REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
OF THE
DOWNERS GROVE PUBLIC LIBRARY
MARCH 9, 2011

MINUTES

ROLL CALL

President DiCola called the meeting to order in the Library Meeting Room at 7:32 p.m. Trustees present: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Read, DiCola. Trustees absent: Loftus. Also present: Library Director Bowen, Assistant Director Carlson. Visitors: Resident John Mochel.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Trustees reviewed the minutes of the regular meeting of February 23, 2011. It was moved by Greene and seconded by Eblen **THAT THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF FEBRUARY 23, 2011 BE APPROVED AS CORRECTED.** Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Read, DiCola. Abstentions: none. Nays: none. Motion carried.

PAYMENT OF INVOICES

Trustees reviewed the list of invoices submitted for payment. It was moved by Humphreys and seconded by Greene **TO APPROVE PAYMENT OF OPERATING INVOICES FOR MARCH 9, 2011 TOTALING $42,365.75 AND ACKNOWLEDGE PAYROLLS FOR FEBRUARY 2011 TOTALING $166,439.32.** Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Read, DiCola. Abstentions: none. Nays: none. Motion carried.

OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS

None.

OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON OTHER LIBRARY BUSINESS

Resident John Mochel commented that his wife used the "Value of Your Library Use" Calculator on the library's website and reported that her use is worth $675 per year, far more than the taxes they pay to support the library.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

- Review and approval of the search consultant's draft of the announcement of the Library Director position

The consultants emailed their draft of the position announcement and recommendation for a salary range directly to trustees prior to this meeting. The trustees discussed the announcement, salary range, and job description, recommended changes, and asked the board president and library director to make the changes and send the edited announcement and job description to the consultants for posting.

- Review and discussion of Guidelines for Communications to and from the Library Board of Trustees

In response to the discussion at previous meetings about "who speaks for the board," Bowen wrote a draft of guidelines for communications to and from the library board. As he reported in his memo for the last meeting, none of the library's neighboring public libraries have such a document, so he based this draft on the policies of the Metropolitan Library System Board of Directors and High School District #99 School Board.

Bowen said he would like to have the guidelines approved before the library board email address is added to the library website. The guidelines cover the various means available for residents to communicate with the library board, as well as clarifying that individual trustees do not speak for the board as a whole. If questions or comments about the library are submitted to an individual trustee, those questions or comments will be referred to the board as a whole for consideration, or to the library administration or the board president for a response, as appropriate.

Trustees should feel free to make general comments about library programs and services as they are expected to promote the mission, vision, and services of the library; however, they should be careful to refrain from comments on matters of policy, controversy, or dispute, and refer these to the library director or the president of the library board. Most questions about day to day library operations will be referred to the library administration. Depending on the subject matter of an email sent to the board, the president will respond to the email, bring it to a library board meeting for discussion by the full board, or refer the matter to the library administration. To ensure that a record is maintained of any official communication of library policy or the board's position on an issue, any email response from the board president or other authorized trustee should be sent from the library board email account, not from the trustee's personal email.

The board discussed the policy. It was moved by Humphreys and seconded by Read **TO ADOPT THE GUIDELINES FOR COMMUNICATIONS TO AND FROM THE LIBRARY BOARD OF TRUSTEES AS AMENDED.** Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Read, DiCola. Abstentions: none. Nays: none. Motion carried.

REPORT FROM THE ADMINISTRATION

Revenue and expenditure reports for January – February were included in the board packet. It is still early in the year to look for trends, but both revenue and expenditures are where they are expected to be at the end of the first two months of the fiscal year.

The Illinois library systems merger process is underway for the five central and north systems. Bowen will report on the merger in more detail at the next board meeting, but he encouraged the trustees to consider serving on the new system board of directors that will take office on July 1, 2011. One of the responsibilities of the interim systems merger board is to hold elections for the new system board of directors. The slate of candidates will be designed to provide an equal number of trustees from each of the original five systems. Public library directors will have to be trustees of a member library board. This will be an important first year for the new system. Bowen urged any trustees who are interested to consider running for the new system board. It will require a monthly meeting. The meetings will be video meetings, with one being held at the old MLS headquarters in Burr Ridge.

Bowen received his statement of economic interest form from the County Clerk in his home mail the previous day, so he encouraged the trustees to watch for theirs and return it immediately.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:56 p.m.

DOWNERS GROVE LIQUOR COMMISSION
VILLAGE HALL COMMITTEE ROOM
801 BURLINGTON AVENUE

Thursday, February 3, 2011

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman McInerney called the February 3, 2011 Liquor Commission meeting to order at 6:33 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Mr. Adank, Mr. Clary, Ms. Fregeau, Ms. King, Mr. Krusenoski Ms. Strelau, Chairman McInerney

ABSENT: None

STAFF: Liaison to the Liquor Commission Carol Kuchynka, Assistant Village Attorney Beth Clark

OTHERS: Paul Tanzillo, Esq., Judith Rosing, Court Reporter

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman McInerney asked for approval of the minutes December 2, 2010 Liquor Commission meeting and asked members if there were any corrections, changes or additions.

Hearing no changes, corrections or additions, the December 2, 2010 minutes of the Liquor Commission meeting were approved as written.

Chairman McInerney reminded those present that this evening's meeting was being recorded on Village-owned equipment. Staff was present to keep minutes for the record and a court reporter was present taking the minutes verbatim.

IV APPLICATION FOR LIQUOR LICENSE

Chairman McInerney made the following statements:

"The first order of business is to conduct a public hearing on a liquor license application. For the benefit of all present, I would like to state that this Commission does not determine the granting or denial of the issuance of any license. We may at the end of each hearing, make a finding or recommendation with respect to the application. If necessary, the Commission may adjourn a hearing to a later date in order to have benefit of further information."

"At the conclusion of the hearing, the Commission will summarize its findings and determine any recommendations it wishes to make to the Liquor Commissioner"

"The Liquor Commissioner, who is the Mayor of Downers Grove, will, pursuant to Section 3-12 of the Ordinance, render decisions regarding issuance of available licenses within 60 days in order to consult the Plan Commission for its recommendations."

"Hearings by this Commission are held according to the following format: 1) reading of information pertinent to the application, 2) comments from the applicant, 3) comments from the public, 4) discussion by the Commission, and 5) motion and finding by the Commission."

<u>Luby's Fuddruckers Restaurants, LLC d/b/a Fuddruckers - 1500 Branding Lane</u>

Chairman McInerney stated that the first order of business was an application hearing for Luby's Fuddruckers Restaurants, LLC d/b/a Fuddruckers located at 1500 Branding Lane. He stated that the applicant was seeking a Class "R-2", beer and wine only, on-premise consumption liquor license.

Chairman McInerney asked that any individual(s) representing the applicant step forward and be seated. He asked that any individual(s) giving testimony, state and spell their name for the record, indicate their affiliation with the establishment and be sworn in by the court reporter.

Ms. Judith Rosing was sworn in by the court reporter. Ms. Rosing introduced herself as the general manager of Fuddruckers. Mr. Paul Tanzillo introduced himself as the attorney representing the Luby's Fuddruckers corporation.

Chairman McInerney asked the applicant to present its case.

Ms. Rosing stated that they were appearing before the Commission for a new liquor license due to a change in ownership. Attorney Tanzillo stated that Fuddruckers, Inc. filed for bankruptcy and Texas-based Luby's bought the Fuddruckers chain nationwide on a bankruptcy. He stated that they are in the process of seeking licenses under the new corporate name.

Chairman McInerney asked if there were any staff recommendations pertinent to the application. Ms. Kuchynka replied that issuance of the license remains contingent upon receipt of a revised Certificate of Occupancy and annual fee. She advised that satisfactory background checks have been completed.

Chairman McInerney asked if there were any comments from the public pertinent to the application. There were none.

Chairman McInerney asked if there were any comments from the Commission.

Ms. King asked if all of the Fuddruckers were changing ownership. Attorney Tanzillo stated that there are five Fuddruckers locations that the new corporation took over from bankruptcy.

Ms. King asked if there were any violations in the Fuddruckers history. Ms. Kuchynka advised that Fuddruckers has had a number of control buy violations. She stated that this location has held a liquor license since 1987 and have had three control buy failures, two violations had two day suspensions and the most recent violation in 2002 had an 11 day suspension. She stated that there have been no violations since 2002. She advised that the Fuddruckers on Lemont Road also had a number of violations. She advised that the south location is not re-opening.

Ms. Kuchynka stated that she advised Ms. Rosing of Fuddruckers history and that she was well aware of the Control Buy Program.

Ms. King asked Ms. Rosing about her liquor handling experience. Ms. Rosing replied that she had worked for Chuck E Cheese for five years in Arlington Heights where they had beer and wine on tap. She stated that she also worked at Pizza Hut for three years where they had beer service. She advised that she has been with the Addison Fuddruckers for six years. She stated that she had no violations under her supervision.

Ms. King asked about the amount of liquor sales. Ms. Rosing replied it is not an integral part of their operation, only being about 2% of sales.

Ms. King asked about the application materials. She stated that the anticipated date of occupancy was listed as 1985. Ms. Kuchynka stated that this location has been occupied by Fuddruckers since 1985 and have held their liquor license since 1987. She stated that a new Certificate of Occupancy will need to be obtained by the Luby's Fuddruckers corporation. She stated that it is not an operational change, but a different corporation holding the occupancy.

Ms. King asked about the staff. Ms. Rosing replied that they have had a bit of turnover since the transition. She stated that she has been at the location for 6 months. Ms. Rosing advised that there are 8-10 cashiers under 21. Ms. King asked how many would serve alcohol. Ms. Rosing explained that only managers can ring up beer sales and serve. She stated that there are three managers, a shift leader and captain, all of whom are over 25.

Ms. King noticed that they have incorporated the Luby's corporate manual. She stated that the corporate version shows that servers can be 18 in Illinois to serve. Ms. King stated that the Downers Grove addendum states employees have to be 19 years of age to serve. Ms. Kuchynka stated that they use the corporate manual company wide, but will use the Downers Grove addendum when complying with local laws.

