

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
OF THE  
DOWNERS GROVE PUBLIC LIBRARY  
JANUARY 25, 2012**

**MINUTES**

**ROLL CALL**

President DiCola called the meeting to order in the Library Meeting Room at 7:30 p.m. Trustees present: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Trustees absent: none. Also present: Library Director Ashton; Assistant Director Carlson. Visitors: Reference Services Coordinator Bonnie Reid; resident John Mochel.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Trustees reviewed the minutes of the regular meeting of January 11, 2012. It was moved by Read and seconded by Eblen **THAT THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF JANUARY 11, 2012 BE APPROVED.** Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Abstentions: none. Nays: none. Motion carried.

**PAYMENT OF INVOICES**

Trustees reviewed the list of invoices submitted for payment. It was moved by Read and seconded by Eblen **TO APPROVE PAYMENT OF OPERATING INVOICES FOR DECEMBER 31, 2011 TOTALING \$3,935.60 AND FOR JANUARY 25, 2011 TOTALING \$23,273.85.** Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Abstentions: none. Nays: none. Motion carried.

**OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS**

None.

**OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON OTHER LIBRARY BUSINESS**

None.

**OLD BUSINESS**

None.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**- Discussion of Second Draft of Major Strategies for the Strategic Plan**

The second draft of major strategies for the strategic plan included examples for further clarification, as the board had requested at the previous meeting. The additions were welcomed by the trustees. They requested that the document clearly refer to books in all formats. They emphasized that they wished to see the library maintain a strong focus, especially for children, on books printed on paper as well as other formats.

The board discussed what these strategies might look like in the activities, atmosphere, and appearance of the library. The discussion focused on a vision of a more welcoming, useful,

attractive, and up-to-date destination -- not radically different but evolved to meet a new age. This vision might include the following:

- Fewer shelves
- More people using their own technology
- More information exhibits or displays with face-out books
- More staff interaction with patrons, providing information and technological help
- Checkout available throughout the building
- Planned, appealing, useful space and activities for teens
- More interactive children's reading technology
- Welcoming and easier-to-navigate second floor
- More intuitive collection organization
- Attractive meeting space, including children's program room
- Presence outside the walls, with attentive staff involved in community settings and contributing to their success

Once the board has agreed on a vision, emphasizing how the library might look and function, the next step is to test the vision with the public. Trustees emphasized the need to invite the public into the library to provide input, and also to go out to the public for direct input from community organizations, schools, churches, businesses, the Chamber of Commerce, Downtown Management, and others.

Ashton agreed to make revisions to the document for the next board meeting and for discussion with the community in the coming months. He will initiate the public conversation with reporters from DG Reporter, TribLocal, and the Patch.

### **- Planning for Library Visits**

Ashton reported that he had not yet scheduled library visits, but will be working on these for the month of February.

### **-Review of 2011 Library Statistics**

The Board reviewed Library Statistics for 2011, indicative of an emerging shift in library use. Although total circulation was down 4% from the previous record-breaking year, circulation of downloadable books tripled from the previous year. The 2011 gate count was down 6% from the high 2010 count, but was up 4% from the previous 2009 count. The number of reference questions continued to decline in 2011, as did library public computer usage for the first time as more patrons brought their own laptops and tablets to use in the library. Community use of meeting rooms and program attendance were up 10-15%, library website usage was up 16% and the largest increase was for reference database usage which was up 47%. Trustees inquired about statistics for use of the library's Wi-Fi by patrons. Carlson agreed to investigate methods for providing this information.

## **REPORT FROM THE ADMINISTRATION**

- a. Ashton reported that the list of all officials and employees required to submit a Statement of Economic Interest under the Illinois Governmental Ethics Act was submitted, and forms will be mailed in March.

- b. Carlson reported on a January 20 meeting of the Downers Grove governments that would be affected by the creation of a stormwater utility. Village staff made a brief presentation regarding the stormwater management system, the current property tax funding approach, the proposed utility fee approach and the financial impact on property owners. With the utility fee approach, tax exempt properties, including the library, which pay nothing for stormwater management under the current funding approach, would pay 8.4% of the annual stormwater revenue, and revenue from residential properties would be reduced. Fees would be based on the amount of impervious area on a property. The library's first year payment would be less than \$750, but annual increases of 17% for 10 years are under consideration. A system of credits for measures to manage stormwater onsite would lower a property's fees. The government bodies attending the meeting requested that the Village consider a utility model based on both pervious and impervious areas of a property. They also emphasized that there would be higher administrative costs for the Village under a stormwater utility system.

Trustee Loftus, who is a civil engineer, volunteered as part of his Library Board service to assist the Village staff and consultants with the development of the credit system. Ashton agreed to inform the Village Manager of this offer.

- c. Carlson reported that overall staff responses, verbal and written, were positive for the staff in-service day on January 13. Jamie LaRue's presentation on "Who Needs the Library?" was well-received as staff appreciated his positive approach and real library examples. The National Alliance on Mental Illness presentation was appreciated by some, and disappointing to others who wanted more emphasis on situations in the library rather than personal stories. Staff enjoyed the get-to-know-your-colleagues game; both staff and trustees were amazed to see the wide range of personal experiences and activities of the staff.

### **TRUSTEE ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION**

President DiCola reported that a resident had reported to her that she does not bring her children to the library as she has a special needs child who can be loud. President DiCola asked how the staff attempts to make parents like this one feel welcome at the library. She inquired about any services the library offers for children with special needs. Trustee Eblen commented that, in the process of bringing her grandchild to the library, she has become very positively aware of the sometimes noisy, vibrant, and active atmosphere of the Junior Room. Ashton offered to provide the board with information on the library's services to special needs children at the next meeting.

