

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
DOWNERS GROVE PUBLIC LIBRARY  
DECEMBER 12, 2012**

**MINUTES**

**1. ROLL CALL**

President DiCola called the meeting to order in the Library Conference Room at 7:30 p.m.  
Trustees Present: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola.

Also Present: Library Director Rick Ashton, Assistant Director for Support Services Sue O'Brien, Assistant Director for Public Services Bonnie Reid, Anthony Oliver representing Cordogan Clark Architects.

**2. WELCOME TO VISITORS**

President DiCola welcomed the staff members and visitor to the meeting and thanked them for their interest in the Board.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING OF NOVEMBER 28, 2012**

Trustees reviewed the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of November 28, 2012. It was moved by Loftus and seconded by Eblen THAT the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of November 28, 2012 be approved. Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Abstentions: None. Nays: none. Motion carried.

**4. APPROVAL OF PAYMENT OF INVOICES AND RELATED FINANCIAL REPORTS**

The Board reviewed the list of invoices submitted for payment. It was moved by Humphreys and seconded by Loftus TO APPROVE payment of operating invoices for December 12, 2012 totaling \$172,284.64 and a Journal Entry of \$2,000 and to recognize November 2012 payrolls of \$174,787.26. Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Abstentions: none. Nays: none. Motion carried.

**5. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS**

None.

**6. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON OTHER BUSINESS**

Anthony Oliver introduced himself, reminded the Board that he had worked as an Owner's Representative on the Library building project completed in 1999, and expressed the interest of his firm in the upcoming renovation project.

## **7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

- a. Review of evaluation criteria and interview process for architect selection

Ashton presented the list of criteria enumerated in Illinois law. The Board discussed the criteria and the process, without taking any formal action. They emphasized that the interior space planning experience of firms would be an important element of the firms' record, along with the makeup of the work team, approach to the project, and professional references. Loftus agreed to work with Ashton on a score sheet for use by Board members in evaluating proposals.

## **8. NEW BUSINESS**

- a. State-mandated action on Executive Session Minutes

It was moved by Eblen and seconded by Loftus THAT the Minutes of the Executive Sessions conducted on January 11, February 22, and September 12, 2013, all concerning the performance and compensation of individual employees, remain confidential. Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Abstentions: None Nays: None. Motion carried.

- b. Invitation to Village Council to meet with the Library Board January 19, 2013

By consensus, the Board agreed to issue this invitation and to attend for discussion with Council members.

## **9. REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR**

Ashton summarized his written report (attached), covering the following topics:

- a. Talk at Downers Grove Rotary Club meeting December 3
- b. Library Bonds refinancing
- c. Architect selection process
- d. Other. Proposals from four vendors seeking to supply self-checkout and materials sorting equipment have been received. Evaluation and award of contract will be completed in January.

**10. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS AND REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION**

None.

**11. ADJOURNMENT**

President DiCola adjourned the meeting at 8:28 p.m.

DOWNERS GROVE PUBLIC LIBRARY  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
DECEMBER 12, 2012  
AGENDA ITEM 9  
REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

- a. Talk at Downers Grove Rotary Club meeting December 3. I did a 20-minute presentation to about 25 Rotary members and guests, emphasizing business-related services and major issues facing the Library. Rotary members showed a high degree of interest in issues relating to e-books and in the improved availability of business and organization library cards.
- b. Library Bonds Refinancing. The ordinance authorizing this action was scheduled for First Reading at the Village Council on December 11.
- c. Architect selection progress. The legally-required advertisement appeared in the Chicago Tribune on December 3. The RFP was e-mailed to a list of architecture firms, some identified by Library staff research and others self-identified, on December 10. The RFP was also posted on the Library's web site on December 10. A mandatory pre-proposal conference will be held at the Library at 2:00 p.m. on Thursday January 3, 2013.
- d. Other. Illinois Library Association Trustee Forum will be held at the Chicago Marriott Oak Brook on Saturday, February 2, 2013. For more information and registration, visit <http://www.ila.org/conference-and-events/trustee-workshop>.

APPROVED 1/28/13

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE  
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING  
PUBLIC HEARING

JANUARY 7, 2013, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Hose called the January 7, 2013 meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and led the Plan Commissioners and the attending public in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll call followed:

**PRESENT:** Chairman Hose, Mr. Beggs, Mr. Cozzo, Mr. Matejczyk, Mrs. Rabatah, Ms. Urban, Mr. Waechtler, Mr. Webster

**ABSENT:** Mr. Quirk

**STAFF PRESENT:** Community Development Planning Manager Jeff O'Brien and Planner Stan Popovich

**VISITORS:** Dr. Arthur Dobbelaere, Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer for Midwestern University; Resident Mr. John Fritz, 2S479 Avenue Orleans, Oak Brook, IL; Dwight Todd, DWL Architects; Dave Shindoll, Mackie Consultants; Kevin McCormick, Midwestern University; Marge Earl, Resident.

A review of the meeting's protocol followed.

**APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2012 MINUTES**

**THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2012 MEETING WERE APPROVED, AS PRESENTED, ON MOTION BY MR. MATEJCZYK, SECONDED BY MR. COZZO.**

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

Chairman Hose briefly reviewed the protocol for the meeting.

**PC 43-12** A petition seeking approval of a Planned Development amendment for the construction of a chapel for Midwestern University. The property is located on the south side of 31<sup>st</sup> Street, approximately 1,280 feet west of Meyers Road, Downers Grove, IL commonly known as 555 31<sup>st</sup> Street, Downers Grove, IL (PIN 06-32-200-015, 06-32-400-026); Midwestern University, Petitioner and Owner.

