

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
VILLAGE HALL - COMMITTEE ROOM
801 BURLINGTON AVENUE

March 15, 2012, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Matthies called the March 15, 2012 meeting of the Architectural Design Review Board to order at 7:05 p.m. and asked for a roll call:

PRESENT: Chairman Matthies, Mrs. Acks, Mr. Casey, Mr. Davenport, Mrs. Falco,
Mr. Pappalardo

ABSENT: Mr. Russ

STAFF: Mr. Jeff O'Brien, Planning Manager

VISITORS: Gordon Goodman, 5834 Middaugh Ave

REMARKS FROM THE CHAIR

Chairman Matthies welcomed everyone back and noted there would be more meetings with the upcoming survey project. He noted had no comments regarding the minutes and asked if there were any changes for the minutes.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The draft minutes of the October 13, 2011 meeting were approved on motion by Mr. Davenport, seconded by Mr. Pappalardo. Motion carried by voice vote of 6-0.

OLD BUSINESS - None

NEW BUSINESS

Historic Building Survey

Chairman Matthies noted the Village was looking to create a new historic building survey. He asked Mr. O'Brien to provide some more information.

Mr. O'Brien explained one of the Village's High Priority Action Items for 2012 would be to begin a historic building survey program. He indicated the goal would be to hire a consultant to complete the survey by December 2012. Mr. O'Brien explained the timeline was set so that the Village could apply for a grant through the State's Certified Local Government (CLG) program. He indicated the grants would become available in October 2012.

Mr. O'Brien explained staff was requesting the ADRB 1) review the draft request for proposals (RFP) and scope of work; 2) confirm the survey areas identified by the Historic Preservation Plan; and 3) comment on volunteer opportunities. He noted several groups including School District 58 and Pierce Downer Heritage Alliance have approached the Village about helping the

Village with this project. He indicated District 58 students would be taking photographs of the areas in the spring. Mr. O'Brien walked through survey areas identified by the Historic Preservation Plan. He noted likely costs for surveying. Mr. O'Brien explained staff was requesting ADRB feedback on the scope of work and survey areas.

Mrs. Falco expressed concern that the estimated costs were too low. She asked if the surveyors would be inspecting the homes.

Mr. O'Brien explained the survey would not include full inspections. The process only involves a "dashboard" survey and photographing the buildings. He noted the surveyor would complete the survey form. He directed Board members to the sample surveys.

Mrs. Falco asked if they would be going to the properties.

Mr. O'Brien said surveyors would visit the neighborhoods, but the Village was hoping the volunteer photography would cut down on the amount of field time the consultant would need.

Mrs. Falco asked if the area around Randall Park and the northeast of Downtown around the Tivoli Theater.

Mr. O'Brien said the Historic Preservation Plan contemplates surveying all of the areas north of 63rd between Fairview and Belmont. He said that the Randall Park neighborhood could be included with a survey of Maple Avenue.

Mrs. Falco stated she thought going south of 55th Street was too far. She thought most of the historic homes would be north of 55th Street.

Mr. O'Brien said for the most part the historic homes are north of 55th Street, but there could be some more structures south of 55th Street that would be worthy of surveying.

Mr. Davenport suggested items 2 and 3 first and go back to discussing the scope of work. He thought items 2 and 3 would guide the preparation of the scope. He noted that he thought the Sears Homes were unique to Downers Grove and should be the top priority for a historic survey. He noted it would good to have a better understanding of the money that would be available from the State for a survey.

Mr. Casey stated that the Sears Homes were well documented. He thought the Village should prioritize areas that were not well documented. He noted Main Street as another area where the research was thorough.

Mr. Davenport noted the conditions of the Sears Homes might have changed since the last survey.

Chairman Matthies stated Glen Ellyn chose a specific geographic area to survey, but did not find as many historic structures as anticipated. He thought the Village could use volunteers to "pre-survey" neighborhoods to refine the scope and come up with a list of addresses for potential candidates.