Ms. King stated that the $15,000 fine was missing in the fine and suspension provision of the manual. Attorney Tanzillo replied that he would update the manual with that information.

Ms. King asked about the license sample pictures and wondered why they were not included in the manual. Ms. Rosing stated that she had a 50 state identification book. Attorney Tanzillo stated that they would incorporate the color IL identifications samples provided by Ms. Kuchynka into the manual.

Ms. King asked about the manager's meal card program. She stated that managers are given meal cards and asked if employees could get free alcohol with their meal card. Ms. Rosing replied that they are not a training facility so they will never have that MIT program. She stated that if you work at Fuddruckers you cannot drink at your own Fuddruckers or any other Fuddruckers or you can be terminated.

Mr. Krusenoski asked if this was the location off Finley Road. Ms. Rosing replied yes. He asked where the other location was. Ms. Rosing replied 75th & Main Street.

Mr. Krusenoski commented that beer and wine sales are projected to be less than 2% of their revenue. He noted that costs for failing a control buy would be more expensive than what alcohol sales generate. He stated that staff diligence in carding and serving will be determined by the tone set by management.

Mr. Krusenoski offered a word of advice that accepting the vertical license causes problems. Attorney Tanzillo stated that they will not accept the vertical license and it is indicated so in the manual.

Mr. Clary asked if patrons have to approach the counter to be served a drink. Ms. Rosing replied yes. She stated that all service is from the front counter. She noted if someone under 21 is at the register a manager is called over to check identification, ring up the sale and deliver the drink.

Mr. Clary asked if managers walk the floor. Ms. Rosing replied yes.

Mr. Clary asked how the beer and wine is served. Ms. Rosing replied that they only offer beer by the bottle. She stated that they do not sell wine.

Mr. Adank was pleased that they will not accept the vertical license. He had no questions.

Mr. Strelau asked if they were serving liquor now. Ms. Kuchynka replied yes and noted it was allowed under the terms of the Bankruptcy Order. She stated that by court order they have a right to continue liquor service under Fuddrucker's Inc. until a new license is issued to Luby's.

Ms. Strelau noted there may be some confusion as to what Fuddruckers requires and what Downers Grove requires. She noted that there were some inconsistencies in their local manual versus the corporate manual.   She hopes that they will pay close attention to Downers Grove regulations. She stated that they are not selling that much to warrant fines if they are caught selling to a minor.

Ms. Strelau noted that each person can only have one drink at a time per person. Attorney Tanzillo replied that the one drink per person policy was listed in the local manual under the liability section.

Ms. Fregeau has pleased that Ms. Rosing had liquor handling experience.

Ms. Fregeau noted her concern with customers sending someone else up to the counter to retrieve a drink. She felt the floor managers should pay close attention so that adults are not sharing drinks with minors. Ms. Rosing understood her concern about the counter service. She stated that Luby's has a policy to have two managers are on duty at all times with one monitoring the floor at all times.

Ms. Rosing stated that they are not the type of place where people will come to drink. She noted that their drinking pricing helps in that they charge $3.75 a beer.

Ms. Fregeau reviewed the floor plan. She stated in looking at the counter area, there is no bar area. Ms. Rosing agreed.

Ms. Fregeau noted the outdoor patio area and asked if they plan on obtaining an outdoor license. Ms. Rosing doubted that they would. She stated that it is a very small area with a few pieces of plastic lawn furniture. She did not feel it would be worth it for Luby's to obtain an outdoor license. Ms. Fregeau noted that there is a separate license would be required should they wish to allow alcohol outside.

Ms. Fregeau noted that the Village allows the unconsumed portion of a bottle of wine to be taken from the premises, provided they do so in accordance with State law. She stated that since they do not serve wine, this provision shall not apply.

Ms. Fregeau cautioned them about the use of fake identification by college kids. She felt it important that they have sample pictures of licenses.

Ms. Fregeau asked how often they plan to conduct liquor training with employees. Ms. Rosing replied that they have monthly and quarterly staff meetings and can incorporate it whenever need be. She advised that new hires are required to complete liquor training.

Chairman McInerney was pleased that Luby's was taking over the Fuddruckers chain. He has had good experiences at the Papas restaurants owned by Luby's in the Houston area.

Chairman McInerney suggested that the addendum be made more clear for their associates by ref-formatting the document, similar to the corporate manual, and highlight important key points.

Attorney Tanzillo appreciated the Commission's input.

Hearing the testimony given in this case, Chairman McInerney asked for a recommendation from the Commission concerning its finding of "qualified" or "not qualified" with respect to the applicant with regard to the Class "R-2" liquor license application.

MS. STRELAU MOVED TO FIND LUBY'S FUDDRUCKERS RESTAURANTS, LLC D/B/A FUDDRUCKERS, LOCATED AT 1500 BRANDING LANE, QUALIFIED FOR A BEER AND WINE ONLY, ON-PREMISE CONSUMPTION LIQUOR LICENSE. MS. FREGEAU SECONDED.

VOTE: **Aye:** Ms. Strelau, Ms. Fregeau, Mr. Adank, Mr. Clary, Ms. King, Mr. Krusenoski, Chairman McInerney

Nay: None

Abstain: None

MOTION CARRIED: 7:0:0

The motion carried.

V. NEW BUSINESS

Chairman McInerney asked if there was any discussion, update from staff or comments from the Commission regarding any new business.

Ms. Kuchynka stated that licenses for Game Pazzo and Baker Food & Liquor were issued on January 1st. She advised that Finley's Grill Room has completed the remodel and is now operating as Rockwood Tap House.

Ms. Kuchynka stated that the Police Department conducted 10 controlled buys on January 25th. She noted that all 10 of those licensees passed the test.

Ms. Kuchynka advised that there are a number of local church special event licenses coming up in the next few months. She stated that they are holding events in connection with fund raising activities.

Ms. Strelau asked about extensions and asked how many a licensee may have per year. Ms. Kuchynka replied eight. She wondered if it was calendar year or by license year. Ms. Kuchynka replied calendar year.

Ms. Strelau asked about Rita's extensions and wondered how late the establishment remains open. Ms. Kuchynka replied they can remain open 24 hours, so long as they stop serving at 2AM on Sunday, Monday-Friday and 3AM on Saturday. The group discussed extensions and suggested that a closing time be provided by the licensee at the time of the request so that the Police Department is notified as to how long they will remain open from an enforcement prospective.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

Chairman McInerney asked if there was any discussion, update from staff or comments from the Commission regarding old business.

Ms. Kuchynka advised that the Friday 2AM serving hours has been placed on the February 15th Council agenda for consideration. Ms. Kuchynka advised that their recommendation for the sunset clause was put into the recommendation, however, the provision was not directly put into the Code. Staff determined they would flag the program in a years time and review police activity during the course of the year to see if there are any issues. The group requested a copy of the materials provided to the Council. Ms. Kuchynka replied she would forward the information. Ms. Fregeau stated that the consensus of the Liquor Commission was to have a one year sunset clause.

Ms. Kuchynka advised that a Compliance Check was conducted at Rita's with no violations noted. Ms. Strelau asked what day of the week the officers were present. Ms. Kuchynka noted it was late on a Friday evening into Saturday.

Ms. Kuchynka advised that she contacted Capri concerning their DUI notification and discussed the matter with the manager. Ms. Strelau asked if Hooters was notified, as they are not a regular violator. Ms. Kuchynka replied she would have to review her notes about the Hooters notification

VII. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were none.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Concluding business for the evening, Chairman McInerney called for a motion to adjourn.

Ms. Strelau moved to adjourn the February 3, 2011 meeting. The meeting was adjourned by acclimation at 7:15 p.m.

APPROVED 3/28/11

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
PUBLIC HEARING

FEBRUARY 28, 2011, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Pro tem Waechtler called the February 28, 2011 meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and asked for a roll call:

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

ABSENT: Chairman Jirik, Mr. Webster

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Manager Jeff O'Brien; Planners Stan Popovich, Damir Latinovic; Village Engineer Mike Millette

VISITORS: Joe Domijan, 911 63rd Street, Nanette and Joe Mendrick, 6124 Lane Place, Mike Mondschein, 1021 S. Western Ave., Chicago, IL; Bill Shank, Bradford Real Estate, 10 S. Wacker Dr., Chicago, IL; Peter D'Angelo, Green Knolls LLC, 6224 Main Street; Dale and Deborah Faber, 604 57th Street; Marshall Schmitt, 1st UMC, 1032 Maple Avenue; Greg Bedalov, Downtown Economic Development Corp., 2001 Butterfield Road; Tim Messick, TAP, 122 S. Michigan Ave., Chicago, IL; Mike Metzger, JP Morgan Chase, 131 S. Dearborn, Chicago, IL; Andy Heinen, V3, 7325 Janes Ave., Woodridge, IL; and Jeff Mueller, Green Knolls, 6224 Main Street

Chairman Pro tem Waechtler led the Plan Commissioners in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

JANUARY 24, 2011 MEETING MINUTES - On Page 2, discussing "Page 66, Item 5, SSAs", Mr. Beggs asked to delete the words "and preferred" and insert the words, "nevertheless, preferred." **MR. MATEJCZYK MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES, AS REVISED, SECONDED BY MR. COZZO. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 6-0.**

FEBRUARY 7, 2011 MEETING MINUTES - On the next-to-the-last page, referring to Mr. Thoman's remarks about the police and fire departments, Mr. Beggs clarified that he agreed with Mr. Thoman as to not removing the comments about the police and fire departments. **MR. COZZO MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES, AS CLARIFIED, SECONDED BY MR. BEGGS. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 6-0.**

Chairman Pro tem Waechtler reviewed the protocol for the meeting and swore in those individuals who would be speaking on the following three petitions:

PC-07-11 A petition seeking final plat of subdivision approval to consolidate two existing parcels into one lot for the property located on the south side of Grant Street, approximately 235 feet west of Fairview Avenue, commonly known as 421 Grant Street, Downers Grove, IL (PINs 09-05-419-007, -008); Jennifer and David Leckie, Petitioners and Owners.

