents. There are 45 parking spaces proposed; 32 parking spaces are required. The stacking plan for the bank and Starbucks followed. A shared parking agreement between the two entities will be necessary.

Details of the widening of Leonard Avenue followed. Staff believes the rezoning is appropriate for the area since there are several current uses along 63rd Street where commercial uses are adjacent to residential uses. Due to the commercial uses to the south and east, staff recommended approval.

Commissioner questions and comments followed. Per Mr. O'Brien, long term, the Village plans to have residential use (6 to 11 units per acre) from the area of Walgreens at 63rd and Belmont, but given the traffic volumes on 63rd Street and the development across 63rd Street, staff expected higher density residential or commercial uses would be more appropriate. Current zoning from the western-most point of Downers Grove to the Auto Zone was zoned R-1 use, including the Walgreens site. Staff stated the current sites were being used for single family uses.

Mr. Nathan Bryant Petitioner with Bradford Real Estate, thanked staff for their assistance on the project. He introduced Mr. Mike Achim with Starbucks and Mr. Ken Coleander with Chase Bank. Mr. Bryant's office focuses on commercial development and the redevelopment of space. Mr. Bryant stated he sees the area as a transitional area from residential to commercial. To date, he explained the plan changed in that traffic from the site would exit to Leonard Avenue rather than Janes Avenue since a signal existed there, and staff supported it. As a suggestion from staff, as traffic moves onto Leonard Avenue, a proposed right turn lane will be created in order to relieve traffic. Mr. Bryant explained the architecture was a combination of input from staff, Starbucks, and Chase Bank. A dense landscaping buffer was designed around the site and approximately 19% of the site is dedicated to green space.

Mr. Eric Styer, Soos & Associates, 105 Schelter Rd., Lincolnshire, discussed the architecture for the Starbucks building but noted he was requesting two Special Uses, one for the café and one for the drive-through. Architectural details of the masonry building followed, noting the building was only 18 feet in height, and mechanicals would be screened. Material samples were presented for viewing by the Commission.

Mr. Matt Wisz, with Interplan Midwest, 1S280 Summit Avenue, Oak Brook Terrace, explained the architectural details for Chase Bank noting some of the details played off the Starbucks building. Sample boards were made available to view.

Mr. Bryant discussed the details and configurations of the two entrance points to the site.

Mr. Lua Abodna with KLOA, Inc. 9757 W. Higgins, Rosemont, traffic consultant, discussed the traveling options for the traffic to enter the site. He explained the importance of the 63rd street entrance was to capture the morning traffic heading westbound. Eastbound traffic on 63rd could choose to use the left-turn lane or the light to head up Leonard. Asked if there was any consideration to create a left-hand restriction to the full access drive off Leonard, Mr. Abodna stated it was not considered, but it would restrict access for the neighborhood. Asked if there was any comparison between the traffic turning into the bank at Belmont on 63rd, he explained they did not compare traffic for that facility. Asked if a comparison for traffic moving east and west at this site

or a comparison of traffic moving east and west on Ogden at Saratoga was done, Mr. Abodna said he did not have the data. Concern was raised about stacking on Leonard at 63rd Street where it could block the intersection, wherein Mr. Abodna stated the intersection was reviewed, noting that peaks for the two facilities were different which balanced the site. He did not see any concern, noting the right turn lane was added to address that concern.

Asked about traffic signage within the site, Mr. Abodna stated that appropriate signage would be installed on the site to direct traffic. As to an estimate of the patrons coming from the Tollway versus the neighborhood or traffic from other areas, Mr. Abodna believed that the majority of traffic would be from 63rd and from the morning westbound traffic heading toward the Tollway. However, the traffic study did not specifically compare the number of trips from the neighborhood versus the number of trips from 63rd Street to the site.

Per a question, Mr. Bryant said Bradley Real Estate would design the block retaining wall.

As to improving the north alley, Mr. O'Brien stated the alley north of the site would include paving and curb on one-half, while the other half would be landscaped.