The Board discussed ways to use volunteers to refine the survey area.

Mrs. Falco stated tax records could be pulled to verify age once there was a list.

Chairman Matthies said the target area was good, but there might be a way to refine the area.

Mrs. Acks asked for clarification on the difference between #3 and #3a in the table.

Mr. O'Brien explained staff separated the brick streets area from the rest of the E.H. Prince subdivision.

There was a discussion about the number of homes to be surveyed in the total E.H. Prince subdivision.

Mr. O'Brien noted using volunteers to "pre-survey" areas could help focus the survey, reduce fieldwork and reduce costs.

Chairman Matthies indicated the scope should set the consultant's expectations that volunteers would be used. The scope should also define what the volunteers would be providing to the Village.

There was more discussion about the number of homes to be surveyed in the total E.H. Prince subdivision.

Mr. Davenport stated that the survey could be used to identify historic districts. He noted that all catalog homes, including Sears Homes, should be identified. He asked if catalog homes could be identified as a historic district if they were not geographically contiguous.

Mr. O'Brien indicated it might be possible to have a non-contiguous historic district. He reminded the ADRB that historic designations require owner consent. The building survey would provide another form of outreach to the public. It was also a tool that could also be used by residents to identify and designate historic districts. He did not believe the survey would be used by the Village staff to start designating historic districts.

Mr. O'Brien added that the Village could ask the consultant to comment on non-contiguous historic districts.

Chairman Matthies stated the areas identified by the Historic Preservation Plan are still appropriate to survey. He indicated that staff should work with volunteer groups and identify what their roles should be.

Chairman Matthies asked for comments from the Board on the survey area and use of volunteers.

Mr. Pappalardo asked who the volunteers would be and asked if a consultant would be willing to work with them.

Chairman Matthies indicated the volunteers would be doing some of the preliminary fieldwork.

Mrs. Falco added that it is important to involve people in the process that know the town.

Mr. O'Brien indicated the consultant would have to agree to the use of volunteers. He indicated using volunteers would help the Village educate and involve the public. He stated one of the benefits of using volunteers might help keep costs low. He indicated having residents participate might provide some valuable information about certain properties.

Mrs. Acks asked about District 58's involvement.

Mr. O'Brien explained Puffer Elementary School wanted to participate in the Comprehensive Plan project. He stated their student government class put together a calendar in 2010 with some of the Village's landmarks. He went on to say District 58 contacted the Village in late 2011 to participate in this project. He indicated the students would be photographing buildings.

Mrs. Acks confirmed the volunteers would be doing this work as an extracurricular activity that would be supervised by adults.

Mr. O'Brien said there would be supervision.

There was discussion about the current Village lists for historic homes and Sears homes.

Mr. Casey suggested that the Village come up with guidelines for volunteers and test their work on a small portion of the survey area – a pilot project.

The Board discussed the importance of having guidelines for volunteers. The Board also indicated that it would be a good idea to have pilot area to test the guidelines and volunteer work. The Board discussed ideal locations for a pilot project.

Mr. O'Brien indicated the Village has a master list of all structures that have been identified as historic or potentially historic. He stated the list was part of the Historic Preservation Plan and this list could be used as well.

Mrs. Acks suggested Maple Avenue might be the easiest place to start given its size.

Mr. Davenport asked if the Village had an amount that could be expected from the State.

Mr. O'Brien said he did not know, but could find out how much could be expected. He noted the Village has money budgeted for a survey.

Mr. Davenport said the amount provided by the State might drive how the Village uses its volunteers.

Chairman Matthies asked what the final product would look like.

Mr. O'Brien said surveys typically contain a mix of text and photographs. He indicated there was usually a little history of the community provided in the document. He noted the most important part of the survey were the survey sheets. He went through the survey examples.

Chairman Matthies asked if there would be an opportunity to sit down with potential consultants to discuss their proposals.