Planner, Mr. Stan Popovich, discussed the proposal was for a Planned Development amendment for the construction of a 2,500 square foot chapel for Midwestern University. Two maps were reviewed on the overhead. Mr. Popovich reminded the commissioners that most recently a parking garage expansion and a classroom and auditorium building was approved by the Village Council. In May 2012 the property was designated a Planned Development. The property is zoned R1 Single-Family Residential but the approved Planned Development allowed minor developments,

that met Planned Development standards, to be approved administratively, if they had been previously identified on a site master plan. When the Planned Development was approved in May, 2012, Mr. Popovich stated the chapel was not on the master site plan, which was why the petitioner was before this commission.

Mr. Popovich directed commissioners' attention to the proposed location of the chapel, which was currently on open green space and located just south of Haspel/Hambrick Hall. Proposed was a 29-foot tall, one-story chapel with exterior cladding of precast concrete panels, brick, and a standing seam metal roof. The interior space would be used for personal reflection and small worship services, which currently were being held at other classrooms throughout the campus.

Reviewing the engineering plan, Mr. Popovich reported that all utilities were existing on the site and the Downers Grove Sanitary District did conceptually approve the proposed plan. A new water service will be provided to the building for domestic water and fire protection services. Storm water would be retained in a proposed rain garden and at the detention basin located in the Basic Science Building to the southwest. The Basic Science Building basin was specifically designed with extra capacity in mind.

Staff believed the proposal complied with the Village's Comprehensive Plan, the Village's bulk regulations and zoning requirements of the Planned Development. The proposed building would be "virtually invisible" to nearby residents throughout most of the year. Traffic issues did not appear to be an issue, as the chapel's primary users would be individuals already on campus. The only new traffic potential could be for a wedding during off-peak hours/weekend. Current parking requirements were being met and a previous traffic study (done in 2011) identified extra parking capacity being available.

Per Mr. Popovich, sufficient access was confirmed by the fire department and the sidewalk around the "Quad" was to be utilized for access purposes. However, the petitioner will improve a sidewalk south of Haspel/Hambrick Hall so that a fire truck can utilize it. The fire department also indicated that some sidewalk modifications were needed at the southwest corner of Haspel/Hambrick Hall to allow for turns.

Public notification of the proposal was published in the *Downers Grove Reporter* and notices were sent to neighbors within 250 feet of the proposal. Northwestern University also sent out its own notifications. Staff received a couple of phone calls which were general inquiries. The Downers Grove Park District was also sent notification and no comments were received. The Forest Preserve responded with no concerns.

Mr. Popovich briefly reviewed the Standards for Planned Development relating to the proposal and based on those reasons, recommended that the Plan Commission forward a positive recommendation to the Village Council, including staff's conditions listed on page 6 of its report.

Asked whether the petitioner would be subject to the new stormwater utility fees, Mr. Popovich clarified that Northwestern was subject to the fees but there were also credits based on rain gardens, best management practices, and provided detention. Village Planning Manager, Mr. Jeff O'Brien, explained the details of how the fee would work.

APPROVED 1/28/13

Mr. Waechtler asked where there was a maximum occupancy for the chapel, wherein Mr. Popovich explained it would be based on the building and fire code and would have to be met at permit. Per Ms. Urban's question regarding the Planned Development's guidelines for architectural details, Mr. Popovich reported there were no specific design standards for building materials or colors but the PUD did identify height and bulk limitations. Details followed. As to the location of the chapel and not being seen by neighbors, Mr. Popovich explained his statement was to clarify that the chapel was located in the center of the campus and would not be visible to neighbors, who could be concerned about the impact of the chapel's height.

Chairman Hose swore in the petitioner and public who would be speaking on this proposal.

Petitioner, Dr. Arthur Dobbelaere Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer for Midwestern University, discussed that the University likes to provide an "entire growth process and educational experience" which includes the spiritual part of an individual's life. The chapel would allow students to think, pray, and meditate outside their classrooms. The chapel was being donated by the Channon Construction Company. Dr. Dobbelaere offered to answer commissioners' questions. No questions followed.

Chairman Hose opened up the hearing to public comment.

Chairman Hose swore in Mr. John Fritz.

Mr. John Fritz, 2S479 Avenue Orleans, Oak Brook, IL stated he resides north of the campus and stated that the only traffic he sees is during peak hours when it becomes difficult to exit out of Avenue La Tours heading east on 31<sup>st</sup> Street. He asked for consideration of a future traffic control at that intersection. Mr. O'Brien explained that there were ongoing discussions between the Village, the county highway department, and Midwestern University about a traffic signal at the University's entrance. Details followed regarding the required warrants and access.

Hearing no further comments, public comment was closed by the Chairman. Petitioner, Dr. Dobbelaere, had no further comments to add.

Mr. Webster stated he appreciated the University sharing its information with the commissioners and appreciated the quality of the campus and continued support of the community. The Chairman concurred. Mr. Cozzo and the Chairman also agreed that the standards for approval for the Planned Development were met. A motion was entertained.