Planner Stan Popovich summarized that the petition is for the consolidation of two lots (one 60-ft. wide western lot and one 30-ft wide eastern lot) into a single lot at 421 Grant Street, which is currently zoned R-4 Single Family Residential and is 90 feet wide by 132 feet deep. He described the property, noting it included a single-family home on the western lot with a detached garage on the eastern lot. The petitioners were proposing to demolish the existing detached garage and construct an addition to the east side of the existing house. The proposed addition would be located over the existing common lot line. Without the consolidation of the two lots into one, Mr. Popovich stated the petitioners would not be permitted to construct the proposed addition.

Continuing, Mr. Popovich noted that the Future Land Use Plan designates the property as Single Family Residential and staff felt the consolidation of the two lots complied with the Future Land Use Plan. As to zoning, the property met the current bulk and setback requirements and also complied with the Village's current Subdivision Ordinance. A five-foot utility easement on the east and west property lines, however, was being required by village staff, along with a 10-ft utility easement on the south property line. Per staff, the petitioner was not requesting any exceptions from the Subdivision Ordinance.

To date, staff received four phone calls from neighbors regarding this proposal, regarding general questions with no specific concerns.

Staff recommended that the Plan Commission forward a positive recommendation to the Village Council subject to the condition in the staff report.

Per a question by Mr. Matejczyk, Mr. Popovich noted there are other 90-foot wide lots in the area. Most likely, these properties were 90-feet wide since their original platting.

Chairman Pro tem Waechtler invited the petitioner forward.

Mr. Michael Mondschein, 3318 N. Menard, Chicago, Illinois, representing the petitioners and project manager/designer for the proposal, explained that his clients would like to add a family room/mudroom and upper bathroom to their older home, along with a two-car attached garage. The current 1-1/2 car detached garage would be demolished. In summary, his clients wanted to modernize their home.

Chairman Pro tem Waechtler invited the public to speak. No comments received. Public participation was closed.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE PC-07-11, MR. MATEJCZYK MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATIN TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION:

> **1. THE FINAL PLAT OF SUBDIVISION SHALL SUBSTANTIALLY CONFORM TO THE FINAL PLAT OF SUBDIVISION PREPARED BY PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYING, INC. DATED NOVEMBER 22, 2010 AND REVISED ON JANUARY 27, 2011 EXCEPT AS SUCH PLANS MAY BE MODIFIED TO CONFORM TO THE VILLAGE CODES AND ORDINANCES.**

SECONDED BY MR. BEGGS.

ROLL CALL:

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

NAY: NONE

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 6-0

PC-08-11 A petition seeking special use approval with variations for a bank with a drive-through window. The property is located at the northeast corner of Main and 63rd Streets, commonly known as 6241 Main Street, Downers Grove, Illinois (PINs 09-17-315-002, -021); Bradford Equities LLC, Owner; Bill Shank, Bradford Real Estate, Petitioner.

Village Planner, Mr. Damir Latinovic, described the proposal as being a lot reconfiguration and special use with variations for the B-2 General Retail Business-zoned property located at 6241 Main Street (northeast corner of Main and 63rd Streets). The existing vacant service station on the site will be demolished and a new 3,843 sq. ft. Chase Bank building will be constructed with four drive-through lanes. In order to move forward, the petitioner is seeking approval of the lot reconfiguration to acquire a 2,475-square foot strip of land to the east and seeking a Special Use for four drive-through lanes. The variations are for parking setback and signage.

Mr. Latinovic reviewed the lot reconfiguration in more detail noting the strip of land to be acquired is a 16.5-foot by 150-foot strip of land east of the existing site and would accommodate the fourth drive-through lane, the additional parking, and on-site circulation. The proposal will not negatively affect the Jewel-Osco site.

The site plan was placed on the overhead projector with staff discussing the features to the site. Specifically, the one-story bank building (3,843 sq. ft.) will include four drive-through lanes located east of the building. Traffic will enter the drive-through from the south side. The parking will be located west and south of the building. Proposed for the site will be parking lot lighting and 3,743 square feet (15% of lot area) of landscaping. Banking hours are as follows: normal business hours Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.; Saturday, 8:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. Drive-through hours will be Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. and Saturday, 7:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. All ATMs will be open 24/7. Deliveries and trash pick-up will be done during normal business hours.

Because the site contained a former gas station, staff stated the petitioner will likely be required to remediate the site and remove the underground tanks, coordinating efforts with the state's Fire Marshall and the Village's Fire Prevention Department. The removal of the underground tanks will take place before issuance of any Village construction permits.

Building elevations were depicted with staff explaining that the front yard setback variation is requested to construct the parking spaces 7.5 feet from the west (front) property line and from the south property line, where 25 feet is required by Code. The petitioner was requesting cross access to the Jewel-Osco property with three access points from the Jewel property. The four existing curb cuts to Main Street and 63rd Street would be closed and restored with parkways and sidewalks. Details of the traffic flow for the new access points were explained, noting that as a condition of approval, the petitioner would be required to install a No-Right Turn sign along the north property line facing the drive-through lanes.

Mr. Latinovic proceeded to report on the four sign variations being sought: 1) the installation of wall signs on the north and east facades of the building which do not front a public right-of-way, 2) the installation of two wall signs on the west and east sides of the building (one sign per facade is allowed); 3) increasing the total signage on the property to 281.31 square feet (265 square feet is permitted); and 4) increasing the size for a monument sign to 49.91 square feet. (36 square feet is allowed). Because signage is based on the frontage of a building, the proposed structure is allowed a total of 265 square feet of signage, and because the proposed building is located on a corner, Mr. Latinovic stated two monument signs would be allowed on the south side and west side.

Staff believed the proposal was consistent with the Future Land Use Plan. Also, the proposal would meet all bulk requirements except for the front yard parking setback and signage. However, the proposed lighting for the parking lot does not meet code, the developer will be required to revise the photometric plan to meet the code prior to issuance of any permits. The developer has agreed to the condition, per staff.

In further support of the proposal, Mr. Latinovic stated that staff believes the proposed lot and the Jewel lot will conform and meet the requirements of the Village's Subdivision Ordinance, as summarized on page 5 of staff's report. No public utility easements are required. Per staff, Section 20.601(b) of the Subdivision Ordinance allows the Director of Community Development to approve the proposed lot reconfiguration administratively if it meets all requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance. This process would take place if the project is approved. Mr. Latinovic noted that the Plan Commission is not required to take action on the lot reconfiguration.

Mr. Latinovic proceeded to explain storm sewer additions, and that the development will meet all requirements of the Village's and DuPage County's stormwater ordinances. He reported that the Fire Department requested that the proposed driveway access in the southeast corner of the lot be widened to 20 feet to accommodate fire truck access, that the building contain alarm and suppression systems and that any tank removal and remediation be coordinated with the Fire Department before permits were issued.

To date, Village staff received a number of phone calls regarding this proposal, along with one email from the owner of Green Knolls Shopping center located west of the site. That owner has requested that the proposed development adhere to the same requirements as the recent redevelopment of the Green Knolls Shopping Center. Staff assured that it would. Staff referred to a letter on the dais received from a neighbor who lives north of Jewel-Osco site in which the neighbor is requesting Plan Commission consider an 8-foot fence and additional landscaping along the north side of the Jewel-Osco property. Staff clarified that property is not part of this proposal.

A review of the findings of fact and special use followed. Mr. Latinovic stated staff believes the standards for a special use were met and the proposed use would not be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of the public nor have an adverse impact on the character of the area. As a condition of the approval, however, staff was requiring that the volume from the drive-through ATM be adjusted after 10:00 p.m. so no negative impact would occur to the nearby residential properties. A bank, with a drive-through use, is listed as a Special Use in the B-2 district.

In speaking about the two variances, staff felt based on its analysis, that all standards for granting the parking variation were met. The petitioner was seeking the variation due to the need for a safe and efficient traffic circulation between the two properties, since a hardship to meet this existed, and the parking spaces that were proposed were to match the existing parking setback on the Jewel property for best cross-access arrangement and circulation.

As to the sign variations, staff reviewed the four requests and felt there were no unique circumstances associated with the proposal that would warrant the additional signage, as requested. In fact, the property was a corner lot which benefits from double frontage and the property was similar to other corner lots in the Village which complied with the Village's Sign Ordinance. Based on this analysis, Mr. Latinovic believed the standards for granting the sign variations were not met and recommends denial of the request.

In summary and based on staff's findings, Mr. Latinovic recommended that the Plan Commission make a positive recommendation to the Village Council regarding the proposed Special Use with a parking variation subject to the conditions listed on page 10 and 11 of staff's report. Staff does not recommend approval of the four sign variance requests.

Per a question about the variations running with the property, Mr. Latinovic confirmed that they run with the land. A similar use, with no changes to the site layout would not have to return to the Plan Commission for another parking variation. Similarly, if the signage were to be approved, staff clarified signs for a new tenant would have to substantially comply with the plans in the staff report or would have to meet the Village's sign ordinance.

Jeff O'Brien, clarified that both the parking and sign variations run with the land. Approval of future signs for a new tenant would depend on the location and square footage of that proposal which would have to be consistent with the location and size that is approved for Chase Bank. A change in use to a permitted use would not require review by the Plan Commission and Council, but an expansion of the special use or a change to another special use (e.g., a drive-through restaurant) would require a new public hearing.

When asked how the volume of the ATM noise level for the drive-through lanes would be adjusted, Mr. Latinovic responded the petitioner would need to demonstrate the levels before and after the adjustment. Staff stated the goal was to reduce the noise level, if necessary, but that the condition could be further clarified by the Plan Commission, if desired, but staff did not feel a specific number needed to be tied to the condition. Mr. Beggs felt the bank was located far enough away from the residential area and the term "adjusted" was sufficient.