Regarding the Starbucks' drive-up window, Mr. Michael Achim, for Starbucks Coffee Co., 550 W. Washington Street, Chicago, pointed out the layout of the drive-through window and the microphone system planned for the facility, noting the menu board has a microphone and visual confirmation board, which reduces the amount of chatter between the patron and employee. Mr. Achim also added the layers of landscaping and fencing should help reduce noise, but he did want to work with the neighbors. Mr. Achim understood that stacking in the drive-through could become a concern, but explained if it became too much, patrons would either go inside or travel somewhere else. He discussed the success of Starbucks shops with drive-throughs. Mr. Achim stated the Starbucks facilities are open from 5:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. depending on their location. He understood that the lighting to the north would be shielded from the residents and would be provided by the developer.

Mr. Nathan Bryant, with Bradford Real Estate, explained the lighting would include 20-foot pole heights with cut-off fixtures at the property lines. However, he explained the issue was to try to serve the use appropriately and to provide security. A review of the landscaping plans for the north side of the property followed. The location of the eight-foot fence was noted on the site plan.

Mrs. Rabatah expressed concern about constructing the fence and running into tree root structures.

Chairman Pro Tem Waechtler opened up the meeting to public comment.

Mr. James Neils, 6237 Chase, asked whether there was a review of the number of accidents at 63rd and Leonard. He questioned whether staff spoke about it to the Parking and Traffic Commission. He expressed concern about rezoning the area. Mr. Neils stated in 2007 ten accidents occurred in the Chase and Puffer area. He wanted to address safety concerns before the development was constructed.

Ms. Kathleen Harmon, 6275 James Avenue, Downers Grove, distributed a petition from a majority of the residents from the "Hobson Triangle" as well as a number of photographs. She reviewed photographs of her property, photos of the Meadowbrook Shopping Center, and photos of the three

new residences. She also provided a list of the accidents and violations within the last 18 months in her area between Belmont to Janes. Her home will be adjacent to the proposal. She believes the proposal will negatively impact the property value of her home, and she will have no privacy. She voiced concern about the safety of her children when vehicles turn around in her driveway. Other concerns included more traffic in the area, more accidents and more air and noise pollution on the other side of her property. If approved, she said the Hobson Triangle residents would be affected by violations of Section 28.1702. For staff to state the proposal was the best zoning for the site she said there would have been no requests for variance setbacks or a text amendment. In addition, if staff's report stated that single-family use should be discouraged then why was the area zoned residential initially. Lastly, she stated if the Village was seeking an additional tax base, it should have considered speaking to the owner of the Meadowbrook Shopping Center.

Mr. Paul Simon, a resident who resides adjacent to the proposal, distributed a letter to the Commissioners from his neighbor who has resided in the area for the past 40 years. Mr. Simon stated he had concerns about using the public alley for private use. He also had concerns about an eight-foot fence in the rear of his backyard. He had concerns of air and noise pollution, litter, water run-off from the site and the Village conducting its own traffic study. He had concerns about no plans depicting a sidewalk on Leonard Avenue, nor that the access drive on Leonard was relocated further south to minimize the impact on the neighborhood since it was not depicted in any of the plans.

Ms. LeeAnn Clary, 6200 Leonard stated she would like to speak on behalf of her neighbor LeeAnn Gutzwiler, 6255 Leonard, who resides directly across the street of the proposal. Ms. Gutzwiler had concerns about lighting since the proposal would face her bedroom. She also understood that the pine trees would be removed to widen Leonard Avenue. Ms. Clary expressed her belief that not much consideration was given to traffic on Leonard Avenue and believed cut-through traffic would occur. She asked if some stop signs could be installed to deter traffic from traveling on Leonard.

Mr. Leonard Atkins, 6204 Janes Street, had concern that the meeting was a formality since the Village already met with the developers. He noted in staff's report that "rezoning is appropriate based on uses across the street." He noted that zoning across the street did not back up to residential uses, such as the proposal. He questioned staff's language in the report and further read part of staff's report as it pertains to the rezoning of the property. He believed the commercial use being compared across the street was not a fair comparison to the proposal, and he questioned the variations being requested and the definition of "spot zoning". He walked through staff's recommendations and found fault with a number of items as it relates to property values, sidewalks, and setback changes. He reminded the Commission that the residents of Hobson Triangle were annexed into Downers Grove as a residential neighborhood. He questioned the benefits of the developer coming into the site and whether tax benefits were being offered to the developer. He reminded the Commission to act on behalf of the residents since they were not accustomed to the zoning terms.