Trustee Humphreys mentioned that the Village Council's "Coffee with the Council" will be meeting in the library's meeting room on February 18, 9-10 AM, and that he will be unable to attend the February 22 board meeting.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The regular meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

APPROVED 2/6/12

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE  
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING  
PUBLIC HEARING

JANUARY 9, 2012, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Jirik called the January 9, 2012 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. Hose, Mr. Matejczyk, Mr. Quirk,  
Mrs. Rabatah, Mr. Webster

**ABSENT:** Mr. Waechtler

**STAFF PRESENT:** Community Development Director Tom Dabareiner; Planning Manager  
Jeff O'Brien and Planner Damir Latinovic

**VISITORS:** David Shaw with Shaw Gussis, 321 N. Clark St., #800, Chicago, IL; Dan Durkin and George Koliarakis with A.C. Alexander, 5940 W. Touhy, Niles, IL; Robert Hamilton, Gewalt Hamilton Assoc., 850 Forest Edge Dr., Vernon Hills, IL; Shirley Klaus, 6296 Woodward; Michelle Schele, 6215 Pershing Avenue; Don and Cathy Weiss, 7050 Newport, Woodridge, IL; D'Anne Gordon, 6237 Pershing Avenue; Ricardo Castaneda, 6208 Woodward Ave; Curt VanLoon, 6211 Pershing; Richard Ooms, 6218 Pershing Ave.; Eric Olson, 5721 Pershing; Rick and Karen Britton, 6299 Woodward; Oma Selle, 6157 Pershing; Alma Scott; Dave Soto; Gary \_\_\_; Barry Dixon, 6291 Woodward; Mimi Williams, 6524 Stair St.; Philip Casseras, 6210 Pershing; Karolle Krajewski, 6154 Pershing; Juan Perce, 6207 Pershing; Guy Bronson, 5904 Downers; Ed Dunn, 5341 Lane Place; Tom Smith, 5316 Washington; Jim Nehls; Frank Freda, 2140 63<sup>rd</sup> St.; Eric Riggs, 2148 63<sup>rd</sup> St.; Shelly Weiss, 2134 63<sup>rd</sup> St.; Mr. Jim Neil, 6237 Chase; Jan Gordon, 6237 Pershing Avenue; Shirley Simpson, 6298 Pershing; and Rick Ooms, 6218 Pershing

Chairman Jirik led the Plan Commissioners in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance and directed the public's attention to the available informational packets.

**APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2011 MINUTES**

**MR. WEBSTER MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES, AS PREPARED.  
SECONDED BY MR. HOSE.**

**MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 8-0.**

Chairman Jirik reviewed the protocol for the meeting.

**PC-39-11 (Continued from 12/05/2011)** A petition seeking a voluntary annexation with rezoning to B-2 General Retail Business, final plat of subdivision approval for lot consolidation and special use approval for a drive-through use for a new Walgreen's store, for the properties located at the northwest corner of 63<sup>rd</sup> Street and Woodward Avenue, commonly known as 2134, 2136, 2138

and 2140 63<sup>rd</sup> Street and 6298 Woodward Avenue Downers Grove, IL (PIN #'s 08-13-419-044, -054, -043, -042, -041, 053) David Agosto, Petitioner; Patel Trust, Jeremy Youngman, DGNB Trust 97-031, Frank Freda and Weiss Loving Trust, Owners.

The Chairman swore in those individuals who were not sworn in at the last hearing and reviewed why the continuation took place, i.e, for the petitioner to supplement the record, if necessary, due to the issues raised during the original public hearing. He clarified that tonight's hearing would focus on taking commentary from staff, the petitioner, and public on any new material entered into the record with the commissioners.

Referring to the outstanding issues listed on Page 14, paragraph 4, of the minutes, the Chairman opened up the hearing based on those open issues and briefly summarize them for the public. Specifically: 1) was the project a significant deviation from the comprehensive plan; 2) limiting/assuring the development with the site plan presented to the commission; 3) sound issues; 4) home values; 5) on-site truck turning patterns; 6) exiting on Woodward Avenue -- site distance relative to traffic movements -- safety posed by ingress/egress on sloping part of the hill relative to inducing traffic movements, cross-movements on the hill, consideration to not have any ingress/egress on Woodward, and how petitioner plans to keep vehicles out of the neighborhood; 7) illumination/spillage from the sign and how much would it affect residents across Woodward Ave; 8) solution for neighbor's driveway; and 9) how many stores have 24/7 hours of operation.

Mr. Damir Latinovic, village planner, gave a presentation on how the proposal would not deviate from the Village's Comprehensive Plan and that, in fact, the site was no longer suitable for single-family residences due to the heavy traffic along 63<sup>rd</sup> Street, the nearby commercial development, and the site's proximity to Interstate 355. Details followed on how the area under discussion had changed, with Mr. Latinovic using various, similar B-2 examples around the Village: the 3800 Highland Avenue site; the northeast corner of 67<sup>th</sup> Street and Main Street; and the addition made to the medical building located at 68<sup>th</sup> and Main Street. Mr. Latinovic pointed out that the proposal was lower in intensity compared to the three examples cited. Referring to the traffic impact study submitted by the petitioner, the proposed use would generate about 10 additional vehicles exiting onto northbound Woodward Avenue. However, he pointed out that the petitioner did not use a 50% discount that is acceptable for retail uses that draw traffic from the existing busy road network, thereby reducing the number of 10 cars down to five cars during the PM peak hour.

Regarding the impact of the school traffic, Mr. Latinovic noted that pharmacy's peak traffic will not coincide with the school bus traffic or the morning rush hour. He reviewed the type of use that could be placed on the site, i.e., a 20,000 sq. ft. low intensity office/medical use building with 101 parking spaces, which would meet the requirements of the Comprehensive Plan and could have 9 cars exiting onto Woodward Avenue during peak hour. This example would be similar to the proposed Walgreens but the traffic generated would coincide with the morning rush hour and the school bus traffic. Mr. Latinovic reiterated that the proposal was compatible with the area and would not negatively affect the surrounding residences.

Mr. Latinovic reported that staff was also recommending several operational conditions that would further offset the retail-specific impact of the proposed use, such as the special use only being approved only for the retail pharmacy, locking in the use to this specific site plan. Per the suggestion that a planned unit development would be better suited for the site, Mr. Latinovic

explained Planned Developments are better suited for properties much larger in size and typically has multiple lots, buildings, and uses.

Discussion followed on how truck traffic, hours of operation, delivery hours, and illumination issues would be addressed, as discussed at the prior meeting. The speed limit pavement markings on Woodward Avenue, north of 63<sup>rd</sup> Street, as submitted by the petitioner, have been included as one of the conditions for the special use ordinance.

Modifications to the site plan were reviewed by Mr. Latinovic: 1) the center left-turn lane was removed; 2) the first 25 feet of the fence along the north property line was removed and same on the west property line; 3) the neighbor's driveway issue had been resolved with the petitioner giving the land affected to the adjacent neighbor; and 4) the building was slightly relocated to the west to allow for truck turning movement and exiting onto 63<sup>rd</sup> Street. Mr. Latinovic, again, reviewed how the proposal met the Comprehensive Plan and recommended approval subject to staff's conditions in its staff memo.