**WITH RESPECT TO FILE PC43-12, MRS. RABATAH MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL TO APPROVE THE CONSTRUCTION OF A CHAPEL, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING FIVE (5) CONDITIONS:**

- 1. THE FINAL PLANNED DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT FOR A CHAPEL SHALL SUBSTANTIALLY CONFORM TO THE STAFF REPORT DATED JANUARY 7, 2013, AND WITH PRELIMINARY ARCHITECTURAL PLANS, ELEVATIONS AND LANDSCAPE PLANS PREPARED BY DWL ARCHITECTS & PLANNERS, INC. DATED DECEMBER 6, 2012 AND PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING PLANS AND STORMWATER REPORT PREPARED BY MACKIE CONSULTANTS, LLC**

APPROVED 1/28/13

**DATED DECEMBER 4, 2012 EXCEPT AS SUCH PLANS MAY BE MODIFIED TO CONFORM TO VILLAGE CODES AND ORDINANCES.**

- 2. THE EXISTING SIDEWALK LOCATED IMMEDIATELY SOUTH OF HASPEL/HAMBRICK HALL SHALL BE REINFORCED TO HOLD 82,000 POUNDS.**
- 3. THE EXISTING SIDEWALK TO THE WEST OF HASPEL/HAMBRICK HALL SHALL BE MODIFIED TO ALLOW A FIRE TRUCK THE ABILITY TO MAKE A RIGHT-HAND TURN ONTO THE SOUTH SIDEWALK.**
- 4. THE PROPOSED CHAPEL SHALL HAVE A MANUAL AND AUTOMATIC DETECTION SYSTEM INSTALLED THROUGHOUT IN A MANNER ACCEPTABLE TO THE VILLAGE. ALL AREAS OF THE BUILDING SHALL BE PROTECTED.**
- 5. THE PROPOSED CHAPEL SHALL HAVE A COMPLETE AUTOMATIC SPRINKLER SYSTEM INSTALLED THROUGHOUT IN A MANNER ACCEPTABLE TO THE VILLAGE. ALL AREAS OF THE BUILDING SHALL BE PROTECTED.**

**SECONDED BY MS. URBAN.**

**ROLL CALL:**

**AYE: MRS. RABATAH, MS. URBAN, MR. BEGGS, MR. COZZO, MR. MATEJCZYK, MR. WAECHTLER, MR. WEBSTER, CHAIRMAN HOSE**

**NAY: NONE**

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

Mr. O'Brien reported that there will be a January 28<sup>th</sup> meeting which includes a petition for a supportive living facility to be located at 63<sup>rd</sup> and Fairmont. Also, the Village released a Request for Proposal to re-write the Village's Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance based on the Village's Comprehensive Plan. A brief timeline followed on when the commissioners would expect to review those documents.

**THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 7:30 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. WEBSTER, SECONDED BY MS. URBAN. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 8-0.**

/s/ Celeste K. Weilandt

Celeste K. Weilandt

(As transcribed by MP-3 audio)



**VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE**  
**Stormwater and Flood Plain Oversight Committee Meeting**  
**December 13, 2012, 7:00 p.m.**

Downers Grove Public Works Facility  
5101 Walnut Avenue, Downers Grove, Illinois

**I. CALL to ORDER**

Chair Eckmann called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. A roll call followed and a quorum was established.

**II. Roll Call**

Members Present: Chair Eckmann, Mr. Crilly, Mr. Gorman, Mr. Ruyle, Mr. Scacco, Mr. Schoenberg

Absent: Mr. Austin

Staff Present: Karen Daulton Lange – Stormwater Administrator

**III. APPROVAL October 25, 2012 MINUTES**

**Mr. Gorman moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Mr. Crilly. Motion carried by voice vote.**

**IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None at this time. See Old Business V.A.

**V. OLD BUSINESS**

**A. 1310 Gilbert Headwall**

Chair Eckmann thanked the Village and Stormwater Administrator for their prompt response to the resident's concern about the proposed grate and headwall reconstruction at this site. Ms. Daulton Lange gave a quick summary of correspondence with Ms. Nevrlly, and that PW had removed the chain and lowered the grate on Monday, December 10<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Nevrlly entered the meeting. Chair Eckmann stated that he observed sedimentation in the outlet pipe on the south side of Gilbert, west of Brookbank. Ms. Nevrlly agreed and stated she was scheduled to meet with Jim Tock, Staff Engineer, on Monday to discuss the grate design. Ms. Daulton Lange stated that it was her understanding construction was not planned for this year, and for headwall construction to occur at this location an easement would be needed.

**B. Electronic Attendance**

An excerpt from Section 2.5 of the Downers Grove Municipal Code was distributed. Rule 2 outlines under what conditions a Committee member can participate electronically.

**C. Open Meetings Act Training**

All Committee members and the Stormwater Administrator have successfully completed their OMA training. The Village Clerk keeps a copy of the certificate of completion on file.

## **VI. NEW BUSINESS**

### **A. 2013 Meeting Dates**

Potential dates were discussed. Chair Eckmann will check his calendar and finalize with Ms. Daulton Lange, who will send out a list to the Committee and the Village Clerk.

## **VII. STAFF REPORT**

The SW&FPOC web page was updated to reflect the ability to hear appeals relative to the Stormwater Utility Fee.

Staff Attorney Dawn Didier will attend the January meeting to give the Committee a primer on the legal process of Appeals relative to the Stormwater Utility. Chair Eckmann expressed concern that the attorney should not try to sway the Committee's decisions. Ms. Daulton Lange explained she would be educating us on the legal process, not participating in the deliberations; much like the role of attorney at a Zoning Board of Appeals hearing.

The Committee will be hearing the first Stormwater Utility appeal at the February meeting. The request was received on December 10, 2012, so the meeting needs to be held within 60 days.