Mr. Robert Craig Bowlin, 6251 Leonard Avenue, pointed out his home and his neighbors' homes on the overhead projector. He stated no one addressed the loss of 25 trees on the site. He too was concerned about air pollution from the vehicles, drainage, the topography of the site and additional traffic from the site.

Mr. Raymond Bagdonas, 6036 Leonard Avenue, voiced concerns about traffic cut-through during the rush hours and ask why the egresses had to be off Janes or Leonard Avenues, since most were off 63rd Street. He noted staff said that future zoning was going from R-1 to B-2. He did not see a trend from R-1 to B-2 near the Walgreens.

Ms. Barbara Messler, 6245 Leonard, discussed the narrow characteristic of Leonard Avenue in general. If the proposal did pass, she asked that the egress from the area onto Leonard prohibit a northbound turn since cut-through traffic was a significant problem in the neighborhood.

Mr. David Heugh, 6261 Janes, recently moved into the area about five months ago and was completely surprised that a commercial use was coming. He was already picking up trash and had concerns about traffic cut-through and too much commercial property not being used. He asked the Commission not to support the proposal.

Ms. Pat McGrath, 6000 Janes, stated it would make more sense to bring in the proposal to an existing mall two blocks away without having to rezone. She believed the proposal would be a nice addition. She believed that eastbound traffic, especially high schoolers, would be traveling to Starbucks in the morning and possibly causing more traffic accidents. She resides three blocks east of Interstate 355 and stated houses, landscaping, etc. do not block the noise from the interstate, and she did not believe the landscaping and fence would buffer the noise for these residents. She had concerns about the fencing being installed near tree roots. She supported that the entrances be off 63rd Street and not the side streets.

Mr. Fernando Lagunas, 2510 W. 63rd Street, stated his concern was traffic and the difficulty of getting in and out of his driveway. He expressed concerns about more noise and traffic and eventually changing his property to a commercial use.

Mr. Jason Siever, 6251 Leonard was sworn in. Mr. Siever stated his concerns involved property value when the proposal develops and the widening of Leonard Avenue since he has three vehicles.

Mr. Tom Sisul, 5120 Main Street, stated he does not reside in the area but believes the developer is a fine developer. Mr. Sisul stated he was surprised the proposal was moving forward, noting the area was strongly residential and akin to 63rd Street and Fairview Avenue.

Mr. Tom Kowalski, 6200 Janes Avenue, stated he agreed with the objections already stated and concurred cut-through traffic was an issue. Eastbound traffic appeared to be making U-turns to enter northbound I-355. He also had concerns about noise and the rezoning to commercial. He did not support the proposal.

Mr. Jim Neils, 6237 Chase Avenue, believed the proposal was inconsistent with the Village's Strategic Plan, and he suggested the Commission speak with the Parking and Traffic Commission and the County. He believed detention was a concern. He noted the Commission was a recommending body, and the residents could again speak before the Village Council.

Ms. Kathleen Harmon stated she was against the proposal since it would affect her property value.

Mr. Matejczyk referenced a picture with three new houses and asked for clarification of the site.

There being no further public comment, Chairman Pro Tem Waechtler closed public comment.

Chairman Pro Tem Waechtler stated the petitioner may cross-examine any member of the public. Mr. Bryant responded he would address that in his closing statement and offered to answer Commissioner questions instead.

Mr. Beggs inquired of the petitioner why the stop light at Leonard was originally installed, wherein the petitioner did not know. Mr. O'Brien stated 63rd Street was a County road, and the Village had no control over the 63rd access. As to why the access was not on 63rd Street, Mr. Bryant explained based on his conversations with the County, it was a condition that no direct access be granted for a commercial development onto 63rd Street. Instead, direct access to Leonard Avenue was a safer condition.

Mr. Bryant discussed stormwater detention for the site, noting the property was lower, and the overland flow would be accepted and captured with the proposed stormwater system. He would work with the residents to address any outstanding issues. In closing, Mr. Bryant stated he was also a resident to an adjacent commercial property and understood change, but also believed the use being proposed was appropriate for the 63rd Corridor and was a connection to the Tollway, which was why the Chase Bank and Starbucks proposal was before the Commission. He agreed the site was a transitional site. He discussed the buffering and lighting that was to take place, the fact that he attempted to work with the residents to the north that were not willing to meet with him, and he discussed the improvements being made to Leonard Avenue to support the 63rd Corridor and the improved detention. Regarding the ability for traffic to exit onto Leonard Avenue, Mr. Bryant stated the driveway as designed was an integral part of the development and would hope that the neighbors become Starbucks customers and bank at Chase Bank. He did not want to prohibit their ability to safely egress the site to their homes. He asked for consideration and support for the project.