Mr. Hose asked for clarification of Condition 5: the hours of operation and the drive-through window. He asked whether there was any contemplation of extended hours or different hours for the drive-through at some point, wherein Mr. Latinovic responded there was not at the moment and that the petitioner would have to come before the Plan Commission to revise the drive-through hours.

As to the far northwest corner of the site being vacant, Mr. Latinovic explained the area was designated green space. There were no plans for development there and any expansion would require the petitioner to return to the Plan Commission to amend the site plan. Per Mrs. Rabatah's question on when the new constructed homes were built on 63<sup>rd</sup> Street, staff reported the county would have the specific information. However, he estimated they were built in the late 1990s or early 2000s.

As to the county working with the Village on its Comprehensive Plan, Mr. Jeff O'Brien, explained that the Village has a mile and one-half planning jurisdiction outside of its boundaries and the county usually makes its comprehensive plan consistent with the Village, as with any other villages. Examples followed on the collaboration that takes place between the county and the Village regarding certain developments.

Chairman Jirik, referring to the 9 cars versus the 10 cars traveling on Woodward Avenue, asked Mr. Latinovic to further explain how he arrived at his calculations, wherein Mr. Latinovic discussed that staff looked at what could be constructed on the site and the number of cars being generated from a larger medical office use was estimated based on the Institute of Traffic Engineers Trip Generation Manual, which was how the 9 cars were arrived at, i.e., 10% of the total traffic generation during the peak PM hour for that use. Because the proposed use already existed on 63<sup>rd</sup>, it was to be expected that much of that traffic that was using Walgreens in the past would continue to do so. He reminded the commissioners that the Comprehensive Plan was a general guideline and the low-intensity office use and the proposed Walgreens were very similar but the proposed 15,000 sq. foot Walgreens would have less of an impact than with a larger low-intensity office building.

## APPROVED 2/6/12

Asked if site specific conditions were considered by staff which could result in the vehicle numbers to be higher, Mr. Latinovic deferred the question to the petitioner. The Chairman also concurred with staff that traffic appeared to be the main concern for this proposal.

Chairman Jirik raised the point that the proposal was for B-2 zoning with a special use for a drive-through; however, under the straight B-2 zoning, he stated a wide variety of other uses could occur and he questioned staff as to what could happen.

In response, Manager O'Brien stated typically a medical office could be constructed by-right, but it would require staff reviewing other "tools" to limit the use, especially if it was a significant traffic generator. In this case, because of the special use ordinance being granted, however, it allowed only that specific use to be tied to the proposal, and that staff was conditioning the approval on the site plan and this use specifically.

Chairman Jirik re-emphasized that his concern had to do with the traffic analysis and leaving the Village open to higher traffic-generating B-2 zonings that were not prohibited, which could invalidate the assumptions.

Mr. O'Brien stated the burden was always on the petitioner and confirmed with the chair that the proposed conditions in the Special Use ordinance had the same protection as a planned unit development.

Asked how the total traffic movement on the site was factored into the proposal, Mr. Latinovic stated the traffic engineer and developer could best answer the question but offered that staff had recognized that the proposal is not a low intensity office use, but it is a smaller retail pharmacy than what a low-intensity office building could be and with much of the traffic being pass-by traffic. The concern as to whether the proposal was adding more vehicles, staff did feel that in the immediately vicinity there would be impacts, which was why operational conditions were added to have traffic exit 63<sup>rd</sup> Street, which the petitioner has agreed to.

Chairman Jirik invited the petitioner to speak and asked that he make his presentation based upon the list of concerns. No objections were heard.

Mr. David Shaw, attorney for the petitioner, stated he had no additional information to add to staff's analysis of the Comprehensive Plan and the plan is meant to be used as a guideline and it urged that when a proposal is being reviewed that the Village Council review it with a certain amount of flexibility. He believed the impact of the traffic matched up favorably. The parking field was smaller and the proposal was more of a transient use where destination traffic would be generated throughout the day during business hours.

For the record, Chairman Jirik noted it was the petitioner's duty to defend his proposal regarding questions posed to him as it relates to the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Beggs, noting the definition of "low-intensity office" in the Comprehensive Plan, pointed out that there was no category for Low Intensity Office in the Village's zoning ordinance. However, he viewed Walgeens as a retail use because of the variety of items it sold. Reviewing the definition of Low Intensity use, he stated it referred to medical, dental, legal and accounting uses which is not retail. He asked why should the Village change from non-retail to retail in this case.

Mr. Shaw responded that the Comprehensive Plan was not an absolute but only a guideline and is basically making suggestions based upon conditions at the time it was prepared. As reviewed by planners at the time, the Walgreens plan was originally submitted for consideration. He explained that the traffic analysis and the intensity of the use was not based upon a 15,000 sq. foot pharmacy but what the chain pharmacy typically generates, which includes a significant retail component, including a convenience store. Therefore, the traffic count estimates in the traffic report include traffic generated by retail component. But, as to the overall general nature of the location and the proposed use, Mr. Shaw stated it did not significantly deviate from the intensity of the use, the nature of the use, or the traffic impact as proposed in the Comprehensive Plan. He believed it may be more beneficial due to the real estate and sales tax component. Mr. Shaw suggested that, given the changing conditions of the intersection, leaving the single-family zoning would be more inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan than what was being proposed.

In response, Mr. Beggs asked about the impacts of placing a 7-11 or similar convenience store in the same location. He asked if the traffic would be lower.

Mr. Shaw stated he did not know if the traffic volume would be lower than proposed Walgreens. He indicated a different analysis would have to take place because there are other considerations when developing a convenience store. Mr. Shaw believed that traffic was just one of the criteria to be considered.

Mr. Beggs asked if there was any data to justify the statement that the proposed Walgreens would generate less traffic than a larger office building. Mr. Shaw deferred to the question to the traffic engineer but did not know the absolute traffic counts.