## **VIII. ADJOURN**

**Mr. Crilly made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:20 p.m., seconded by Mr. Scacco. Motion carried by voice vote.**

APPROVED January 16, 2013

**TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION  
Minutes**

November 14, 2012, 7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers - Village Hall  
801 Burlington Avenue, Downers Grove

Chairman Pro tem Schiller called to order the November 14, 2012 meeting of the Transportation and Parking Commission at 7:00 p.m.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited by all in attendance. New student Commissioner Kristen Loehman was welcomed.

Roll call followed and a quorum was established.

**ROLL CALL:**

Present: Chairman Pro tem Schiller; Commissioners Cronin, Loehman, Saricks, Vlcek, Wrobel

Absent: Commissioners Van Anne and Stuebner

Staff Present: Mr. Dorin Fera, Transportation Division Manager; Mr. Timothy Sembach, Police Parking Supervisor

Visitors: Ms. Stacy Meekins and Mr. Ian Preston with Sam Schwartz Engineering; Mr. Paul Barton, 1400 Maple Avenue, Downers Grove; Ms. Mary Stapleton, 1400 Maple Avenue, Downers Grove; Ms. Kristen Kaplan, 440 Prairie Avenue, Downers Grove

A quick review of the meeting's protocol followed, noting that the minutes were being recording on Village-owned equipment.

**APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 12, 2012 MINUTES**

Mr. Saricks clarified that the document he had referenced in the minutes and had provided to staff for distribution was entitled "Transportation Research News, with the article entitled "Active Transportation – Implementing the Benefits".

The September 12, 2012 minutes, with correction, were approved on motion by Mr. Saricks, seconded by Ms. Vlcek. Motion carried by voice vote of 6-0.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

The public was invited to speak on non-agenda items. No public comments were received.

A change in the agenda followed:

**2. File # 20-12 St. Mary's School - Temporary Drop-off Zone.** Mr. Fera reported this matter was brought to the attention of staff in August, 2012. Due to changes in the school's campus, student growth, and church services, the school approached staff, suggesting to have a temporary drop-off zone on the west side of Douglas Avenue to better serve the pre-school center. The zone will be temporary because the use of the building will be changed after the end of the school year. The police department was aware of the request.

**Mr. Fera** stated the existing No Parking restriction from 7 AM to 4 PM could remain, noting that it would be in effect during and after the school's drop-off procedure.

**Ms. Vicek** inquired about the Prairie area on the map and whether it was a parking lot, wherein **Mr. Fera** indicated that it was on the street. Asked if there would be a crossing guard there, he stated there was a crossing guard currently. **Mr. Wrobel** suggested placing cones at the designated drop-off area to alert drivers of the area, wherein **Mr. Fera** stated it was a good low-cost idea that would be looked at, as it delineated where drivers had to be and would slow them down. However, he noted the “drop-off” signage would be also placed in the designated area.

As a general comment regarding process, **Mr. Cronin** suggested that in the future staff bring such items to the commissioners’ attention sooner since half the school year was going to be over by the time the action was implemented; staff concurred.

The public was invited to speak. No comments followed. A motion was entertained.

**MS. VLCEK MADE A MOTION THAT THE PARKING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL REGARDING THE PROPOSED DROP-OFF ZONE ON THE NORTH SIDE OF PRAIRIE AVENUE, WEST OF DOUGLAS AVENUE, AS PRESENTED.**

**SECONDED BY MR. WROBEL.**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 6-0.**

**3. File # 21-12 Lester School One-Way Change to PM School House.** **Mr. Fera** reported that School District 58 changed all school hours and the current Village’s posted signage for the PM hours did not match. Staff was seeking to extend the PM hours on its signage and the school district was agreeable to the solution. **Mr. Fera** added that the Village Manager did address this matter immediately in order not to delay the matter.

The public was invited to speak. No comments followed. A motion was entertained.

**MR. SARICKS MADE A MOTION THAT THE TRAFFIC AND PARKING COMMISSION FORWARD A POSTIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL APPROVING THE LESTER SCHOOL PARKING AND OPERATION PM HOURS, AS PRESENTED.**

**MR. CRONIN SECONED THE MOTION.**

**MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 6-0.**

**4. File # 22-12 Avery Coonley School - Turn Restrictions off of Maple Avenue.** **Mr. Fera** addressed the growth of the area in general and called attention to the area’s increased traffic over the years. Recently, staff received a letter from Avery Coonley School asking the Village to make some changes to provide better safety for the pedestrians. As a result, **Mr. Fera** explained that both the school and the Village wanted drivers’ patterns to change.

To his point, **Mr. Fera** explained that he and the school leaders wanted drivers to enter the school from the east side of Maple Avenue, make a right turn into the school site to their parking space and drop off. When the drivers left the school, they would turn right out (only) and not turn left across the Maple Avenue traffic. While he believed was an inconvenience for parents and drivers coming from the west, it was for safety purposes and was it was proactive in the short-term. He referenced the exhibit in staff’s packet. However, **Mr. Fera** pointed out that

come spring, the current wide driveway would have to be re-striped to better delineate an exiting right-turn lane.

**Mr. Wrobel** explained that he frequents the area and said two complex issues existed: first, the queue allowing the vehicles to make their right turns into the property, and second, the queue of cars coming northeast on Maple Avenue. In addition, there were the cars in normal traffic trying to make a right turn and those making a left turn into the school. He indicated that he also has seen right-in/right-out curbs which physically do not allow left turns and which could be used in the future. Lastly, **Mr. Wrobel** suggested offering a “side holding area” for the school property to allow room for those drivers who queue up, since there is no shoulder.