Mr. O'Brien, Village Planner, added that one item not addressed was the petitioner's request for a text amendment. At staff's direction, the text amendment was to specifically allow the Village to include the minimum district size in the Zoning Ordinance for two acres. While the Zoning Ordinance states if that particular zoning district is adjacent to a less restrictive zoning district, the additional area may be counted towards the overall district size. However, the Zoning Ordinance was not clear whether it included zoning districts in neighboring jurisdictions. Staff looked at this matter with the petitioner and determined that, as with the past, the Village did use neighboring jurisdictions' zoning to calculate a new zoning district's boundaries. Mr. O'Brien clarified staff was not recommending approval of the petitioner's text amendment since the Village's Zoning Ordinance already covered the matter.

Continuing, Mr. O'Brien defined the term "spot zoning." Regarding the sidewalks fee in lieu issue, Mr. O'Brien explained the Village did not study which side of the street on which the sidewalk would be installed. The Village was not offering the petitioner any tax incentives. Other Village departments did review the proposal and included the Public Works Division, the Fire Prevention Division, and Community Development Department. The Village's on-staff traffic engineer did review the traffic study and recommended adding the extra right-turn lane onto Leonard Avenue.

Asked where else in the Village was there a development which included both egresses into a residential neighborhood, Mr. Beggs stated the Family Shelter Services, located on Old Main Street

between Lemont Road just north of 75th Street. Mr. O'Brien stated the hospital was another example.

Mr. Matejczyk, while he favored the proposal, had issues with rezoning the area between Janes and Leonard as well as only considering that portion of the side of the 63rd Street. The new homes that were recently constructed were another concern. He believed the entire north side of 63rd Street should be considered. He had concerns about rezoning the area as commercial since the lots were shallow. He preferred the north side of 63rd Street be considered, and if rezoned, to see it considered as high-density residential versus commercial.

Mr. Cozzo also preferred the design of the buildings, but he had trouble supporting the proposal when three sides of the surrounding properties were residential. He did not see a trend to commercial and, therefore, he would not support the proposal.

Mrs. Rabatah agreed the development was nice, but pointed out that only two locations were identified in the Village that exited out to a residential area. She did not believe the proposal met the standards for approval for a development and would not support it.

Mr. Quirk stated that while he liked the design, the lot depth was not appropriate for the development. The number of traffic accidents was another concern and adding such a development would only add to it. He would not support the proposal.

Mr. Beggs discussed some of the history of previous commercial developments which were approved that led into residential neighborhoods, noting that developments intruding into neighborhoods were a difficult argument to sustain when a street was in transition. There were areas up and down a street that reflected abutment to residential areas. However, his concern was traffic accidents in the immediate area of the proposal. He stated he drove through the neighborhood recently and was impressed by its residential aspect. However, he was opposed to establishing a business development at the proposed location.

Chairman Pro Tem Waechtler shared many of the Commissioners' comments and believed the project was a nice development in the wrong location. He addressed the Village's Strategic Plan and pointed out how it addresses the business aspect but also addresses the residents. To zone the area from R1 to B2 based on Woodridge's commercial use across the street was not a good reason to support the proposal. Lastly, he believed the proposal was too tight for the space

Mr. Bryant asked that the matter be tabled due to hearing new traffic information. The Chairman Pro Tem left it up to the Commissioners.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE NO. PC-26-07, COMMISSIONER MATEJCZYK, MADE A MOTION TO FORWARD A NEGATIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL REGARDING THE PROPOSED RE-ZONING, PLANNED DEVELOPMENT WITH VARIATIONS, SPECIAL USES, PLAT OF SUBDIVISION AND TEXT AMENDMENT.

SECONDED BY MR. BEGGS.

ROLL CALL:

**AYE: MR. MATEJCZYK, MR. BEGGS, MR. COZZO, MR. QUIRK, MRS. RABATAH,
MR. WAECHTLER**

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIES. VOTE: 6-0

(The Plan Commission took a 10-minute break at 9:45 p.m. and then reconvened at 9:55 p.m.)