Traffic engineer, Mr. Robert Hamilton, Chairman of Gewalt Hamilton Associates, Vernon Hills, Illinois, was introduced. Mr. Hamilton reminded the commissioners that the prior engineer appearing before this Plan Commission was Bill Grieve and he was currently substituting for him. Referring to Exhibit A of the traffic report, Chairman Jirik asked where the 10 unaccounted workers went for the day, wherein Mr. Hamilton explained they did not “make it out in the peak hour” and are therefore not represented in the peak hour count, and that he does not get 100% of the workers in or out during the peak hour. Mr. Hamilton stated the numbers were based on “empirical counts” and if one of the figures was unbalanced, it typically meant that the true peak was later. Asked if the use was consistent with light office use, Mr. Hamilton stated the use was not “identical” in terms of the traffic generation. Mr. Hamilton proceeded to explain that the traffic will come from either pass-by traffic where the vehicle is already on the road, or from the residents who come from the neighborhood. He did not expect to create new trips in the area. However, Chairman Jirik pointed out that the 150 trips were new to the property today that were not there prior with single family homes being there. Mr. Hamilton concurred.

Asked how many total trips the site would generate on a typical day, Mr. Hamilton referenced Exhibit 5 in the traffic report, noted there were 1,300 total trips, with half being neighborhood and half being pass-by. He could not provide total Light Office movements because he was not asked prior.

Chairman Jirik asked if there would be any other traffic generation from other accessory uses such as a Red Box. Mr. Hamilton clarified that the data that was used was from a typical pharmacy,



which would have similar uses, i.e., ice machine, propane tanks, Red Box -- which was not distinguished in the figures but is included.

As to the estimate about the 9 cars traveling down Woodward Avenue, Mr. Hamilton, again, reminded the Chairman that the traffic and assignment of directions was empirical and he was dealing with the two sources of traffic. The percentage of traffic currently on the highway was very close to the percentage of traffic distribution that the store would generate. Mr. Hamilton spoke about the radius of attraction that drivers use. Asked what the total daily movements were for north and south on Woodward Avenue, Mr. Hamilton stated to take the 1,300 and multiply it by 10%. Asked what his expert opinion of the impact of prohibiting those movements, Mr. Hamilton stated, from a municipal perspective, he generally recommended against it because those restrictions mostly impacted neighborhood residents.

Mr. Cozzo commented that if less people were making a turn off of Woodward Avenue exit that it could be wise to restrict the turn northbound since it inconvenienced few drivers and to remove it from the discussion. Mr. Hamilton stated, from his experience, it proved frustrating for the neighbors, and cited some examples.

Regarding the question to staff on assuring that the development and use was consistent with the plan presented to the commission, Chairman Jirik asked the petitioner if he would be opposed to constructing the project as a PUD, wherein Mr. Shaw stated he would not be opposed.

Addressing the drive-through speaker, Mr. Dan Durkin, AC Alexander Architect and Engineers, referenced a note in the commissioners' packets from E.F. Bavis Associates explaining that the conversation that takes place between the pharmacist and the driver would be through a telephone at 74 decibels adjacent to the car. At approximately 30 feet from the drive-through the sound levels become indistinguishable in the surrounding area. The property line was 42 feet from the drive-through window. There were no issues with the sound.

Chairman Jirik noted 61 decibels appeared to be a high ambient and he did not believe 61 as being ambient conditions for this property. He found the information unresponsive to the question. The Chairman believed the ambient for this neighborhood, to be 40 to 50 decibels.

Mr. Durkin also stated that if the decibel level was found to be disturbing, the sound level could be adjusted by Walgreens.

Chairman Jirik asked about the acoustic qualities of the fence along the north property line.

Mr. Durkin stated it would be a six-foot tall wooden fence with trees and bushes in front of it. Asked if the petitioner would be adverse to an 8-foot fence with the obligation that it be suited as an acoustic barrier, Mr. Shaw reported that the area was already three feet below grade which had an impact on the ambient noise. The closest home was also 140 feet away. Mr. Durkin stated he could investigate the acoustic qualities of what is normally required by the village and report back.

Chairman Jirik reminded Mr. Durkin that the drive-through pharmacy area would be an area of commotion and one could not control the noise coming from vehicles. Additionally, the Chairman pointed out that the wall of the building would push the sound outward and magnify it.

Regarding home values, Mr. Shaw stated he had no specific information on home values and while he could have commissioned an appraiser, he believed credibility and applicability in such circumstances, became very subjective. He believed that those homes immediately adjacent to the proposal would be at one impact level, while those further away would be at another impact level. He believed that because of the changing nature of this intersection, the increased traffic and the commercial uses across the street, the value of the property as single family was already diminished.

As to truck-turning traffic on the site, Mr. Hamilton summarized that the auto template used was a wheelbase 62 feet with the primary movement being eastbound on 63<sup>rd</sup> and traveling counterclockwise around the building, back into the dock with departure to the east or west on 63<sup>rd</sup>. He distributed a copy of WB62 auto-turns to the commission. Mr. Hamilton added that the east drive aisle was narrower now. Asked if there was consideration given to the geometric design of the Woodward Ave exit, Mr. Hamilton responded that there was not.

Addressing the issue of sight distance onto Woodward Ave, the ingress/egress, the hill, slope, crossing lanes for northbound traffic, and general safety, etc., Mr. Hamilton reported that safety was looked at from the perspective of whether drivers have the ability to see and stop. He reviewed how elevations are taken and determine how far away a driver can be expected to see, noting that the calculations are speed dependent. Details followed, noting that the listed 290 feet gave a driver adequate time to identify and decide to stop from a speed of 40 miles per hour. Posted speed, however, was 25 miles per hour. Mr. Hamilton distributed an exhibit depicting the Walgreens driveway to the approaching driver's location, 290 feet away. It was a safe location.

Chairman Jirik raised discussion about the illumination spillage from the sign and how it would affect the residents across Woodward Avenue. Mr. George Koliaraneis, engineer with AC Alexander, Niles, Illinois, reported he had a photometric plan in the packet submitted to the Commission and the spillage from the lighting at the property line would be zero. No signs would be located on the north and west sides of the building.

Regarding the neighbor's driveway to the north, Mr. Shaw stated he reached an agreement with Mrs. Klaus, i.e, when the property closes, he will simultaneously deed the 4-foot portion of the parcel under discussion, to the neighbor so it will not be an encroachment.

Lastly, the concern about how many of the Walgreens in the area ran 24/7 operations, Mr. Shaw did not have that information but stated the existing Walgreens was not 24/7 and the proposed Walgreens would not be a 24/7 operations.

Chairmn Jirik opened up the meeting to public comment, reminding the public that redundant information would be limited.