As to the parking setbacks, Chairman Pro tem Waechtler confirmed with staff they would run with the land if another petitioner came afterwards.

Petitioner, Bill Shank with Bradford Real Estate, 10 S. Wacker Drive, Chicago, Illinois, discussed the parking variation and said if he were to adhere to the 25-foot setback, it would create a hardship that would make the site difficult to develop. He felt the variation would provide better circulation and provide better site layout overall.

Mr. Tim Messick, Architects Partnership, 122 S. Michigan Ave., Chicago, Illinois, summarized that the building will be constructed of a brick and stone veneer with EFIS on top and will include a pitched roof canopy. He believed the materials were consistent with the businesses in the area. He stated the landscaping will exceed ordinance requirements. Details followed. He emphasized further that the petitioner was seeking the four sign variations due to the uniqueness of the hard corner and its opportunities. He explained that the signage on the south façade was smaller in square footage than what could be allowed, and, theoretically, he was taking that extra square footage and placing it on the north and south facades, due to better vehicular and pedestrian traffic. As to the second wall sign (illuminated blue octagon) being requested for the west and east facades, Mr. Messick felt that they were appropriate for the tower elements, the architecture fit the signs, and it was part of Chase's branding efforts. He believed Chase met the "design intent" of the Village's sign ordinances. Because there was one monument sign being proposed at 63rd and Main Street, rather than the two allowed, he felt he was lessening the number of signs on the site.

Mr. Mike Metzger, Project Manager for J.P. Morgan Chase, 131 S. Dearborn, Chicago, IL, spoke about the opportunities of the site and emphasized the importance of identity to Chase. To have the signs on all four facades would guarantee the success of the company. He agreed with Mr. Messick's comments about the monument sign. He also mentioned that the ATM noise levels could be adjusted, if necessary.

Dialog followed that if the petitioner had the additional wall signs, the monument sign would become redundant, wherein Mr. Metzger stated it was still a good flag to the vehicles.

Chairman Pro tem Waechtler confirmed that the trash location would be screened. As to vehicle stacking problems in the drive-through lanes on the east side, Mr. Messick discussed how a vehicle would circulate on the site. Additionally, he pointed out the north and south circulation of vehicles on the site.

For the record, Mr. Beggs pointed out that Chase had a site just west on 63rd Street in the Meadowbrook Shopping Center, another site on Ogden Avenue just east of Fairview, and another at the intersection of Ogden and Saratoga Avenues. He noted that just one sign existed at those locations, wherein Mr. Metzger stated those locations were not primary locations. However, Mr. Beggs concluded that if the sign variations were approved, how would he justify such signage for a future project. Wherein Mr. Metzger mentioned that, if possible, the signage would not have to follow each corner or it could be written into the ordinance.

Seeing that Mr. Millette was present, Chairman Pro tem Waechtler thanked him for his input on the project. Mr. Millette confirmed that the proposal will meet the requirements of the county's stormwater and floodplain oversight ordinance requirements. No questions follow for Mr. Millette.

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

Mr. Peter D'Angelo, 6224 Main Street, stated he is a partner with the Green Knolls Shopping Center and stated he looked at the proposed site some time ago and was told by Economic Development that if he wanted to locate a bank on the Green Knolls site he would be charged an impact fee because banks do not pay sales tax. He said his proposed tenant declined further interest to the site. Mr. D'Angelo thought the proposed site was too small for a bank and was told that Jewel would not sell him the land for a bank because they had a bank. While Mr. D'Angelo said he supported the proposal, he expressed his discontent about the project and believed that if the Jewel site was being subdivided, then it should meet the requirements of the subdivision ordinance, like he did for the Green Knolls site redevelopment. He stated he wanted to know if there was "a level playing field."

Chairman Pro tem Waechtler recalled there was some flooding problems before the Green Knolls development began, wherein Mr. D'Angelo stated there was never any flooding prior, only after when the storm trap was installed.

Mr. O'Brien proceeded to explain the reconfiguration of the site was an exempt land division per the State's Plat Act. Communities have the ability to review these minor divisions. The Village permits these minor divisions after it is reviewed by Village staff. He further explained that the Subdivision Ordinance, however, did not trigger the stormwater ordinance requirements. Rather the development of the site make a stormwater permit necessary. Mr. O'Brien noted that a lot over one acre could disturb up to 25,000 square feet before detention becomes an automatic requirement. He reminded the Commissioners that the engineering was preliminary at this point and if detention was required, he believed it was likely the amount of detention would be able to be contained in the parking lot and not in an underground storage facility – such as the underground system at the Green Knolls Shopping Center. He indicated that all developments in Downers Grove are reviewed on a fair and consistent basis. Mr. O'Brien stated staff works extremely hard to ensure that ordinances are evenly enforced.

Mr. Joe Mendrick, 6124 Lane Place, asked about sign illumination and their height. He stated he lives behind Green Knolls and was concerned about the Chase light shining in their bedroom windows on the west side (Main Street side). He opposed the variance. He invited everyone to see their homes and appreciated Green Knolls' efforts in screening the lighting.

Mr. Joe Domijan, 611 63rd Street, stated no one addressed the amount of traffic to the site and stated a number of accidents have occurred at that site, five of which he has called in. He believed the common development drive between the two businesses needed restrictors (right in/right out) for both access points closest to the intersection.

There being no further comments, Chairman Pro tem Waechtler closed public participation.

As to the lighting from the Chase sign, Mr. Messick explained that the sign for the west façade is a 30" inch wall sign and was approximately 12 feet above grade and would be less illuminated than allowed by code. It would also be less square footage than allowed. The sign would have an acrylic face covering the light source to reduce the harsh glare. He did state that the Jewel elevation was higher than what Chase was proposing, but he cautioned the commissioners that there was a grade level to consider. He did not know the exact grade differential at the corner but noted it was more than 5 feet.

Mr. Andy Heinen (phonetic spelling), with V3 Engineering, 7325 James Avenue, Woodridge, IL confirmed he would be applying to the DuPage County Department of Transportation for the improvements within the public right-of-way and the County would have the final decision on any access points or restrictors.

Mr. Metzger had no closing statements but thanked staff for its presentation.

Mrs. Rabatah stated she was having trouble understanding the petitioner's need for the signs on the north and east sides and raised concern about setting precedent seeing there was no hardship and she was not sure about the illumination. Mr. Cozzo voiced his comments regarding signage, stating he had no compelling reason to grant the requests. However, as to the octagon sign on the west and south facades, he supported the request. He was fine with the parking also. Mrs. Rabatah questioned whether the petitioner could do something architecturally with the octagon signage. Mr. Beggs pointed out the fact that the monument sign would be seen from just about every direction and he did not support an over-abundance of signage along Ogden Avenue. He believed the signage on the west and south facades as well as the monument sign were sufficient. He supported staff's recommendation. Mr. Waechtler also concurred and was not in favor of setting a precedent for future proposals. Commissioners, overall, supported the design of the structure and its architecture.

Mr. Beggs suggested that the commissioners recall the illumination done at Saratoga and Ogden Avenue and at the shopping centers.

Mrs. Rabatah had concerns about the language of staff's recommendation number 8 in its report, wherein staff was leaving it in general terms which was normal. Details followed on the coordination of the various agencies involved with the remediation. Mr. Cozzo believed the standards for approval for a Special Use were met and the standards for variation for the parking were also met. But he was not sure if the variation standards for signage were met.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE PC-08-11, MRS. RABATAH MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION MAKE A POSITIVE RECOMMENDAITON OR A SPECIAL USE WITH PARKING VARIATION, AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF, TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS LISTED IN STAFF'S REPORT:

1. **THE PROPOSED SPECIAL USE REQUEST WITH PARKING SETBACK VARIATION SHALL SUBSTANTIALLY CONFORM TO THE CHASE BANK REDEVELOPMENT PLANS PREPARED BY V3 COMPANIES DATED JANUARY 21, 2011, THE CHASE BANK FLOOR PLAN PREPARED BY ARCHITECTS PARTNERSHIP, LTD DATED JANUARY 21, 2011, THE CHASE BANK ELEVATIONS PLAN PREPARED BY ARCHITECTS PARTNERSHIP, LTD. DATED FEBRUARY 4, 2011, THE CHASE BANK LANDSCAPE PLAN PREPARED BY ARCHITECTS PARTNERSHIP, LTD. DATED JANUARY 26, 2011, AND CHASE BANK PHOTOMETRIC PLAN PREPARED BY WLS LIGHTING SYSTEMS DATED JANUARY 19, 2011 ATTACHED TO THIS REPORT EXCEPT AS SUCH PLANS MAY BE MODIFIED TO CONFORM TO VILLAGE CODES, ORDINANCES, AND POLICIES.**
2. **THE PROPOSED PHOTOMETRIC PLAN SHALL BE REVISED TO INDICATE THAT FOOT CANDLE READINGS AT ALL LOT LINES WILL NOT EXCEED 2.0 FOOT CANDLES TO MEET THE ZONING REQUIREMENTS.**
3. **THE PROPOSED PHOTOMETRIC PLAN SHALL BE REVISED TO INDICATE THAT THE AVERAGE FOOT CANDLE READING ON THE SITE DOES NOT EXCEED 3.6 FOOT CANDLES TO MEET THE ZONING REQUIREMENTS.**
4. **ALL NEW SIGNAGE ON THE SITE MUST MEET ALL REQUIREMENTS OF THE SIGN ORDINANCE.**