Chairman Pro Tem Waechtler announced that the petitioner for File PC. 31-07 would like to defer his petition to the October 1, 2007 Plan Commission meeting. Staff concurred.

FILE NO. PC-31-07 A petition seeking an Amendment to Chapter 28 of the Municipal Code-Zoning Ordinance, Article 13(c) Residential Accessory Structures; James F. Russ, Jr., Attorney/Petitioner

**MR. BEGGS MADE A MOTION TO DEFER FILE PC 31-07 TO THE OCTOBER 1, 2007
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING.**

SECONDED BY MR. QUIRK.

ROLL CALL:

**AYE: MR. BEGGS, MR. QUIRK, MR. COZZO, MR. MATEJCZYK, MRS. RABATAH,
MR. WAECHTLER**

NAY: NONE

MOTION APPROVED. VOTE: 6-0

FILE NO. PC-30-07 A petition seeking a Special Use for a Drive-Up Window for property located at the Northeast corner of Ogden & Highland Avenues, commonly known as 950 Ogden Avenue, Downers Grove, IL (PIN'S 09-05-118-022,-023,024); A. W. Wendell & Sons, Inc., Petitioner; Rich & Maureen Fear, Owners

Mr. Popovich, Village Planner, explained the petition is for a Special Use for a drive-through window for a restaurant. The owners would like to split the existing building into two spaces, with the eastern half for a restaurant and the western half for office use. The drive-through is proposed for the eastern side of the building. No speaker system will be used at the drive-through window. Two parking spaces will be removed on the south side and three spaces will be located to the north side of the building. The parking lot will be improved with ten spaces dedicated on the east side of the lot and will be moved off the property line to add some green space. Approximately 13 parking spaces will be included as required by the Zoning Ordinance. Landscape buffering will take place on the north and east sides of the property.

Per staff, the proposal complies with open space requirements of the B-3 zoning district. It also complies with the Future Land Use Map and the Ogden Avenue Master Plan. Regarding signage, Mr. Popovich stated the existing signage was not in compliance and had to be relocated ten feet from all property lines. While parking spaces were being proposed to be installed in the Highland Avenue right-of-way, they had to meet Village's standards as a condition of approval. Those parking spaces would not be counted towards any future use for the building. If the spaces are not installed, the parkway will have to be restored. Staff recommended a photometric plan at the permitting phase. Staff recommended a positive recommendation to the Village council.

Ms. Maureen Fear, Petitioner, 5155 Cornell, Downers Grove, stated she and her husband purchased a Maui Wau franchise, which offers coffees and smoothies, a year ago. After building up their business, they decided to open up a retail store at the proposed location. Improvements to the site include a facade update, reconfiguring the interior, increasing green space, and increasing the overall curb appeal of her building on Ogden Avenue. Hours of the drive-through window will be from 6:30 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. but can be reduced if necessary. Peak times will be the morning commute, mid-afternoon, and after-school rush. No speaker system will be used. She asked for the Commission's support.

Chairman Pro Tem Waechtler opened up the meeting to public comment. No comments received. The Chairman Pro Tem closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

Ms. Fear had no closing comments.

Chairman Pro Tem Waechtler asked for Commissioner comments. Overall, comments were positive that the proposal would be a good improvement for the location. Per a question, Ms. Fear stated a four-foot fence and landscaping were proposed for the east side of the property in order to delineate her property from the adjacent Mr. Trim business. She will improve it with green space. As to a neighborhood comment, Mr. Popovich confirmed he did speak to the neighbor to the north who had concerns about noise and loitering. Mr. Popovich stated the noise would most likely be coming from the restaurant use and not the drive-through window.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE NO. PC-30-07, MR. QUIRK MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION OF THE SPECIAL USE TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. THE IMPROVEMENTS SHALL SUBSTANTIALLY CONFORM TO THE ARCHITECTURAL AND LANDSCAPE PLANS PREPARED BY A.W. WENDELL & SONS, INC. DATED JULY 26, 2007 AND REVISED ON AUGUST 21, 2007 EXCEPT AS SUCH PLANS MAY BE MODIFIED TO CONFORM TO VILLAGE CODES AND ORDINANCES.**
- 2. THE DEVELOPMENT SHALL COMPLY WITH THE VILLAGE'S ENGINEERING, STORMWATER AND WATER ORDINANCES.**
- 3. A PHOTOMETRIC PLAN SHALL BE PROVIDED TO THE VILLAGE PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT. ALL PROPOSED LIGHTS SHALL BE DIRECTED AWAY FROM RESIDENTIAL USES.**