Mr. Barry Dixon, 6291 Woodward Avenue, stated from the plan he reviewed he did not see a fair comparison of retails uses on the site and asked if the commission or the petitioner could provide more similar impacts within the site itself.

Mr. Eric Olson, 5721 Pershing Ave was sworn in by Chairman Jirik. Mr. Olson stated he could not find the latest land use plan on the Village's web site but did locate the 2009 plan and noticed that as of two or three months ago, the area was designated as residential. He pointed out that when the change occurred from residential, the neighbors were not notified of that change. Chairman Jirik

discussed the meetings that were made public regarding the Comprehensive Plan, which changed the future land use designation to low-intensity office.

Ms. D'Ann Gordon, 6237 Pershing, stated the back of her kitchen will be looking at the proposed building. She asked about the difference between the Low Intensity Office use versus retail. Her understanding was that retail was not part of the Low Intensity Office use and asked if 1,300 vehicles on a daily basis qualified under Low Intensity office space. She also believed the hours for office use were more of a 9AM to 5PM Monday-Friday versus 8AM to 10PM seven days per week. She noted her concern that the petitioner could come back to request a 24-hour operation in the future based on the applicant's previous testimony. She did not think the proposed use was a light intensity use.

Mr. Jim Nehls, 6237 Chase, stated there were six traffic lights between Fairview and Interstate 355 and only two of them entered into residential areas -- Woodward and Chase. He stated that two years ago this commission agreed upon the use for the area and now the commission was trying to change the area less than three months later. He believed the neighborhood was unique, just like Hobson Triangle, and the development would destroy the north side of 63<sup>rd</sup> Street. He cited two new homes that were constructed in recent years. Mr. Nehls asked the commission to make the right decision.

Mr. Ricardo Castaneda, 6208 Woodward Avenue, along with other members of the public, were sworn in by the Chairman.

Mr. Castaneda recalled at the last meeting the neighbors were led to believe that the developer did some research in other areas and for some reason he decided to locate the Walgreens where it was being proposed. He cited that Village staff was becoming lobbyists for the petitioner and not considering the neighbors. He recalled the available land at the Meadowbrook Shopping Center and the litigation taking place and the petitioner not taking the time to investigate it further.

Mr. Castaneda stated he investigated the litigation further. He stated that he posed as a person seeking to open a business in the center and he spoke with the center's leasing agent. Mr. Castaneda stated the leasing agent assured him there was not any pending litigation. He went on to say the leasing agent would provide an affidavit of such after a lease was signed. Mr. Castaneda reiterated he was not proposing to open a business at Meadowbrook. Mr. Castaneda also voiced concern that when the site gets developed, who will guarantee him that he will not have water issues within the easement on his property.

Mr. Frank Freda, Jr., 2140 63<sup>rd</sup> Street, discussed the sound/noise on 63<sup>rd</sup> Street, as he has no air conditioning. He doubted that there will be more sound coming from a single speaker until 10 PM that will be louder than the traffic going past on 63<sup>rd</sup> Street at 10 PM or the noise from the bar across the street.

Ms. Michelle Shele, 6215 Pershing Avenue, pointed out there had been no discussion regarding the garbage trucks that would be servicing this site early in the morning.

Mr. Rick Britton, 6299 Woodward, resides across the street and said he was looking for an answer but assumed that his property value would be reduced based on Walgreens being his neighbor.

## APPROVED 2/6/12

Mr. Eric Riggs, 2148 63<sup>rd</sup> Street, owns one of the four new homes and paid \$300,000 for a nice home but he was concerned about Walgreens moving in and the property value subsequently.

Mr. Guy Brownson, 59<sup>th</sup> and Springside, said he travels the area often and in reviewing the graph for truck traffic, he walked through the traffic patterns. He discussed the difficult sight lines when making a left turn at the light from north on Woodward Ave to west on 63<sup>rd</sup> Street. Having two turn lanes of traffic, there were times when a driver could not see between the inner lane and the outer lane. He believed the left-turn lane into the Walgreens lot needed to be striped and the area re-graded on 63<sup>rd</sup> Street so a truck could wait for traffic to clear.

Ms. Mimi Williams, 6524 Stair Street, said she visited the Belmont Walgreens between noon and 3:00 PM and saw a very large truck there.

Ms. Jan Gordon, 6237 Pershing Avenue, was concerned about the site's driveways being close to the intersections and asked if the petitioner was planning to widen the turning lane so that traffic does not back up into the intersection and traffic light.

Mr. Guy Brownson, 5904 Downers Drive, voiced concern about the southbound traffic sliding into someone exiting/entering the lot when traveling over the hill. He reported that the 3800 Highland Walgreens had a traffic light which stopped the traffic. Another site had a level grade and a driver could see traffic approaching. He did commend the developer for giving a portion of the land to the neighbor.

Ms. Oma Selle, 6157 Pershing, asked what police department would be enforcing the speed limits since the property was being annexed. She asked how installed speed limit signs would be helpful when no one observes them anyway. Mr. O'Brien explained the Village would have jurisdiction to the north property line of the subject site once the parcel was annexed into the Village.

Mr. Eric Olson, 5721 Pershing, commenting about the 290-foot sight line, estimated it was about four and one-half houses and he did not believe a person could see four and a half houses over the hill. The Chairman noted that the information was part of the packet, which would be on-line.

Mr. Don Weiss, 7050 Newport Drive, Woodridge, explained that he used to own the 2134 63<sup>rd</sup> Street address and it was almost impossible for a driver to turn left out of the driveway. He discussed how his father used to maneuver the driveway and to add a semi-truck was ludicrous. He discussed the overall congestion of the intersection due to the vehicles traveling to I-355. He believed adding a Walgreens would make the intersection more dangerous and eventually cost someone their life. He stated the petitioner could wait a few months and locate the Walgreens in the Meadowbrook Shopping Center where better parking was available and less congestion.

Village Manager, Jeff O'Brien, reported that the Village provided accident data for this intersection in the packet. He noted there were approximately 20 accidents at the intersection in 2011. He noted the report contained information on injuries – most of the accidents did not have any injuries. He further reviewed the top five intersections for traffic accidents. Most of those intersections were subject to 40 or more accidents per year. He noted that 20 accidents per year is pretty typical for a signalized intersection like Woodward.

## APPROVED 2/6/12

Ms. Michelle Schele, 6215 Pershing Avenue, stated she had concerns about the traffic survey being a one-day survey. It was on a Friday, which was light. The weather was not listed and the pedestrians were not listed. She suggested doing the survey on a warm sunny day in the summer.