5. **THE VOLUME ON THE DRIVE-THROUGH ATMS SHALL BE ADJUSTED AFTER 10 PM TO ASSURE NOISE LEVELS DO NOT IMPACT NEARBY RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES.**
6. **THE PROPOSED DRIVEWAY IN THE SOUTH-EAST CORNER OF THE SITE SHALL BE WIDENED TO BE MINIMUM 20 FEET WIDE.**
7. **A "NO-RIGHT TURN" SIGN SHALL BE INSTALLED ALONG THE NORTH PROPERTY LINE FACING THE DRIVE-THROUGH LANES.**
8. **THE PETITIONER IS REQUIRED TO COORDINATE THE REMOVAL OF THE UNDERGROUND TANKS WITH THE OFFICE OF THE STATE FIRE MARSHALL AND VILLAGE'S FIRE PREVENTION DEPARTMENT. THE REMOVAL OF THE UNDERGROUND TANKS SHALL BE COORDINATED WITH THE ISSUANCE OF VILLAGE CONSTRUCTION PERMITS.**
9. **THE BUILDING SHALL BE FULLY SPRINKLED AND EQUIPPED WITH AUTOMATIC AND MANUAL FIRE ALARM SYSTEM.**
10. **PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF THE BUILDING PERMIT, THE PETITIONER SHALL OBTAIN PERMITS FROM THE DUPAGE COUNTY HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT FOR THE PROPOSED WORK IN THE RIGHT-OF-WAY.**

SECONDED BY MR. BEGGS. ROLL CALL:

Mr. O'Brien added that a recently received traffic circulation report would be reviewed carefully.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: MRS. RABATAH, MR. BEGGS, MR. COZZO, MR. MAEJCZYK, MR. QUIRK, MR. WAECHTLER
NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 6-0

WITH RESPECT TO FILE PC-08-11, MRS. RABATAH MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION MAKE A REQUEST TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL TO DENY THE PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR THE FOUR (4) SIGN VARIATIONS.

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

(The Plan Commission took a five minute break at 8:55 p.m. and reconvened at 9:00 p.m.)

PC-06-11 A petition seeking approval of a Zoning Ordinance Map Amendment to rezone the property from DT, Downtown Transition to DB, Downtown Business. The property is located on the south side of Grove Street approximately 220 feet west of Main Street and is commonly known as 1035 Grove Street, Downers Grove, Illinois (PIN 09-08-310-021); 1st United Methodist Church, Owner; Dale and Deborah Faber, Petitioners.

Mr. Beggs recused himself from this petition and departed the meeting.

Mr. Latinovic reported the 3,268-square foot property, owned by the First United Methodist Church, located at 1035 Grove Street, is zoned DT, Downtown Transition. The property is improved with a two-story, single-family building on site, which has been vacant. The petitioner was requesting to rezone the property to DB, Downtown Business to use the property for an accounting office and a psychotherapy practice. The property was formerly rented out as a single-family residence. Interior changes were planned for the structure but no exterior changes were planned.

Per staff, the Future Land Use Plan designated the property as Residential with 0-6 dwelling units per acre. The properties to the west and south were also designated Residential with 0-6 dwelling units per acre. Properties to the east were zoned for commercial use. Rezoning the property to DB, Downtown Business would designate the property for future commercial use and staff believed that due to the parking lot to the west and the properties designated for commercial use to the east, the property was better suited for commercial use in the future with no negative impact to future development.

Per staff, the proposal does meet the requirement that the property was zoned DT dating back to June 7, 2005. It is also adjacent to the properties zoned DB, Downtown Business to the east.

Mr. Latinovic referenced the bulk requirements in staff's report and stated the property could be improved in the future like any other lot in the Downtown Business district. The rezoning would allow the petitioner to use the property for the accounting business and psychotherapy practice. Staff believed the proposed DB, Downtown Business zoning classification was appropriate for this property, would have no negative impact to the area, was consistent with the zoning classifications in the area, and was better suited for commercial uses in the future. The proposal would enable the petitioner to improve the property and enhance the value of the neighborhood.

Staff recommended that the Plan Commission make a positive recommendation to the Village Council regarding this petition.

Chairman Pro tem Waechtler pointed out there two residences just east of the site and confirmed with staff that they were zoned DB Downtown Business. As to the parking restrictions in the DB district, staff confirmed there was no requirement to provide on-site parking for the two uses being proposed. The petitioner did, however, obtain rights to use parking spaces on the church property parking lot.

Chairman Pro tem Waechtler swore in petitioner Mr. Faber.

Mr. Dale Faber, 604 57th Street, Downers Grove, reiterated that he plans to set up an accounting office and a psychotherapist office in the building and was requesting a re-zoning. He initially was going to apply for a special use but in looking at the zoning map, realized it would be beneficial to ask for a rezoning classification. He confirmed that the church has made available to them two parking spaces. Mr. Faber described the waiting area that would be created in the interior of the building.

Chairman Pro tem Waechtler opened up the matter to public participation.

Mr. Marshall Schmitt, 1032 Maple Avenue, representing First United Methodist Church, clarified that between the time the initial discussions took place with the Fabers, the gas company turned off the heat and the pipes burst in the building. While the church was fine with the commissioners reviewing the proposal, Mr. Schmitt informed the commissioners that damage review and discussions with the insurance company were taking place to ensure that the property was returned to an acceptable condition. He noted that due to the renovation cost and the negotiations for a proper contract with the Fabers the church could have to change its position and stay with the DT zoning. He clarified that the church was not technically the petitioner. Regarding the parking spaces, there was negotiation for two spaces, but Mr. Schmitt said he was open to other arrangements.

Asked if it was necessary to revise staff's recommendation on this matter, Mr. O'Brien clarified, after speaking with Mr. Schmitt, that the Plan Commission can forward a proposal to the Village Council but that the church will ask Village staff to provide an extension before final Village Council consideration.

There being no additional public present, public participation was closed. No further discussion followed and the chairman pro tem entertained a motion.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE PC-06-11, MR. COZZO MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL ON THIS PETITION.

SECONDED BY MR. QUIRK. ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. COZZO, MR. QUIRK, MR. MATEJCZYK, MRS. RABATAH,
MR. WAECHTLER
NAY: NONE

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 5-0

Mr. O'Brien stated he sent an email for next week's meeting with a quarterly newsletter from the Planning Association. He also announced that Mrs. Hamernik's resignation was received and her vacancy will have to be filled. He was not sure when a new Commissioner would be appointed. Next week's meeting will consist of the Comprehensive Plan.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:15 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. COZZO, SECONDED BY MR. QUIRK. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 6-0.

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

APPROVED 3/28/11

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
PUBLIC HEARING

MARCH 7, 2011, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Jirik called the March 7, 2011 meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and asked for a roll call:

PRESENT: Chairman Jirik, Mr. Beggs, Mr. Cozzo, Mr. Matejczyk, Mrs. Rabatah, Mr. Webster

ABSENT: Mr. Quirk, Mr. Waechtler

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director Tom Dabareiner; Planning Manager Jeff O'Brien; Devin Lavigne Houseal Lavigne Associates

VISITORS: John Wendt, 1701 Concord Dr., Downers Grove; Marge Earl, 4720 Florence, Downers Grove; Mark Thoman, 1109 61st Street, Downers Grove; and Nick Vogel, owners Grove Reporter

Chairman Jirik led the Plan Commissioners in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

File PC-17-10 (continued from February 7, 2011) The purpose of the request is to consider the draft Downers Grove Comprehensive Plan, which, if adopted will become the official plan for the Village as required by Section 1.12 of the Municipal Code. The proposed comprehensive plan will replace the 1965 Comprehensive Plan; Village of Downers Grove, Petitioner.

Chairman Jirik reconvened the public hearing for File PC-17-10 and reminded the commissioners that the Commission has been holding public meetings to consider various aspects of the Comprehensive Plan with the goal to make a final recommendation to the Village Council in April 2011. Tonight's discussion would focus on Key Issue No. 6 -- Land Use Plan, Transportation and Key Focus Area Plan Recommendations.

Chairman Jirik swore in members of the public wishing to speak on this topic.

Chairman Jirik asked for public comments. There were none.

Comments by the Commissioners followed:

Pages 43-48: Mr. Matejczyk noticed that along Warren Avenue it was designated Low Intensity Office. He asked if consideration was given to incorporate high density housing in the area since it was within walking distance to the train and close to the downtown area. He believed if offered a nice buffer to the area, specifically at the vacant lumber yard. Mr. Dabareiner responded the plan recommended Low Intensity Office due to the recent trend of development occurring in this area. He noted several professional office buildings had been constructed in this area in recent years. He suggested the recommendation was in response to the market's demands.

Mr. Matejczyk noted that much traffic is generated on Warren by the light manufacturing zoning. Mr. O'Brien added that if a developer were to come with a proposal for a residential use, the idea could be reviewed and its potential impacts would be compared against the proposed land use plan and proposed policies described in the plan for this area. He noted the lumber yard was previously considered for a senior housing development by adeveloper but the narrow depths of the lots and the proximity of the railroad made residential uses challenging in this area. Based on these factors, staff was recommending professional offices.

In response, Mr. Matejczyk stated office use would be a significant impact and detriment to the neighborhood. Mr. Lavigne responded that multi-family uses have similar impacts as professional offices. He agreed the lumber site was a unique site but stated the narrow depths of the lots presented a challenge, citing developments in Clarendon Hills near railroad tracks. Mr. Matejczyk supported a row house development there (multi-family) and hoped the plan would be flexible to incorporate such type developments.

The Chairman, however, explained if the proposed use was equal or lesser, presuming the market is moving that way, it was not necessarily inconsistent with the plan and justification would have to be explained to future petitioners. He reiterated that deviation from the plan could be considered, provided there was just cause.

On this point, Mr. Dabareiner directed commissioners' attention to page 46 and read the description of "Low Intensity Office", noting that anything that fits the description will fit in and be considered. Mr. Matejczyk noted concerns about signage, lighting, and business operations in relation to the nearby residential uses. He also thought a business office would generate increased traffic.

Mr. Beggs added that it was important to think very carefully about residential development between the railroad tracks and Warren Avenue, noting multi-family housing existed on the north side of Warren. He stated he would be concerned about the financial stability of the residential use and whether it was the kind of development he would want there. Mr. Webster agreed with Mr. Beggs, noting the little development that has occurred, has not been toward multi-family. He supported Low-Intensity Office since it already existed. Dialog followed that the plan would be reviewed periodically and the market would reflect what development has been taking place in the area.