4. **THE PARKING SPACES PROVIDED WITHIN THE HIGHLAND AVENUE RIGHT-OF-WAY SHALL NOT BE COUNTED TOWARDS THE PARKING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PROPERTY AT 950 OGDEN AVENUE.**
5. **THE PROPOSED PARKING SPACES WITHIN THE HIGHLAND AVENUE RIGHT-OF-WAY SHALL CONFORM TO VILLAGE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS. IF THESE PARKING SPACES ARE NOT CONSTRUCTED, THE PETITIONER SHALL RESTORE THE PARKWAY WITH TURF AND THE INSTALLATION OF A CURB WHICH MEETS VILLAGE STANDARDS.**
6. **THE PETITIONER SHALL EITHER RELOCATE THE EXISTING SIGN TO BE COMPLIANT WITH SIGN ORDINANCE SETBACK REQUIREMENTS OR SHALL INSTALL A NEW SIGN WHICH IS IN COMPLETE COMPLIANCE WITH THE SIGN ORDINANCE.**
7. **THE PROPOSED OFFICE SPACE MAY NOT BE USED FOR MEDICAL OR DENTAL OFFICES.**
8. **THE BUILDING SHALL HAVE AN AUTOMATIC SPRINKLER SYSTEM INSTALLED THROUGHOUT. ALL AREAS OF THE BUILDING SHALL BE PROTECTED.**
9. **THE BUILDING SHALL HAVE A MANUAL AND AUTOMATIC DETECTION SYSTEM INSTALLED THROUGHOUT. ALL AREAS OF THE BUILDING SHALL BE PROTECTED.**
10. **A FIRE DEPARTMENT CONNECTION SHALL BE PROVIDED ON THE EXTERIOR OF THE BUILDING.**

SECONDED BY MR. COZZO.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. QUIRK, MR. COZZO, MR. BEGGS, MR. MATEJCZYK, MRS. RABATAH, MR. WAECHTLER

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 6-0

FILE NO. PC-33-07 A petition seeking an Amendment to a Special Use for the addition of two Garages, Gazebo and Pavilion for property located on the West side of Saratoga Avenue, 800 feet North of 41st Street, commonly known as 4000 Saratoga Avenue, Downers Grove, IL (PIN'S 09-06-215-005,-006); Alexander Bradley Burns American Legion Post No. 80, Petitioner/Owner

Mr. Damir Latinovic, Village Planner, explained the request is for a 10.8-acre property located on the east side of Saratoga Avenue just north of 41st Street. The property is zoned R-1 Single Family

Residence District and is surrounded by open space on the north, west and south sides. Multi family residences are located east of the site. The property currently has a 10,666 sq. foot office building with meeting and banquet halls. A surface parking lot occupies northern portion of the property with 135 parking spaces. American Legion Post 80 and the DuPage County Traffic Court occupy the existing building. As a permitted Special Use, any changes to the property require Plan Commission review and Village Council approval.

Per staff, the petitioner is proposing to construct two new 28 foot by 22 foot garages (adjacent to the parking lot), an open-air pavilion (30 x 60 feet to replace an existing shed), and a new 192 square foot gazebo to the south of the existing building. The petitioner is also proposing to install a dirt trail throughout the property for recreational purposes and to provide access to the gazebo. The existing building and parking lot would remain the same. With the addition of the structures on the lot, the proposed lot coverage of all buildings would be 13,845 square feet, or 0.028 percent of the site, well within the maximum permitted 0.6 percent. All structures meet or exceed required setbacks. The open-air pavilion, which is located 40 feet from the existing building, is the closest structure to the principal building, well over the minimum required ten feet. The existing chain link fence and landscaping located along all property lines will remain unchanged.

The property is privately held but functions as an open space for recreational use. The American Legion plans to rent out the space for private parties. Staff believes the addition is consistent with the intent of the Future Land Use Map and other Village planning documents. The existing uses are permitted Special Uses, and the proposed changes to the site will meet or exceed all zoning bulk requirements. No on-site detention facilities will be required on the site, but the property will have to meet the Stormwater Management Ordinance and will need to include a cost estimate from an engineer prior to building permit issuance. No neighborhood comments have been received.