Ms. Shirley St. Vincent, 6298 Pershing, stated it was her mother's property on Woodward Avenue is being considered as part of the proposal and that her father owned the 2134 63<sup>rd</sup> Street address in the past. She stated the entrance to her father's driveway was much closer to the intersection and said it was not a sharp turn and it was not dangerous. As far as coming out on Woodward Avenue, she stated her mom was located at the top of the hill and there was no visibility problems at all.

Ms. Marge Earl, 4720 Florence Avenue, stated she did not live in the area but began driving through it once a week about a year and a half ago. She stated it occurred to her that something was already affecting the traffic on Woodward Ave-- there was a new Costco located at Fountain Road - - and it was only in this small section that four traffic lanes did not exist on Woodward Avenue. Whether the Walgreens was constructed or not, she said the traffic issues were already occurring.

Mr. Rick Britton, 6299 Woodward Avenue, was concerned about getting out of his driveway safely.

Ms. Karen Britton, 6299 Woodward Avenue, emphasized the inconvenience of the proposed Walgreens driveway being directly across from her driveway. She voiced concern about backing out of her driveway safely.

Mr. Rick Ooms, 6218 Pershing, clarified it was not the traffic on Woodward Ave but the traffic on 63<sup>rd</sup> Street which was his concern. Referring back to the highest accident intersections, he pointed out that all of the intersections cited had double turn lanes, which were hazardous, and the drivers coming off of Woodward Avenue were fighting with drivers to get to Belmont Avenue, or 63<sup>rd</sup> Street or the Interstate.

Ms. Karen Britton, 6299 Woodward, stated the front of her home faces the Walgreens property and she was of the understanding that there would be no signage illuminated on the building. Lighting engineer Mr. Koliaraneis with AC Alexander, responded the photometric plan showed the illumination at the property line would be zero, including signage. Asked if there would be a monument sign across from her home, staff confirmed there would be a monument sign at the corner and a wall sign on the east side of the building which will be illuminated. Ms. Britton confirmed with the petitioner that the parking lot lights would be on 24/7. She also confirmed with staff that the proposal had no impact on the residents, which the Chairman reminded her that they testified and it was their position. Ms. Britton stated her position, as a resident, was quite different.

Mr. O'Brien clarified that staff's position was that impact from the lighting for the proposed Walgreens and a low-intensity office use (as contemplated by the Village's Comprehensive Plan) would be similar.

Mr. Curt Van Loon, 6211 Pershing, stated that Walgreens usually had signage on both sides of its buildings wherein office buildings had nothing similar.

Mr. O'Brien, explained that an office use does have the same sign standards as retail uses. He noted in many cases, office users choose to have signs that tend to be toned down from typical retail users. He went on to reiterate that an office use could still have some measure of an illuminated sign and

fall under same regulations as a retail store. From a visual impact with the lighting, whether an office building or a Walgreens, staff had to assume that an office would take the worse case scenario and install similar letters and the impact would probably be about the same.

Per Mr. Van Loon's question about the height of the parking lot light fixtures, Mr. O'Brien stated they were 30 feet from the ground to the light fixture. It was noted that there was a grade difference on the site.

Ms. Michelle Schele, 6215 Pershing Avenue, recalled at the last meeting there were 26 pharmacies within a five mile radius, but really there were 28 pharmacies, which broke down to 18 in a three-mile radius and out of those 18, six pharmacies were be 24 hours.

Chairman Jirik asked the commissioners if they had any questions for the public; none followed.

Asked if the petitioner had any rebuttals to the public or information he wanted to provide, Mr. Shaw had none. Asked if he had a closing statement, Mr. Shaw explained that he wanted to address the staff's report due to the intimation of a prejudice being projected.

Mr. Shaw explained that when he filed the petition, Village staff did review the proposal very thoroughly and while he could not agree to everything, compliance was made. He believed staff supported the project because it met the Comprehensive Plan and was in the best interest of the Village. He stated staff did do their job very well.

Chairman Jirik opened the floor for commissioners to deliberate.

Mr. Webster commented that his only apprehension was going from low intensity office to a B-2 retail use. He was not convinced and understood the Comprehensive Plan was intended to be flexible but he was not sure he supported the argument for the project.

Mr. Cozzo asked a question about the zoning of the Auto Zone at 63<sup>rd</sup> and Belmont which was B-2 and designated for Corridor Commercial in the Comprehensive Plan, per Mr. O'Brien. The area that was light blue was designated Low Intensity Office. The area shown as red was Corridor Commercial. The future land uses designated had no direct correlation to current underlying zoning. Mr. O'Brien explained that all office uses require a B or higher zoning district and both the blue and red required a B zoning. The Village's current Low Intensity Office uses fall within one of four zoning categories. Mr. O'Brien explained that the office at 3800 Main Street was zoned R-4 because that office was a court-ordered zoning decision. The office at 6700 Main Street was zoned B-2. The two sites at 68<sup>th</sup> and Main Street (NW and SE corners) were zoned B-1 and part of a PUD. Per Mr. Cozzo's understanding, then, the light blue color was consistent with the B-1 or B-2 (and the comprehensive plan), to which Mr. O'Brien concurred.

However, Mr. Beggs disagreed, stating that there was now a category of the zoning ordinance which was B2 and it covered different types of uses. He explained that the Comprehensive Plan attempts to differentiate amongs the uses which were presently in the B-2 category.

The Chairman, having worked on the Comprehensive Plan, explained that, personally, when the plan was being reviewed it was not to establish the zoning but to establish guideline for future land uses that were coherent, beneficial, and would support the orderly development of the Village. He

further explained that residential, along a high speed corridor, was not beneficial and that low intensity office could also act as a buffer. He questioned the commissioners whether it fit the area and was it appropriate.

Contrarily, Mr. Hose acknowledged that the Comprehensive Plan stated Low Intensity Office, but also noted these uses require a B1 or B2 zoning in most cases. The zoning required for a medical, dental clinic or lab is B-2, and the zoning required for a 7-11, grocery stores, or meat markets is B-1 -- things that would potentially generate a higher amount of traffic as a Walgreens store. While he did not mind going to the B2 zoning, the issue he had was whether it was a large departure from light intensity office. He believed the proposal was not a large departure but yet it was a departure because it would bring with it traffic at different hours than a traditional office setting. He believed it was consistent with moving in a commercial direction that the Comprehensive Plan contemplates.