**Mr. Saricks** summarized that it was a matter of a mindset change for those who travel to the school and that the entrance drive to the school actually “begins” at Carpenter and Maple and, from that point, the street becomes a one-way access into the school, around it, and out of it.

Clarification followed on how the signage would be posted for Areas A (facing west) and B (facing south). **Police Parking Supervisor Sembach** stated he spoke to the traffic sergeant regarding staff’s proposed signage, and believed it would be fine. **Mr. Saricks** also confirmed with staff the sign placement on the west side of Maple Avenue and sight lines were fine, to which **Mr. Fera** believed the locations of the signs were a good start to see what other improvements, if any, would have to be made.

The public was invited to speak. No comments received. A motion was entertained.

**MS. VLCEK MADE A MOTION THAT THE TRANSPORTATION & PARKING COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL APPROVING THE PROPOSED TURN RESTRICTIONS ON MAPLE AVENUE FOR VEHICLES ENTERING AVERY COONLEY SCHOOL TO BE “NO LEFT TURN 8:00 AM TO 9:00 A.M. AND FROM 3:00 P.M TO 5:00 PM, AND ALSO FOR VEHICLES EXITING THE AVERY COONLEY SCHOOL DRIVEWAY TO BE “RIGHT TURN ONLY 8:00 A.M. TO 9:00 A.M. AND 3:00 PM TO 5:00 PM”, AS PRESENTED.**

**MR. CRONIN SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 6-0.**

**1. File #19-12 Bike/Ped Update Plan – Draft Recommendations.** **Mr. Fera** introduced consultants **Ms. Stacy Meekins** and **Ian Preston** with Sam Schwartz Engineering. He summarized that staff did review the recommendations and had some comments which were incorporated into the material being presented. The material was now up for commissioner comments with refinements to follow and hopefully finalization during December 2012.

**Chairman Pro tem Schiller** mentioned that when he did review the material, he was surprised to find that there were a number of items that would normally come before the commission as individual items. He confirmed with **Mr. Fera** that if the commission recommends this draft that the recommendations made in the report would still come before the commissioners with participation by the property owners, etc, that are affected by the recommendations, to which **Mr. Fera** confirmed yes but clarified some items may cost more or have certain timelines, etc. but that they would come before this commission. The plan would also go before the Steering Committee for review as well.

**Ms. Meekins** walked through her PowerPoint presentation and asked the commissioners to feel free to walk around the room to view the map boards and make comments.

She brought the commissioners up to speed on the Bike/Pedestrian plan, recalling that existing conditions were taken into consideration, primarily focusing on ADA accessibility and how information was gathered for the Existing Conditions Report. A Pedestrian Infrastructure Report was put together for the downtown area, along with the draft recommendations being presented today. **Ms. Meekins** pointed out that the draft recommendations were different from the final plan which would include costs and implementation steps.

A survey was taken from 400 individuals on the positives and negatives of the current pedestrian/biking conditions in the Village and key destinations which fed into the goals and recommendations. Details followed on the goals for that portion, followed by the seven Bicycle Network recommendations. Commissioner questions followed on the design competition, removing abandoned bicycles, and the implementation of the covered bicycle racks, also noting that cyclists could use the public parking garage for long-term parking.

**Ms. Meekins** said that one consistent comment received from the public was that the current signed Bike Route streets do not make them comfortable bike routes. **Ms. Meekins** mentioned a number of phases would take place: Phase 1 encompassed enhancing the current bike routes with on-street pavement markings and adding some connections and off-street routes to improve the overall connectivity of the bike network. Phase 2 would cover further improved connectivity by marking the longer routes and working with the county on some engineering analysis. Speaking on the recommendations for Fairview Ave., **Mr. Wrobel** pointed out that other communities have used large amounts of parkway area and expanded their sidewalks to become bikeways/sidewalks and that Fairview Ave could be left as a three-lane street and incorporate the bikeway with the existing sidewalks. **Ms. Meekins** offered to review that idea but agreed with **Mr. Schiller** that the third center lane on Fairview Ave was usually used for left-turners and that it depended on the land use characteristics. In this case, Fairview Ave was not heavy commercial, but instead, was residential, and should not have much turning volumes. **Ms. Vleck** countered her comment, stating the street has become an arterial street. She suggested **Ms. Meekins** reviewing Fairview Ave again. She also appreciated the educational piece added in the plan.

**Ms. Loehman** also stated she did not understand why **Ms. Meekins** would want to remove a lane when there was a sidewalk, wherein **Ms. Meekins** stated that biking on a sidewalk was less safe than biking in the street and streets had to be designed to be safer for bikes, i.e., bike lanes. Examples followed.

In response to **Mr. Wrobel's** question regarding the Green Valley Bikeway and the Woodridge Trail network and those networks being counter to using streets, **Ms. Meekins** stated that many people do feel safer off the roadway and the issue was a "Catch 22". Examples followed but also the fact that the issue was visibility with cyclists and if given a separate lane on a street, the cyclists become more visible.

Continuing, **Ms. Meekins** reviewed Phase 3, which would cover connections, some coordinated engineering with the county and neighboring municipalities. Because it was not on the map, **Mr. Fera** inquired about the Burlington/Warren connection from the Village's downtown to Walnut Avenue and that it be added to the map. **Mr. Saricks** agreed and that consideration should be taken to connect the north and south areas of the Village, specifically to Gilbert Park, with either an overpass or underpass at the location. **Ms. Meekins** stated it should be on the map and will follow up. **Mr. Fera** added that staff also initiated dialogue with the Forest Preserve about the narrow bridge within Maple Grove near Gilbert Park. The existing gravel path is useable, but is very difficult to navigate once one got to the bridge over the creek.