In reviewing the current zoning map, Mr. Webster said it appeared that the Village was moving away from specific zoning categories and moving towards land use categories as part of the zoning map. Mr. O'Brien explained that once the comprehensive plan was completed, a review of the zoning ordinance would follow along with modifying the use lists to ensure it was compatible with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan's land use goals and policies.

Mr. Webster noted interest in the changes to the residential areas around the intersection of Maple and Walnut. He believed the market would drive the future development under discussion.

Returning to the vacant lumber yard parcel on Warren, Mr. Lavigne noted when his firm recommends Transit Oriented Development (e.g., mixed residential and commercial uses), the distance to a train station or bus stop is a key factor. He indicated research generally finds that individuals will only walk approximately 10 minutes before they begin to search for other modes of transportation. He believed the parcel on Warren would fall out of that 10 minute walk and believed the east side of Belmont Avenue offered a better success rate for the multi-family uses – as recommended in the plan.

Mr. Matejczyk, noted it was the same distance from the lumber yard to the train as was the Belmont parcel area mentioned.

In discussing pages 55 and 56, a question was raised as to the meaning of a “building registration.” Mr. O’Brien explained that it was a list of vacant structures where the owner would have to provide the Village with a contact name and phone number in case there were maintenance or safety concerns. He indicated many communities are using these registries to track foreclosed buildings and reduce time for banks or other absentee owners to respond to the community’s concerns. The Chairman suggested revising the words to “building registration inspection program for unoccupied properties” or a similar explanation, to be clarified by staff.

Reviewing No. 9, Mrs. Rabatah asked about the restrictive words “lawn cutting and snow removal services”. She suggested inserting the words “such as,” wherein the Chairman suggested inserting the words “affordable services, such as…”

Addressing No. 13, Mr. Webster asked for clarification about senior housing be “lumped in” with multi-family housing. Mr. Dabareiner explained that some senior housing may be small single-family housing and not much difference exists with multi-family. He stated the language could be expanded further, if desired. Mr. Dabareiner stated that this idea was a movement being seen among the aging baby boomers. Mr. Webster supported the contents of No. 13.

Regarding No. 11, remove the word “negative”.

Regarding No. 10, the Chairman questioned what the mechanism and the expectation is for getting existing developments to increase their screening to residential properties. Mr. Dabareiner explained that there was that foundation that lays the groundwork for staff to develop regulations to ensure that when an owner or developer proposes a change to a use that is incompatible, additional buffering should be provided. He believed the statement was important to include in the Comprehensive Plan.

Regarding No. 8, the Chairman asked the commissioners whether they were fine with the statement. Commissioners appeared to be fine with the current wording of the statement.

Regarding No. 7, Mr. Cozzo questioned the last word in the statement, “enhanced” as it relates to historic preservation efforts.

Mr. John Wendt, 1701 Concord Drive, suggested using the word “embraced”. Commissioners concurred.

Reviewing the colored map, Mr. Lavigne explained that on this map the planned residential areas could be highlighted that were not indicated as “residential” in the land use plan, so that there is flexibility provided. The Chairman felt that going through that exercise may involve a more comprehensive review of all areas. Mr. Lavigne commented that he did not believe there would be many parcels and felt the entire plan should be flexible. Mr. Beggs felt it was already inherent in the plan. Mr. O’Brien agreed that some inherent flexibility already existed in some transitional areas and believed the text of the plan explained how the Village would handle transitional land uses.

Page 55, Residential Map, Mr. Webster voiced concerns about the land surrounding the Belmont train station as being listed as mixed use and the idea behind it, wherein Mr. Lavigne explained it was an area that could be considered for transit-oriented development. He referred Mr. Webster to page 106.

Discussing commercial, pgs. 66-67, the Chairman suggested removing the word “negative” out of No. 12.

Pages 79-80, Transportation: Regarding the shuttle parking at the Belmont Area, Mrs. Rabatah asked whether the commission should show commuter parking lots on the transit map. Mr. Lavigne thought it was a good idea. As to the shuttle routes, Mr. Beggs saw that the transportation map acknowledged the current shuttle routes, which was beneficial to the residents. Comments followed that the variety of transportation offered in and around the Village was a great attribute

Regarding No. 9, addressing adequate parking, Mr. Webster asked whether there was some need for adequate parking now or in the future. Mr. Dabareiner, in discussing a parking study, said there was the assumption that parking was not adequate. Mrs. Rabatah suggested to identify commuter lots, possibly as an overlay. Mr. Lavigne noted that page 77 referred to commuter parking. Mr. Matejczyk also pointed out that to construct a downtown parking deck would invite more traffic to the area and probably be a detriment versus dispersing the traffic through the neighborhoods.

Furthering his point, Mr. Webster discussed that the text noted there was a “perceived” problem of inadequate parking Downtown. He queried whether it included commuter parking. Mr. Lavigne stated there were comments during TCD-3 about lack of parking downtown. In other areas where he had worked, this was common perception about downtown areas. Mr. Lavigne stated it was often the case where there was only the “perception” that downtown parking was inadequate because one was not able to park directly in front of a downtown store. He stated it was sometimes more of a mind-set than an actual deficiency in parking spaces. The commuter parking was a different issue entirely.

In response to a question, Mr. Dabareiner proceeded to discuss a prior experience with PACE as it relates to parking. He thought the plan adequately describes existing transit and believed this section of the plan made it clear more detailed transit studies would be needed before any route or transit-related parking changes occurred.

Chairman Jirik proceeded to discuss that one of the advantages to the Village was the ability to access the trains but with regard to the commuter parking, it should be done in such a way so as to enhance the quality of life for those in Downers Grove. He felt that if there was going to be remote commuter parking lots, could there be a way to develop them to promote micro-commercial centers in town, yet keep the retail in the downtown area as well. If so, he stated that it was adding to the quality of life and aiding careers. In response, however, Mr. Dabareiner explained there were studies that demonstrated that commuters get into their cars and leave and that those types of commuter lots are not a good economic tool except perhaps for a cup of coffee. Mr. Lavigne agreed.

Mr. Webster then raised the question of whether the Village really wanted commuter lots in the downtown area in the next 15 to 20 years, referencing the language in No. 9. Mr. Lavigne explained it was a matter of evolution of an area and once the land economics worked, parking structures would appear. He described it as a trade-off in that the former surface parking areas become available for development. He believed that Downers Grove could be ripe for a vertical parking lot and it would be beneficial to continue to monitor the lots and eventually consolidate them into a vertical lot to make other areas available for redevelopment. Chairman Jirik supported that as a recommendation, noting it was not being captured in the statement. However, Mr. Dabareiner suggested waiting for the results of the parking study.

Mr. Beggs suggested the following text: "The village should continue to plan for the provision of adequate parking in downtown Downers Grove, particularly as it relates to commuter parking."

Mr. Matejczyk appreciated the number of places where bicycle corridors were mentioned, stating it was very appropriate.

Pages 104-107: Mr. Matejczyk drew attention to the bullet point of reducing the heat island effect, and discussed whether it would be beneficial to require reflective roofs on structures that are having their roofs replaced and whether it would be appropriate to mention the roofing and/or light-colored roofing materials in the statement. Mr. Lavigne supported the idea. He would also send information to the Chairman on a study performed regarding reflective materials.

Before moving on to the Key Focus Areas, Mr. Dabareiner stated to the commissioners that this section was unique to Downers Grove's plan since it included details that most communities do not obtain in their comprehensive plan. He reiterated that different levels of details would now be discussed from this point forward. The Chairman concurred, noting that gateway signage was being discussed, changes in the commercial use along Belmont Avenue, and even preserving the manufacturing or higher density of residential in that area.

Regarding No. 7, Mr. Webster found the following verbiage "the village should forcibly annex…" interesting.

The Commission discussed the recommendations for the Cameo property at the northwest corner of Maple and Walnut. The Chairman explained that there was the presumption in the statement that sometime in the future there would be sufficient value to allow a developer to put together the parcels, collectively purchase them, and then redevelop them for another use, whether it was because the property was distressed or because of the proximity to the Interstate. He believed the area was also being pulled in many directions and a decision or vision on what to do with the area was necessary. The Chairman asked for staff's thoughts regarding this recommendation.

Mr. Lavigne stated nothing specific came from the TCD-3 process regarding this property. He explained the area was not conducive to multi-family, since the occupants were mostly seniors, and there was nothing around them except for an ice arena, some manufacturing, and access to the expressway. A location where there is better access to services and shopping were a better option for senior developments. Another concern for the occupants, Mr. Beggs recalled, was financial and what it would cost them to live out the rest of their lives there.

Mr. O'Brien, after hearing some concerns, reiterated that plan was not suggesting the Village should condemn the Cameo property. Instead, the plan identifies the site as an opportunity for private investment at some point in the future. He indicated it was likely the zoning designation would remain multi-family for these properties until such time that a request was made to change it. He noted that would likely require a large financial investment from a private developer to buy-out current owners and redevelop the site.

The Chairman explained the language on pages 106-107, provided clarification on the recommendations for the intersection of Maple and Walnut and the Cameo properties. He noted the Plan Commission did not need to make any decisions on how or when the Village could pursue this change. Rather, the Commission only needed to note whether the proposed land use was appropriate should the opportunity for redevelopment arise. The Commissioners concurred the proposed designation would be appropriate given the right circumstances.

Per Mr. Cozzo's question, Mr. Lavigne explained the village's process for annexing property in the unincorporated areas of the village. Commissioners recommended removing the word "forcibly" prior to the word "annexation".

Turning the discussion to the Downtown section, Mr. Lavigne would change the legend on Page 109 as it related to existing auto-oriented businesses.