Adding to the discussion , Mr. Beggs directed commissioners' attention to the first paragraph at the top of page 35 of the Comprehensive Plan which discussed residential character, specifically single-family detached residential neighborhoods being "one of the Village's most cherished attributes and one of its most defining characteristics." Thinking about the properties neighboring the proposal, Mr. Beggs believed the commission had to think about the point of what the Plan considers as its most valuable asset, which was why he drew a closer distinction than Mr. Hose. He considered the proposal as a retail store, which was not the same character as the low intensity office buildings he was familiar and he did not believe size nor traffic was significant and it was the type of occupation that was being conducted.

Mr. Quirk added that when he thought of low intensity office and what differentiated it, he explained it was the hours of operation and the individuals using them, specifically pre-dinner and post-dinner hours. To him, office space and low intensity translated to individuals coming to work and not having much traffic activity to and from it during the day. It was having more of a professional staff.

Mrs. Rabatah added that when the comments were made about the low-intensity offices, she did not see the comparisons. Additionally, it was mentioned that the petition was more retail-related than office. She pointed out that the density in the area was very different and the neighborhood was very different in relation to the proposed site. Mrs. Rabatah understood there was commercial on the south side but this was not the south side. She lived in the area and agreed with one of the neighbors that expressed concern about the double traffic turning lanes from northbound Woodward to westbound 63<sup>rd</sup> Street and the backups occurring even during non-peak hours. She believed the proposal needed to be site-specific. She voiced concerns about the hill and travelled the neighborhood to avoid the congestion on 63<sup>rd</sup> Street. She questioned the development during icy conditions and also questioned a future 24/7 operations coming before the commission. She was not comfortable with the proposal.

Mr. Hose then proceeded to discuss that by placing any commercial development at the location, the Comprehensive Plan raised the idea of adding more traffic to it. Asked if Mrs. Rabatah thought there would be any type of commercial development more fitting for the particular location, given the traffic issues she voiced, Mrs. Rabatah explained that she did not see any development but she did frequent the Walgreens at Belmont and 63<sup>rd</sup> and saw the traffic issues there and saw no difference with the problems that already existed in the proposed location, i.e., several vehicles traveling in and out of the site. She stated she was not opposed to the Comprehensive Plan placing

APPROVED 2/6/12

Low Intensity Office at the site; however, she challenged how worse it would be placing a Walgreens at the site, given the grading of the hill and the two turn lanes turning west onto 63<sup>rd</sup>.

Asked if the proposal were an office building with the same physical characteristics of the site and the same statistics being presented, would her opposition be the same, wherein Mrs. Rabatah responded the proposal would have to come before this commission and the specifics would have to be heard. She stated she could not answer the question.

Chairman Jirik pointed out that the petitioner had two options: 1) to propose a change to the Comprehensive Plan, or 2) propose a development which is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. The Chairman reminded the commissioners that the petitioner chose the second option where the petitioner's position was that, basically, the development resembled Low Intensity Office. After much research, Chairman Jirik personally believed the proposed Walgreens generated much more traffic than a low intensity office building and the hours were greater. Also, a drive-through window existed as well as other on-site services (Red Box, propane cylinders, etc.). He believed the proposal was retail and commercial and the petitioner did not make the case. He further stated he asked himself if mitigation could be considered for the development, given the close proximity of the neighbors and, while he had some ideas, he did not feel they would have been enough to create a low intensity office feel for the neighbors.

The Chairman entertained a motion for the petition. Mr. Quirk asked if he could vote, given his absence at the December meeting. After questioning him as to reading the prior minutes and understanding the petition, the Chairman allowed Mr. Quirk to vote on this petition.

**WITH RESPECT TO FILE PC 39-11 MR. BEGGS MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION DENY THE PETITION.**

**SECONDED BY MR. WEBSTER. ROLL CALL:**

**AYE: MR. BEGGS, MR. WEBSTER, MR. COZZO, MR. MATEJCZYK, MR. QUIRK,  
MRS. RABATAH, CHAIRMAN JIRIK**

**NAY: MR. HOSE**

**MOTION TO DENY PASSED. VOTE: 7-1**

Mr. Hose stated he voted negatively because the Low Intensity Office Use defined in the Comprehensive Plan requires B1 or B2 zoning. While he agreed traffic was an issue, the traffic study showed that traffic from Walgreens would be similar enough to a low intensity office use. He did not believe it warranted denial of the zoning. He believed traffic calming steps would mitigate such concerns. Also, he stated the commission saw studies about the visibility and stopping distance and his questions were answered with respect to those. As to the drive-through and special use, they went "hand in glove."

A change in the agenda followed:

**PC-03-12** A petition seeking approval of a special use for a business/professional office for a property in the DT, Downtown Transition district. The property is located on the west side of Main Street approximately 450 feet south of Maple Avenue and is commonly known as 5338 Main Street,



APPROVED 2/6/12

Downers Grove, Illinois (PIN 09-08-313-022) Patrick A. Tallon, Petitioner; North Star Trust Company #MBOB 3065, Owner.

Chairman Jirik swore in those individuals who would be speaking on File PC-03-12.

Chairman Jirik swore in those individuals who would be speaking on this matter.

Mr. O'Brien presented staff's report. He indicated the owner of 5338 Main Street was requesting approval of a special use for a professional office in the existing building. He explained the property is zoned DT, Downtown Transition. He noted the property was rezoned in 2006 from R-4 to DT. A music studio, for voice lessons, was established in the building shortly after the rezoning. He noted the use is permitted in the DT.

Mr. O'Brien explained there is currently an attorney's office in the building. This use was discovered when the applicant applied for a commercial occupancy permit for a new tenant – a photographer. Professional offices are special uses in the DT district.

Mr. O'Brien stated the proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan because it is zoned for commercial use. Further, the property has been used as commercial since 2006-07. He went on to explain the property serves as a transition from heavy commercial uses of the downtown core and is compatible with surrounding structures and uses.

Mr. O'Brien noted staff believes the proposal meets the standards for granting a special use. He explained the office use is similar to previous music studio. He reiterated that no changes to the site that would affect surrounding properties. As such, staff is recommending approval of the request with the condition outlined in the staff report.

No questions followed.