Continuing, **Ms. Meekins** reviewed the Pedestrian Improvement recommendations which included general policy recommendations. Regarding the rectangular rapid flash beacon (RRFB) a question was raised regarding the testing done on it due to concerns about neuro-patients, which **Ms. Meekins** confirmed was done. Recommendations for specific intersections also followed, noting that many were located on Fairview Ave, to which **Mr. Fera** pointed out that 4 out of the 6 intersections were not Village-maintained intersections. Regarding 55<sup>th</sup> Street, **Mr. Fera** added that the DuPage DOT was currently studying the corridor between Dunham Road and the Village limits. The Village has provided some input already to certain intersections in that corridor, with more comments to it in the future.

**Ms. Meekins** then discussed the programmatic recommendations. A question followed on the latest trend in bicycles, wherein **Ms. Meekins** stated the move was more toward "city bikes" -- upright and utilitarian. Another question was whether the bike lanes were wide enough along the apron of the road -- given the training cyclists -- wherein **Ms. Meekins** explained the lanes were designed to have more space than is physically needed to ride a bike. Asked if **Ms. Meekins** was seeing more incumbents in older demographic communities, she indicated she had not heard it was a trend, but it was possible. **Mr. Fera** also brought attention to the fact that there are different types of bike riders, i.e., the weekend riders, the parent-with-child rider, and the athlete rider, and lanes had to be designed with all three in mind.

**Ms. Vlcek** appreciated the plan as it was very detailed and helpful. A motion was entertained.

**MR. SARICKS MADE A MOTION THAT THE TRAFFIC AND PARKING COMMISSION APPROVE THE BIKE/PEDESTRIAN REPORT AND TO FORWARD IT TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL AS PRESENTED.**

**MS. VLCEK SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 6-0.**

### **OLD BUSINESS**

**Mr. Fera** updated commissioners on the Belmont Road project and the new DuPage DOT – 55<sup>th</sup> Street road project; the Safe Routes to School project; and the Grove Street (brick paver) project. Per a question, **Mr. Fera** reported he met with North High School officials today and discussed the drop-off system. The surrounding streets and parking lots were working fine but the school was completing some work along Saratoga Avenue. Positive details followed. A concern was raised about the rude trucker drivers from Donegal Trucking pulling out onto Ogden Avenue, wherein **Mr. Fera** stated he was not aware of any complaints. He is considering placing some edge lines but no action was agreed to at this time. He and **Police Parking Supervisor Sembach** offered to look into the matter.

**COMMUNICATIONS** (See packet for any communications)

### **ADJOURN**

**MR. WROBEL MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:30 P.M.  
MS. LOEHMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 6-0.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Celeste Weilandt,  
Recording Secretary  
(as transcribed from MP3 digital recording)

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE  
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
NOVEMBER 28, 2012 MINUTES

**Call to Order**

Chairman White called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM.

**Roll Call**

**Present:** Mr. Domijan, Ms. Earl, Mr. Enochs, Ms. Majauskas, Mr. McCann,  
Ms. Souter, Chairman White

**Absent:** None

A quorum was established.

**Staff:** Jeff O'Brien

**Also Present:** Lee Eisenberg, Bill Kay Buick/GMC, 2300 Ogden Avenue, Downers Grove

**Minutes of October 24, 2012 meeting**

Ms. Earl noted that she submitted a change to staff for the October 24, 2012 minutes.

**Ms. Souter moved to approve the minutes of the October 2012 meeting as amended. Ms. Earl seconded the motion.**

**AYES:** Ms. Souter, Ms. Earl, Mr. McCann, Ms. Majauskas, Ch. White

**NAYS:** None

**ABSTAIN:** Mr. Domijan

**The motion carried 6-0-1.**

**Meeting Procedures**

Chairman White explained the function of the Zoning Board of Appeals, and reviewed the procedures to be followed during the public hearing, verifying with staff that all proper notices have been published with regard to case ZBA-10-12. He called upon anyone intending to speak before the Board on the agenda item to rise and be sworn in, as the public information portion of the meeting is an evidentiary hearing. Chairman White explained that members of the Zoning Board of Appeals all have had the opportunity to review the documents for the petition prior to the meeting. In order for a requested variation to be approved there must be four votes in favor of approval. Chairman White added that the Zoning Board of Appeals has authority to grant petitions without further action by the Village Council.

.....



**ZBA-10-12** A petition seeking a sign variation for a monument sign. The property is zoned B-3, General Services and Highway Business District. The property is located on the north side of Ogden Avenue approximately 365 feet west of Finley Road, commonly known as 2300 Ogden Avenue, Downers Grove, IL (PINs 08-01-402-003, -004, -005, 012, 013, -014); Bill Kay Buick GMC, Petitioner and Owner.

**Petitioner's Presentation**

Mr. Lee Eisenberg, Vice President and Executive Manager of the Bill Kay Auto Group explained that their petition requests a variation for placement of one of two allowed monument signs, bringing their nonconforming monument signs into conformity. The easternmost sign is 22 feet from the curb line of Ogden Avenue, which would require an additional 10-foot of setback making the placement of the sign 32 feet behind Ogden Avenue. It would cause a disruption to their visibility, and does not continue the illusion of the property being a whole. They have the largest frontage of any automobile dealer on Ogden Avenue. Given that two signs are allowed, the westernmost sign is inconsistent with the property line. Their frontage is more than 800 feet, and the allowable placement would be slightly over 100 feet from the western property line, leaving 700 feet to the east covered by one sign. This condition creates a disadvantage for visibility. If they place them equidistantly, the signs would be at 300 feet and 600 feet. That is their hardship.