Mr. O'Brien explained that the illustration for Catalyst Site 16 reflected an idea to incorporate the former blacksmith building should redevelopment of the surrounding properties occur. He indicated the illustration was for example purposes only. Mr. Lavigne stated the intention was to keep the building. Mr. Webster questioned whether it could be relocated somewhere, just as other buildings had been. Mr. Beggs supported keeping it where it was. However, the Chairman reminded the commissioners that it was not a matter of whether the commission wanted it preserved, but rather, it was a demonstration of what could be developed in the area for future developers and nothing more. Mr. Webster still questioned what the Village wanted at this site.

Mr. O'Brien agreed with Mr. Webster in that the "notch" in the building left the building open for discussion for staff to discuss with any potential developers. He noted the drawing merely provides a discussion point when a potential development is brought forward. The Village would decide at that time if the building is significant and how it would be preserved.

Mr. Beggs supported the idea of doing something with the northwest corner of Maple and Main Streets. As to the development of the northeast corner of Maple and Main, Mr. Dabareiner envisioned any development there would have to include underground parking given the lot sizes. He noted that the illustration was merely an example of what could be developed on the site.

Mr. Lavigne indicated that all of the illustrations for potential developments included buildings that were actually constructed in the Chicago region.

Mr. Beggs reminded the commissioners that the Village was trying to establish a gateway at the southern end of the Downtown.

Reviewing the Butterfield Key Focus Area, Chairman Jirik suggested that on page 119 to break up the long façade. Mr. Lavigne stated they were working to make the modification to the drawing and modify its orientation.

Discussing Ogden Avenue (West Area), page 123 on the map, right-hand side, Mr. Webster confirmed the vacant parcel was part of a TIF district. Mr. Lavigne stated it was and the map should reflect this fact. Mr. Webster supported the reconsolidation of the auto dealers at the west end of the corridor.

Discussing the Center Area, Mr. Matejczyk stated that between Main and Belmont there was no controlled access to cross the street. He asked if there was consideration for a new traffic signal for this area. Mr. O'Brien stated there was an existing signal at Saratoga and Ogden. In addition, Village previously supported a signal at Lee and Ogden for a previous development. IDOT was amenable to the concept at the time. Mr. Lavigne stated traffic warrants would have to be met for a new signal.

East Area – Mr. O'Brien noted that at Catalyst Site 33, a CarX building was being constructed. However, the rest of the site could be a potential redevelopment candidate if the current tenant leaves.

Fairview Area - Comments followed that this area needed a vision. Commissioners noted that if Pepperidge Farm were relocated, it would require a railroad spur as they receive many of their deliveries via rail. Mr. Dabareiner stated the plan for Fairview works whether or not Pepperidge Farms remains at its current location. He indicated the Village hopes they stay on the site, but wants to be prepared if the plant were to close. General comments followed on the odd location of the plant and the general infrastructure challenges of the area.

In closing, Chairman Jirik suggested to the commissioners that when they receive the draft plan with tracked changes, to review it carefully, but as it is reviewed, if there is a concern or question, to develop it a bit more to a proposed solution in order to move the plan forward on April 4, 2011. If more time is needed, Mr. Dabareiner stated more time could be allowed for the commissioners to review the document. Once the document is completed, Mr. Beggs asked for a completed plan of what the Commission recommends to the Village Council. Mr. Dabareiner obliged.

MR. MATEJCZYK, MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING TO A DATE CERTAIN, THAT DATE BEING APRIL 4, 2011, SECONDED BY MR. WEBSTER.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. MATEJCZYK, MR. WEBSTER, MR. BEGGS, MR. COZZO, MRS. RABATAH, CHAIRMAN JIRIK
NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 6-0

Mr. O'Brien briefly updated the commissioners on what to expect at the regular March 28th meeting.

APPROVED 3/28/11

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 10:00 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. COZZO, SECONDED BY MR. WEBSTER. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 6-0.

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

APPROVED March 9, 2011

TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION
Minutes
December 8, 2010, 7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers - Village Hall
801 Burlington Avenue, Downers Grove

Chairman Wendt called the December 8, 2010 meeting of the Transportation and Parking Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

The chairman led the commissioners and the public in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll call followed and a quorum was established.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Chairman Wendt, Members: Mr. Cronin, Mr. Saricks, Mr. Schiller, Mr. Stuebner, Student Rep. Robert Clark

Absent: Mr. Gress, Ms. Van Anne

Staff Present: Village Manager Dave Fieldman; Traffic Manager Dorin Fera; Assistant Director Public Works-Engineering Andy Sikich; and Mr. Tom Topor

Visitors: Jonathan Platt, 4009 Seeley, Downers Grove, Helen Rakowski, 4024 Seeley, Downers Grove; Millie Herbig, 4017 Seeley, Downers Grove; Margaret McCole, 1617 40th St., Downers Grove; Jane and Jane Baughman, 1523 40th St., Downers Grove; Les and Jane Hall, 4201 Lee, Downers Grove; Bill Wrobel, 7800 Queens Ct., Downers Grove; Michael Nawara, 1657 Janet, Downers Grove; Pam and Joe Starinieri, 4016 Seeley, Downers Grove; Christine Fregeau, 1918 Elmore, Downers Grove; Mariana Wolff, 1716 Janet St., Downers Grove; Paul Spork, 1653 Virginia, Downers Grove; Sheila Pollock-Bowlin, 4130 Lee, Downers Grove; Ellen and Ed Tausk, 1619 Herbert, Downers Grove; Fred and Donna House, 3927 Morton, Downers Grove

Chairman Wendt announced the minutes were being recorded for transcription purposes on village-owned equipment. Commissioners and the public recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 8, 2010 TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION MINUTES. An address change was noted on Page 2, second paragraph, first line, delete the words "521 Cumnor" and insert the words "4521 Cumnor." **Mr. Saricks** queried staff regarding **Chairman Gress's** response to a **Mr. Paul Simms** regarding the status of a recommendation from this commission regarding traffic calming measures along Blodgett Drive, which had not been completed, per **Mr. Fera**. **Chairman Wendt** offered to follow up on the matter. **Mr. Saricks** inquired about the status **Mr. Stuebner's** question about the number of handicap spaces in the village, to which **Mr. Fera** stated the data would be presented at the next meeting.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 8, 2010 MEETING, WITH CORRECTION, WERE APPROVED, ON MOTION BY MR. STUEBNER, SECONDED BY MR. SARICKS. MOTION PASSED BY VOICE VOTE OF 7-0.

1. File # - 2011 Sidewalk Program - Discussion and Information Only. Village Manager Dave Fieldman summarized that he would be discussing sidewalks and sidewalk installations and would be giving the residents an opportunity to provide their input so that everyone understood the issues that were important to the residents. A background of the sidewalk program followed.

Mr. Fera introduced the Public Works staff. **Mr. Robert Clark**, new student representative, was introduced and welcomed to the commission. **Chairman Wendt** thanked previous student representative Kaitlin Jeffries for her participation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ed Tausk, 1619 Herbert Street, asked what the relationship was between the Transportation Department, the Parking Commission and the Water Works Department.

Chairman Wendt proceeded to explain the responsibilities of each, noting that tonight's discussion was for the Public Works Department to present to the residents and the Commission its plans for sidewalk construction for 2011.

Mr. Tom Topor, staff engineer, discussed his professional background with the village. He walked through his presentation on sidewalks, pointing out that he will first be discussing the objectives of the program, provide an overview of the project, discuss what side of the street the sidewalks shall be installed, and will receive input from the residents. The PowerPoint slide presentation followed.

Wrapping up his presentation, **Mr. Topar** stated another design meeting is planned for January/February 2011 followed by a construction meeting in March/April 2011. Project award to occur in May 2011 and construction to begin in June and August 2011. He explained that comments could be stated verbally, written on the available comment forms, mailed, or he could be contacted directly. He also welcomed the opportunity to meet with the residents.

Chairman Wendt opened up the discussion to the commissioners. Questions included whether engineering staff was addressing existing drainage issues when designing the sidewalks and how was further drainage issues to be prevented. **Mr. Topor** explained the goal was to make existing conditions better, citing an example on Seeley Avenue. He explained the steps that will be used to avoid drainage issues, and, should an issue exist after a sidewalk is installed, he stated it could be addressed also. Per a question about having to tear up sidewalks afterwards to address drainage projects, **Assistant Director Sikich**, said he spoke to the sanitary district who had no plans over the next five years. Furthermore, he stated that coordinating projects with the other departments takes place constantly so as not to duplicate work.

As to a question about residents upgrading part of their driveways, **Mr. Topor** explained that a contractor can be introduced to the resident and the two parties can make their own arrangements; staff did not negotiate prices with the residents.

Chairman Wendt opened up the meeting to public comment and explained the protocol to follow.

Ms. Helen Rakowski, 4024 Seeley Avenue, stated she has had drainage issues dating back 20 years and would not support the sidewalk program. Twenty years ago she installed her asphalt driveway only to come home from work one day to find two cuts in it for a culvert pipe, which was never replaced. She voiced concerned about this project and did not want additional flooding. She also had a disc with pictures, taken over the past 20 years, which she provided to staff.

Assistant Director Sikich raised the fact that this particular area was identified under the Watershed Infrastructure Improvement Project as a medium priority project and will be studied and designed in 2011. **Ms. Rakowski** asked that she be notified by **Mr. Topor** before the project begins and before the sidewalks are installed.

Mr. Ed Tausk, 1619 Herbert Street, resides at the corner of Morton and Herbert (Area 2). He stated his property is on a downhill slope and asked whether the proposed sidewalk will be at the level of the uphill slope of the grass or the downhill slope of the grass, citing concerns for his septic field. Wherein, **Mr. Topor** explained that sidewalks typically slope toward the ditch and stated it depends on the location. He offered to look at **Mr. Tausk's** property and would update **Mr. Tausk** about the status of Herbert Street after the meeting.