Petitioner/owner, Mr. Patrick Tallon, stated he agreed with staff's recommendations. In 2006 he purchased the property and used it as a voice studio and law office. The business grew and was relocated near the Tivoli. The current building is still used with his and his wife's law practice and it averages one client arriving per month. Currently Mr. Tallon believed the proposal met the village's requirements of the Comprehensive Plan and the use conformed with the law, i.e., small business office, low traffic. He requested approval of the petition.

The public was invited to speak. No public comment received. Mr. Tallon had no closing statement.

Mrs. Rabatah asked if the uses would be limited to the current user.

Mr. O'Brien explained that future users would not be limited. He went on to state the term "professional office" is defined by the zoning ordinance. He noted this term includes attorney offices, general business offices, accountants and similar professional uses. Any of these types of uses would be permitted as part of this special use. He indicated that more intense office uses such as medical and dental offices are defined separately and would not be allowed as part of this special use.

APPROVED 2/6/12

Chairman Jirik asked for public comments. No comments were received. The chair declared public participation closed.

Chairman Jirik asked for additional comments from the Commission. There being none, he asked for a motion.

**MR. COZZO MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL FOR A SPECIAL USE FOR A PROFESSIONAL OFFICE IN THE DT DISTRICT SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION:**

- 1. THE SPECIAL USE SHALL SUBSTANTIALLY CONFORM TO THE STAFF REPORT AND ATTACHMENTS DATED JANUARY 9, 2012.**

**SECONDED BY MRS. RABATAH.**

**ROLL CALL:**

**AYE: MR. COZZO, MRS. RABATAH, MR. BEGGS, MR. HOSE, MR. MATEJCZYK, MR. QUIRK, MR. WEBSTER, CHAIRMAN JIRIK**

**NAY: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 8-0**

**PC-02-12** A petition seeking a text amendment to Article XV, Signs, of Chapter 28 of the Municipal Code. The purpose of the request is to amend certain sign regulations regarding the amortization date for nonconforming signs. Village of Downers Grove, Petitioner.

Chairman Jirik swore in those individuals who would be speaking on this matter.

Mr. O'Brien presented staff's report. He indicated the Village was requesting approval of an extension of the sign ordinance's amortization date. He explained the date is currently May 4, 2012. The new date would be May 5, 2014. The change in the day would ensure the deadline falls on a weekday. He provided background on the sign ordinance and compliance levels. Mr. O'Brien explained that 75% of signs comply with the sign ordinance, which means that 565 signs still need to be updated to comply with Village regulations.

Mr. O'Brien indicated the Village was requesting the extension to account for the economic conditions that were not foreseen when the original update was adopted. He also indicated that enforcing the deadline with the current number of nonconforming signs would overburden the Village staff and court system.

Mr. O'Brien indicated the proposed amendment was consistent with the Village's Comprehensive Plan and original goals of the updated sign ordinance. He stated staff was recommending approval of the extension.

Mrs. Rabatah asked if staff knew where the nonconforming signs are located.

APPROVED 2/6/12

Mr. O'Brien explained staff spent time reviewing sign permit files and inspecting properties in November and December 2011. He indicated staff knows what properties are noncompliant. He explained staff knows the nature of the nonconformity too. He went on to note that Ogden Avenue has the most nonconformity.

Mr. Beggs stated the Village first adopted a sign ordinance in 1965. He indicated the Village reviewed numerous requests for bigger and taller signs almost immediately after the original adoption. He provided an example of an early variation request.

Mr. Quirk asked how staff was notifying owners of violations.

Mr. O'Brien explained if the extension was approved, notices would be sent to owners shortly after the Council approval. He noted owners would receive letters detailing violations and explaining that they had two years to comply. Staff would follow up with a final, formal notice in 2013 to those who were still not in compliance.

Mr. O'Brien stated owners in the Ogden Avenue TIF district would be given a reminder about the OASIS program. However, the Economic Development Corporation was already making owners in this area aware of the program.

Mr. Webster asked how the Village had previously been informing owners.

Mr. O'Brien explained that owners were notified when the ordinance was originally adopted in 2005. He stated the Village also proactively seeks sign compliance when owners apply for sign permits. He noted the sign ordinance contains provisions that owners must bring all signs into compliance when applying for a permit. Mr. O'Brien stated that bringing signs into conformance with the ordinance is a standard condition for redevelopment or incentive agreements with the Village. He noted that these practices helped reduce the number of nonconforming signs.

Chairman Jirik asked if there would be future extensions.

Mr. O'Brien stated the staff did not believe additional extensions would be entertained or necessary given the current and anticipated levels of compliance.

Chairman Jirik went on to say he thought it was important that businesses were treated fairly and that those who continued to wait to comply would not be rewarded with future extensions. He thought that would help ease concerns of businesses that already complied.

Chairman Jirik asked for public comments.

Marge Earl, 4720 Florence Ave, encouraged the Plan Commission to adopt the amendment. She noted that the ZBA would see a sharp increase in the number of sign variation requests if the extension was not adopted. She went on to say this increase in cases would punish others looking to pursue development, redevelopment and home improvements.

There being no further comments from the public, Chairman Jirik declared public participation closed.

APPROVED 2/6/12

Chairman Jirik asked if there were any other thoughts or comments from the Board. There being none, he asked for a motion.

**MR. WEBSTER MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE SIGN ORDINANCE EXTENDING THE AMORTIZATION DATE TO MAY 5, 2012.**

**SECONDED BY MR. QUIRK.**

**ROLL CALL:**

**AYE: MR. WEBSTER, MR. QUIRK, MR. BEGGS, MR. COZZO, MR. HOSE, MR. MATEJCZYK, MRS. RABATAH, CHAIRMAN JIRIK**

**NAY: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 8-0**

Staff confirmed there was no January 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting. A review of the upcoming February 6<sup>th</sup> agenda followed. Mr. O'Brien said he sent out a link from the Village attorney discussing some of the changes in the state's FOIA and Open Meetings Act and that the commissioners will need to take the on-line training course. Mr. Beggs had asked Mr. O'Brien if there could be a general meeting on this topic but was told that he had taken the training. The Village administrator also confirmed the on-line training had to be completed. The chairman asked to have the topic on the agenda each month. It was noted that January 1, 2013 was the deadline to receive a training certificate.

**THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 11:00 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. WEBSTER, SECONDED BY MR. BEGGS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 8-0.**

/s/ Celeste K. Weilandt

Celeste K. Weilandt

(As transcribed by MP-3 audio)