Ms. Majauskas asked to see where the signs are now. Mr. Eisenberg explained that the property configuration has been renovated and changed. That renovation affects the way the facility lies along the 800-foot frontage, making the facility and property appear to be fragmented. He showed on an overhead how the building has changed in its size and placement. He pointed out the location of the existing sign and explained what the code requires. He explained that they are proposing a different placement of the western sign. Moving the sign 10 feet back would block out the building from eastbound traffic. They would like to keep the sign where it is presently located.

Mr. Domijan asked the current offset from the property line. Mr. Eisenberg said it is right on the property line.

**Staff's Report**

Mr. Jeff O'Brien, Planning Manager, explained the request before the Board. The property is on the north side of Ogden Avenue and is about 4.8 acres in size. The petitioner proposes moving the existing signage and replacing it with new signage. Mr. O'Brien displayed a slide of the proposed sign. There is a difference in the property line that jogs as it moves westerly and the petitioner said this property line makes sign placement inconsistent and limits visibility of the facility. He reminded the Board that the petitioner received variation and that variation expired in 2012. Mr. O'Brien explained that the code changed for larger properties in the B-3 zoning district. Sign area allowed is now 60 square feet. He noted that the petitioner is not proposing any changes to the existing wall signs on the building, and the two new monument signs at a total of 150 square feet of signage would meet the Village's sign requirements.

## **APPROVED 1/23/13**

Mr. O'Brien then noted that there are nine other properties along the Ogden Avenue Corridor that have an inconsistent setback from the roadway, which is considered a unique condition to the subject property. However, staff does not believe there are physical hardships associated with the property because the Petitioner can install two signs adjacent to Ogden Avenue providing signage that is visible to both eastbound and westbound traffic. Therefore staff does not recommend approval of the requested variation as noted on page 3 of staff's report dated November 28, 2012, as follows:

1. There is no physical hardship or practical difficulty associated with the property that warrants granting the request because the applicant has the ability to install a sign ten feet from the roadway on the west side of the property without a variation;
2. The ability to install two signs on the property can reduce or eliminate any concerns with visibility from Ogden Avenue;
3. The Petitioner has the ability to increase the size of the proposed monument signs from 40 square feet to 60 square feet for additional exposure on Ogden Avenue, and
4. If the requested variation was approved, it could be construed to be applicable to all commercial properties in the Village where physical hardship does not exist.

Ms. Majauskas asked whether there were separate PIN numbers attached to the parcels, and if so, how that affects the property. Mr. O'Brien responded that there are five separate PIN numbers, but that has no bearing on signage for the property.

Mr. McCann asked for clarification on the Sign Ordinance's amortization clause. Mr. O'Brien explained that the amortization was to be 2012 originally; however, the Council extended the deadline to May of 2014 for businesses to come into compliance. The applicant proposes changing the sign because they have rebranded their dealership. In further response to Mr. McCann, Mr. O'Brien said the existing sign is a legal conforming sign. The important issue here is the setback.

Mr. O'Brien noted further that the property line inconsistency is not unusual for the Ogden Avenue Corridor. As property was sold and developed, there were additional dedications and increased rights-of-way on Ogden Avenue. It is a condition seen throughout the Corridor.

Mr. Enochs quoted the written report regarding two signs for two corners. He said it seemed that the intent for two signs is to place one on each frontage. Mr. O'Brien replied that two frontages result in two signs provided they are 200 feet apart. Mr. Enochs then asked if the property did not have two frontages whether there would be allowance for the length of property to allow two signs. Mr. O'Brien said that is only the case for shopping centers if their frontage is greater than 500 feet. Mr. Enochs said that it would then be fair to say if they did not have two frontages, only one sign would be allowed. Mr. O'Brien said that is correct. He noted the code recognizes larger properties need additional signage as properties in the B-3 district with more than 260 feet of frontage and 2.5 acres can have taller and larger signs.

Mr. McCann referred a question to staff regarding page 4, item (9) of staff's report, and Mr. O'Brien explained that the Zoning Board of Appeals has granted other setback variations to

## **APPROVED 1/23/13**

businesses along the Corridor with unusual property lines or configurations. They were granted based on the individual configuration of the properties involved, including issues such as elevation. He reviewed other situations on Ogden Avenue that received variations.

Ms. Souter asked Mr. O'Brien about properties with irregular property lines. Mr. O'Brien said that the Nissan dealership has a significant jog on the west side of their property, similar to Merlin. He also mentioned other locations with jogs to the property line, such as the Steak 'n' Shake, a vacant property in the 600-block on Ogden, as well as the Bill Kay Nissan Store, Bill Kay GM store and the Gerber Auto Body that have significant frontage and significant size.

There being no further questions from the Board, Chairman White called upon Mr. Eisenberg to make further comments.

Mr. Eisenberg distributed some photographic items to the Board showing the general conditions on the property. He said he did not have to apologize for the ability to have two signs. When he did the Nissan property in 2005 there was a similar situation allowing him two signs. He pointed out that the ability to have two signs is that signs are messaging agents with different messages. The westernmost sign states that they are a Buick and GMC truck dealer. The second sign will give the message that they sell pre-owned and certified pre-owned GM vehicles with two separate businesses. The 800 feet of frontage tends to give the impression that the property is fragmented. Coming from the west it appears to be more than one property. Coming from the east someone could pass up the pre-owned section before they see the other sign. On the west end there is also a new car storage area with no identification. If the pre-owned sign were 32 feet off Ogden Avenue it would be difficult to see.