Petitioner, Mr. Richard Mueller, 1410 Concord Drive, Downers Grove, as Post Commander of the American Legion, summarized the American Legion would like to enhance the appearance and attractiveness of Memorial Park. The existing 60 year-old red shed will be removed and replaced with two new garages to house maintenance equipment and an old fire truck. The outdoor picnic pavilion will be used for special events and alleviate the need for outdoor tents. The gazebo will be added for attractiveness for the community. The path will be enhanced throughout the park. Mr. Mueller thanked Village staff and the Commissioners for their assistance.

Chairman Pro Tem Waechter opened up the meeting to public comment. No comments followed. Public comment was closed.

Mr. Mueller did not have a closing statement, and the Commissioners had no questions on the proposal.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE PC-33-07, MR. COZZO MADE MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS 1 THROUGH 3 OF STAFF'S REPORT:

- 1. THE IMPROVEMENTS SHALL SUBSTANTIALLY CONFORM TO THE SITE PLAN PREPARED BY JFP, DATED JULY 14 2007, ARCHITECTURAL PLANS PREPARED BY REGENCY GARAGES AND MANUFACTURER'S SPECIFICATIONS FOR THE GAZEBO AND THE PAVILION INCLUDED WITH**

THE STAFF REPORT EXCEPT AS SUCH PLANS MAY BE MODIFIED TO CONFORM TO VILLAGE CODES AND ORDINANCES.

- 2. THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A COST ESTIMATE FOR THE COST TO CONSTRUCT THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF THE BUILDING PERMIT. THE COST ESTIMATE SHALL BE PREPARED BY A REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER PER VODG 26.77.**
- 3. ALL NECESSARY CONSTRUCTION PERMITS SHALL BE OBTAINED BY THE PETITIONER PRIOR TO ANY SITE DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.**

SECONDED BY MR. QUIRK.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. COZZO, MR. QUIRK, MR. BEGGS, MR. MATEJCZYK, MRS. RABATAH, MR. WAECHTLER

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 6-0

FILE NO. PC-32-07 A petition seeking an Amendment to Chapter 28 of the Municipal Code-Zoning Ordinance, Article 28.201 Definition of "Recycling Collection Facility"; Village of Downers Grove, Petitioner

Mr. O'Brien explained that in May 2007 the Commission looked at setback modifications for recycling collection facilities. After the Village Council reviewed the matter, a 90-day moratorium for recycling collection facilities was initiated on July 18, 2007 in order to further research the issue. Concerns were specifically related to the definition and regulations for the uses. Since then, the revision specifically addresses better clarification of the definition as it relates to the materials that can be picked up (as defined in the State's code) as well as clarification of waste transfer stations, which were not included as recycling collection facilities. No changes to the previous setback regulations are being proposed at this time. Staff believed the language better clarified the Ordinance and recommended that the Plan Commission forward a positive recommendation to the Village Council.

Per Mr. Beggs' question, Mr. O'Brien explained the definition of a waste transfer station. As to sorting demolition debris, Mr. O'Brien explained sorting did not affect the processing. Mr. O'Brien explained the terms "articles or materials" were basically better clarified in the text amendment. Staff believes the current definition permits a clean construction and demolition facility and the language does and will continue to permit that use. Should the Plan Commission or Village Council want to change what it considers a recycling collection facility, then it would be up to the Plan Commission and Village Council to make that determination. Examples followed on what would or would not fall under the definition and what a donation was. Asked whether it was safe to incorporate another statute by reference, Mr. O'Brien stated it was done in other areas of the Ordinance.

Chairman Pro Tem Waechtler opened up the meeting to Public Comment.

Mr. Mark Toman, 1109 61st Street, Downers Grove, attended the May 2007 Plan Commission meeting where this matter was brought up. He stated the definition impacts the process of the Ordinance. He provided some slides as they relate to the definition and recycling collection facilities. Mr. Toman discussed while the new definition broadens the original definition so it is easily understood; it “clouds and confuses” the definition by providing vagueness and lack of singular clarity. Currently, anything could be classified as a recycling collection facility. It also added in a vague reference to a transfer station, as defined elsewhere outside the Village’s Municipal Code, which gave the impression it was a State law. Mr. Toman referenced the State’s current definition. Mr. Toman stated through his research no other Village or City in Illinois combined the definition of recycling collection facilities and facilities that accept construction and demolition debris because they were two separate items.