Mr. Ron Baughman, 1523 40th Street, voiced concern about drainage issues in the area. He did not believe the above area was of medium concern but a higher concern. He presented photographs of his area and the water issues already occurring after a significant rain, noting that if the sidewalk is installed on the south side of 40th Street, it would incur the water issues. He did not support a sidewalk on either side of the street without correcting the problem.

Mr. Fred House, 3928 Morton, stated he received a letter from the village which stated the area was low priority for stormwater drainage. His concern was that the improvements already made to Burnich Highlands have drained onto his property, as water floods within 10 feet of his walk-out basement. His site floods approximately twice a year now as compared to 42 years ago when he moved to his home. **Chairman Wendt** suggested that **Mr. House** and **Mr. Topor** walk his site together.

Mr. Jonathan Platt, 4009 Seeley, said his home sits higher than some of his neighbors but he does get the stormwater from Bell Aire School. He noted that some of the areas are lower than street level and the village would need to build up those areas. He feels there are two larger water areas converging at **Ms. Rakowski's** property and feels that if sidewalks are installed in this area, the sidewalks will either act as dams or be undercut.

Asked why staff was considering sidewalks for this area given the existing stormwater issues and given that there were other areas in the village to consider, **Assistant Director Sikich** responded that as the sidewalk matrix gets completed, some of the areas located further away from the central travel areas are considered. However, some of the roads are not designed for sidewalks and some remaining sidewalk gaps have issues such as being described by the residents. He explained that the area under discussion was not flooding regularly and that in the larger picture, the amount of sidewalk being considered was relatively small.

Mr. Joe Starmieri, 4016 Seeley, stated the topography of his neighborhood was not uniform by any means and the drainage issue has become such that the water runs through it. He agreed **Mr. Baughman** in asking why would the village want to install the sidewalks before fixing the drainage first.

Mr. Ron Baughman, 1523 40th Street, discussed the current top of the culvert near his home and talked of how he envisioned the sidewalk, asking staff how much lower could they lower the sidewalk so it would not interfere with the culvert. He questioned why staff would be spending money now if such a project did not make sense.

Commissioner Cronin stated that sidewalks were installed in his neighborhood 10 to 15 years ago and while he and his residents initially balked, they were now pleased they were installed. However, to the residents in attendance, he believed that the proposed sidewalks would not add to the above residents' drainage issues. Asked if such projects were done in other areas with similar flooding issues, **Mr. Topor** stated there were and resident feedback was positive.

Mr. Paul Spork, 1653 Virginia Street, asked who was funding the project, to which staff stated it was the village. He asked if the residents were ever asked by the village if they wanted sidewalks installed. He did not recall receiving a survey. Wherein, **Chairman Wendt** clarified that **Mr. Fieldman** was referring to the TCD-2 survey in his presentation, which was done 25 years ago and the goal then was to install sidewalks to separate pedestrians from the vehicular traffic. He further explained that the village has, as its objective, to install sidewalks where possible. **Mr. Spork** added, however, given the financial economy, he would think the village would want to save where it could and to ask the residents whether they wanted them or not.

Ms. Vicky Rhode, 4008 Seeley, stated her garage floods every time it rains. She recalled the residents did sign a petition against the installation of sidewalks and preferred the village to remedy her streets and the drainage issues. She said there were plenty of sidewalks for students to use to get to Bell Aire School and believed other village needs were more important.

Mr. Ed Tausk, 1619 Herbert Street, stated there were a number of issues with the installation of sidewalks on Herbert Street and he wanted to ensure any drainage issues were addressed prior to the start of the Morton Street project. Wherein, **Assistant Director Sikich** explained the background as to the sidewalks installed on Morton and Herbert Streets. The drainage block **Mr. Tausk** encountered was not due to the installation of the north side sidewalk. **Mr. Tausk** proceeded to explain how he would rectify the problem, discussing a culvert extension. **Assistant Director Sikich** reassured him that the issue would be rectified in 2011.

Ms. Christine Fregeau, 1918 Elmore Avenue, said her sidewalk was installed over 10 years ago and the project being discussed represented less than one percent (1%) of the village's budget and a small part of the Community Investment Program. She discussed the history of the village when it became incorporated and its top goals during that time, i.e., sidewalks, followed by TCD-2. She called out those staff departments which had been sensitive to the residents and cited examples. To **Mr. Cronin's** comments, **Ms. Fregeau** emphasized that sidewalks connected neighbors and neighborhoods and made for a more viable community. She encouraged the residents and their neighbors to participate in this process.

Ms. Helen Rakowski, 4024 Seeley Avenue, inquired if a disc of photographs could be provided to someone on the commission, wherein, **Chairman Wendt** offered to take one, review it and forward it on to the appropriate individuals.

OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Bill Wrobel, 7800 Queens Court, provided an update to last night's village council meeting regarding sidewalk safety on the main streets and keeping sidewalks clear by the merchants. He stressed that this commission should encourage the village to get the message out to its residents to be good citizens and make existing facilities more user-friendly during the winter months. As a member of the Dowers Grove Watch group, he asked for the commission's support.

On another matter, **Mr. Wrobel** reported that the Queens Court traffic study, conducted this past May, recorded that 85% of the vehicles were traveling 34.6 MPH in a 25 MPH speed zone even though vehicle traffic was low. He suggested installing speed humps to staff, but was told that there was no money to do so, and found this discouraging because the humps were sitting in a warehouse. **Mr. Wrobel** hoped this Commission could encourage the village setting aside funds in the budget in order to utilize the tools that are available to address speeding issues which have been prior approved by this Commission. With regard to stormwater issues on Queens Court, **Mr. Wrobel** understood the entire street would be redone in 2012 and felt this would be an opportune time to install the humps at low cost. He reiterated his point about public safety.

On another matter, **Mr. Wrobel** asked the commission for direction regarding code enforcement for a parking issue at the 1028 Curtiss address. Apparently, the restaurant business next to it was expanding its parking and was blocking/parking vehicles on part of the sidewalk. Fortunately, he stated that in working with the Downtown Management Corp., he was able to have the owner of the building install No Parking signs in its front window and had him file a complaint with the police department so citations could be issued.

Lastly, **Mr. Wrobel** addressed a violation of the use permit for the U.S. Bank drive-through facility located downtown, commenting that vehicles have been parking in a couple of the drive-through lanes on an 8-hour basis and patrons of some of the restaurants will use those lanes to park. The issue has been addressed with the bank, however, he did not know the status of it, to date. He referenced the ordinance in place and believed there was an overlap in parking and that owners cannot turn their private property into parking lots.

While **Chairman Wendt** agreed there was an issue, he stated the Code Enforcement Department would be the correct venue. After some dialog, **Mr. Fera** explained that any variation or change in parking or land use would need to go before the Plan Commission and/or the Zoning Board of Appeals. He offered to provide a reference for **Mr. Wrobel**.

Chairman Wendt mentioned he was glad to see that reconstruction of Queens Court was going to occur, commenting that he has always pointed out that traffic calming installation needed to take place during the street plan phase. **Chairman Wendt** also appreciated the comments about the temporary speed humps being stored, but also recognizing that there are costs involved in the process.

To **Mr. Wrobel's** point about removing funds set aside for public safety last year, **Mr. Stuebner** hoped that in 2011 the village council would set some funds aside for public safety and that this Commission send some form of communication, i.e. a resolution, to Village Council to address this matter. Dialog was raised that a number of prior issues were passed along to the Village Council only to be told there were funding shortfalls. Prioritization for such projects needed to be communicated, as **Mr. Stuebner** pointed out. Comments followed that public safety needed to be addressed and by pulling out those funds, the Village Council was not addressing public safety.

Mr. Wrobel mentioned that Mr. Martin Tully, who was also running for mayor, was a proponent for cost-sharing and suggested mentioning the matter to him, or seeking out citizens groups or residents in the neighborhood to discuss these options.

Ms. Christine Fregeau, 1918 Elmore Avenue, stated that in listening to the discussions of the village council and in reviewing the Community Investment Program, she stated there will be a significant increase in the 2012 budget to focus on projects using some creative options. She believed the council was looking to reinvest in the community.

In discussing the matter further, **Mr. Cronin** spoke that as much as he supported the idea, he believed the timing was not right and other issues needed to be addressed first; but agreed frustrations existed on the commission.

Discussion followed on what mechanisms existed to offer cost-sharing and the fact that in prior instances when the topic was mentioned, residents felt they paid their taxes and did not support the cost-sharing suggestion.

Mr. Fera discussed that a cost-sharing opportunity was discussed with the residents on 68th Street who had similar safety concerns. However, after the approximate costs for improvements were provided, the residents did not discuss the matter further with staff. He stated that from his own research with other villages that various cost-sharing programs have been used, i.e., 70/30, 50/50, etc., but the programs have become policy and unless the parties meet their cost share, the project does not move forward.

Dialog then moved to whether the Village had the authority to levy all residents of a certain residential area if only a certain majority of the residents wanted a specific project. **Mr. Fera** could not specifically respond, but recalled that a Claremont Drive SSA was discussed several years ago, but did not move forward. A commissioner suggested that **Chairman Wendt** speak to the village manager on how to find out that information. Some commissioners also agreed that there had to be leadership on the village council to get some of the projects moving forward by using some of these creative alternatives.

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Fera updated the commissioners on recent neighborhood meetings held discussing traffic, speeding, and safety. From the two meetings, the following streets were discussed: Woodward Avenue (Prairie to Grant) and Carpenter Street (55^{th} to 59^{th}). Striping on Claremont has been completed; photos to follow next month. A downtown parking study is also scheduled with proposals to arrive in January. Next month, staff will return with its findings from the 2010 Neighborhood Traffic Study between Main, Fairview, 55^{th}, and Maple Streets. An update followed on the Safe Routes to School application; the driver feedback signs; a grant application for the traffic signal/LED replacements; and the pedestrian countdown signals on Main Street.

ADJOURN

MR. STUEBNER MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. MR. SARICKS SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Celeste Weilandt,
Recording Secretary
(as transcribed by digital recording)