Mr. Eisenberg said auto dealerships display vehicles. They display vehicles as close to the road as possible as that is crucial to their business. If they had to put the vehicles in front of the sign it significantly inhibits the visibility of the sign. He showed a photograph that depicted the dilemma they have. He noted that the Max Madsen photo shows two monument signs along Ogden Avenue at a lesser setback, and he believes that Bill Kay should be allowed to be competitive and allowed to promote the product they are selling in the location that they are selling it. The operation of an automobile dealership is different than most businesses, and visibility is key to letting people know the products they sell. That necessitates the request for this variation.

Ms. Earl asked when the sign ordinance was changed for larger properties. Mr. O'Brien said it was 2009 or 2010.

There being no further comments or questions, Chairman White closed the opportunity for further public comment.

## **Board's Deliberation**

Chairman White called for comments from the Board.

Ms. Earl said this was just reviewed in 2010. She was at the Council meeting when they exhaustively discussed the need for these properties to have taller and wider signs. She does not see anything too special about this, as they were discussed by Council.

## **APPROVED 1/23/13**

Ms. Majauskas said this request is in relation to the distance from Ogden Avenue and not the sign. Ms. Earl replied that the distance from Ogden Avenue does not make a difference.

Ms. Majauskas said she thinks this falls in the same line as Max Madsen. The signs are in the middle of the parking lot and it does not make sense.

Ms. Earl responded that they do not have to be placed in the middle of the parking lot. She was at the site earlier in the day and does not see the hardship. She was present when the Board discussed the Max Madsen sign, and it was necessary because of the existing berm. There is no berm on this site.

Ms. Majauskas said if the sign were placed anywhere other than where the petitioner wants to put it, it would be in the parking lot.

Ms. Earl responded in other cases they were 50-foot and 60-foot lots with no place else to put the signage. This site has 800 feet of frontage.

Mr. McCann said the problem is the inconsistent property line. There are means of addressing the problem that are beyond the scope of this Board. He tends to have property owners do what needs to be done for their property. However, the Village's Ordinance has to be followed. He thinks every time they grant a variation they have to ask whether they are re-writing the Ordinance, which is not the authority of this Board.

Chairman White said he has a hard time thinking the Village Council was not aware of the jog in the property lines. If the Council wanted to make exceptions or allow for the fact of the roadway curve, it would have done so. He does not see an exception to the Ordinance.

Ms. Majauskas said that she thinks the Board has already set a precedent for other cases. What has to be determined is whether this makes sense. Ms. Earl replied that they are still entitled to the directional sign, which Mr. O'Brien said was correct.

Mr. Enochs said he thinks aesthetics matter. From a common sense perspective it does not make sense to have two signs that are in different places, which could affect the reasonable returns and all the standards for granting a variation. He would be in favor of granting the variation. It makes sense to do as the Petitioner requests, as it affects the visibility of eastbound traffic.

Mr. Domijan said they have a lot of frontage with 500 feet or more that can be used. There could be specific reasons in other cases. Mr. Enochs noted that they are allowed two signs because there are two sides to the property.

Mr. Domijan said they cannot stand on aesthetics if they look to future cases. He would tend to think the sign could be positioned within the Ordinance that could mitigate his current concerns. An exhaustive study was conducted on the Ordinance and no change was made based on the property line inconsistency.

Ms. Majauskas said the Board's duty is to put everyone in the same position. By saying "no" to Bill Kay the Board is making them put the sign on the lot in a location that makes no sense. She

**APPROVED 1/23/13**

does not understand why the Village would allow them to move it in 10 feet and thereby not let traffic identify the location.

Chairman White said it is not the Board’s job to re-write the Ordinance. He would not be opposed to granting the variation.

Mr. Enoch said he was not suggesting re-writing the Ordinance, but his argument is based on the unique circumstances which meet the standards for granting the variation.

Ms. Souter said that it is impossible to re-write an Ordinance and draft every issue that might arise. They can’t know what a property owner may want to do in the future. The Board is there to evaluate the request and see whether it can fit within the framework of the Ordinance.

Ms. Earl said it is not difficult to know where the dealership starts and stops. At night the lights are there and then the lights stop. People know exactly where the dealership is based on the lighting as well.

**Mr. Enochs made a motion that in case ZBA-10-12, the Board grant the variation as requested with the following conditions:**

- 1. The proposed monument sign shall substantially conform to the sign drawings attached to this report except as such drawings may be changed to conform to Village codes, ordinances, and policies.**
- 2. The existing two free-standing signs along Ogden Avenue must be removed and no new monument signs are permitted along Warrenville Road.**

**Ms. Majauskas seconded the motion.**

**Roll Call vote noted the following:**

**AYES: Mr. Enochs, Ms. Majauskas, Ms. Souter**  
**NAYS: Mr. Domijan, Ms. Earl, Mr. McCann, Ch. White**

**The Motion fails with a vote of 3-4, and the Petitioner’s request for a variation is denied.**

.....

Mr. O’Brien said there are no items for the December meeting and an official cancellation notice will be sent out next week. He will also send the meeting schedule for 2013 to the Board members. He wished everyone a happy holiday.

Upon voice vote, Chairman White adjourned the meeting at 8:27 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Tonie Harrington  
Recording Secretary