Mr. Toman continued by explaining that 415 ILCS 5/3 provides distinct definitions for each type of facility. He believed this Code would provide the clarity. He recommended that the Village use the State and Federal Code in order to provide better clarification for the Plan Commission. Mr. Toman explained that 415 ILCS 5/3 was better than staff’s proposed amendment because it contained a specific statement that mandates separate requirements and it tests for requirements in the Ordinance. Details followed.

Mr. Beggs inquired as to where staff’s definition violated State law, wherein Mr. Toman explained that it did not necessarily violate State law, but it set up potential legal issues. He explained recycling collection centers have no distance requirement, whereas construction and demolition process facilities have a quarter mile separation requirement. In essence, staff was combining two different items and calling them the same thing. The concern was how the definition would be implemented. Additionally, if such a facility was called a recycling collection facility, and, if the definition was approved and forwarded to the Village Council, the construction and demolition facility which accepts that type of material could claim to be exempt from the State law that requires the separation. Mr. Toman explained one of the best examples was the Village of West Chicago. He recommended the Plan Commission forward a negative recommendation to the Village Council.

As an aside, Mr. O’Brien, noted as part of the moratorium more research was being done by staff. The Environmental Concerns Commission was also looking at the matter to discuss the impact of these types of facilities on Village residents.

Ms. Lorraine Tresnak, 5300 Walnut, Downers Grove, was concerned about the Special Use being allowed to be placed in close proximity to her condominium complex. She expressed concern that the debris from construction and demolition facilities would be emitted into the air and affect owners of her building. She stated transfer stations were more akin to heavy industrial use. She asked that the Plan Commission consider those that are in the community as well as property values. She believed there was a specific need for this topic to be raised.

Mr. Tom Sisul, 5120 Main St., Downers Grove, expressed concern that the issue was whether the facility belonged in the area or not, and it depended upon the environmental impacts from the various types of materials. He was also concerned about staff’s proposed definition and believed better clarity was necessary. He had concerns about the nearby residents.

Mr. Beggs inquired of Mr. Sisul if the Special Use conditions applied to one type of facility or another, noting that such Special Use standards were applied all the time with surrounding environments being considered for each proposal. Mr. Sisul believed this matter was entirely different.

Mr. Frank Falesch, 820 Prairie Avenue, Downers Grove, stated the existing law was generic and asked if it could not be more specific to the recycling facility, citing the laws of the Illinois EPA.

Mr. O'Brien stated the setback amendment was still pending in front of the Village Council.

In reviewing Mr. Tomah's handout, Chairman Pro Tem Waechtler saw similarities between the State's definition and staff's proposed definition.

Mr. Toman stated the definition he proposed only dealt with a recycling collection center and defined only a recycling collection facility. There was no mention of any other type of facility.

Chairman Pro Tem Waechtler closed Public Comment.

Ms. Beth Clark, Village Attorney, stated the purpose of the definition was to better clarify the definition. This matter paid attention to zoning. It was under the Village's authority to include a broad definition of recycling collection facility under its zoning authority, to say where those facilities could go and whether or not they required a Special Use permit.

Given the response from the Village attorney, Mrs. Rabatah stated she was comfortable with staff's definition.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE NO. PC-32-07, MRS. RABATAH MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL REGARDING THE AMENDMENTS TO SECTIONS 28.201 RELATIVE TO THE DEFINITION OF RECYCLING COLLECTION FACILITIES ASSOCIATED WITH PC 32-07.

SECONDED BY MR. BEGGS.

ROLL CALL:

**AYE: MRS. RABATAH, MR. BEGGS, MR. COZZO, MR. MATEJCZYK, MR. QUIRK
MR. WAECHTLER**

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 6-0

Staff reported the next Plan Commission meetings were scheduled for October 1 and October 22, 2007. Mr. O'Brien thanked the Commission and the public for their patience during the long meeting.

APPROVED 10-01-07

MR. BEGGS MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. MR. MATEJCZYK SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 11:15 P.M.

/s/ Celeste K. Weilandt
Celeste K. Weilandt
(As transcribed by MP-3 audio)