Mr. O'Brien said staff would likely interview firms after reviewing their proposals.

Mr. Pappalardo asked if there were a lot of firms that performed building surveys.

Mr. O'Brien said there were a number of firms that produce building surveys.

The Board discussed the level of detail the consultant would provide.

Chairman Matthies asked if a consultant was even necessary.

Mr. O'Brien said a consultant would be necessary. He stated the surveys contain a determination of whether or not a building would be contributing or noncontributing to a historic district. It would also identify potential boundaries for a historic district. He explained these actions typically require an architectural historian or preservation specialist – expertise that staff does not have.

Mr. Davenport stated the survey should have more graphics and be more of a tool than a report. He stated the survey should focus on the survey sheets to try to generate more interest in historic preservation. He noted the narrative should be minimized as a reference or appendix because the Village has a historical narrative.

Mr. Casey indicated that getting information directly from residents and neighborhood groups might help generate more interest. He indicated Shady Lane Estates was one of the groups that might prove to be helpful.

Chairman Matthies asked about the format and end results of the survey.

Mr. O'Brien explained the Village would receive the survey sheets, but the most important element would be the recommendations for potential historic districts and determination of contributing and noncontributing structures.

Chairman Matthies asked if the Board needed to define the organization and lay out for the final survey.

Mr. O'Brien said the scope requires consultants to provide the Village with survey sheets, maps, determination of contributing/noncontributing and potential district boundaries.

Mr. Davenport pointed out the Village has maps with historic structure information already. He thought this type of information was useful because it communicates information quickly.

Chairman Matthies said the Village should provide direction to the consultant on the end product.

The Board discussed the example surveys and some their positives and negatives.

Mr. Davenport noted he really liked the experience with the Pattern Book. He stated the RFP's scope of work is missing how the consultant would interact with volunteers. He said it should clarify how volunteers would be used.

Chairman Matthies said developing guidelines for the volunteers and providing them to the consultant would be helpful in clarifying what volunteers would be doing and how they would interact with the consultant.

Mr. Casey said guidelines should be attached to the RFP.

The Board discussed potential volunteers and how the Village should reach out to these groups to participate in the survey.

Mr. Casey said using online mapping tools could be used to enhance the survey.

Mr. O'Brien explained that the Village has the information for known historic buildings in its mapping programs. He noted this information is in an interactive format on the Village's web page.

The Board discussed the importance of having online maps and interactive information for historic buildings.

Mr. O'Brien said staff would go back and add information about the consultant's interaction with the volunteers, prepare guidelines for volunteers and providing more information electronically.

Chairman Matthies stressed that the survey information should be provided in an interactive electronic format. He stated the Village should ask consultants about their experience and abilities to provide interactive information.

Mr. Davenport said that the Village should not have a static, boilerplate survey. He said the Village should have a tool that can be used for other applications.

Mr. Casey asked if the survey was from the TCD 3 process.

Mr. O'Brien explained why the Village was pursuing a historic building survey.

Chairman Matthies asked for public comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Dr. Gordon Goodman, 5834 Middaugh Avenue, asked who the seventh member of the Board was.

Mr. O'Brien said Jim Russ – who was not able to attend this evening's meeting.

Dr. Goodman said he was pleased the Village was pursuing the survey. He said the scope does a good job of laying out the minimum requirements for the survey, and was pleased about the ADRB's comments about enhancing the survey. He said the scope should provide options to the consultant for data gathering and explain how the community would be involved in providing some of this information. He said it sounded practical that the Village could provide some information up front. He was concerned about cost estimates. He hoped the Pierce Downer Heritage Alliance and community could help the effort.

Chairman Matthies asked for additional comments. There being none, he asked for a motion to adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT

MR. DAVENPORT MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. MR. CASEY SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:17 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

/s/ Jeff O'Brien
Jeff O'Brien, AICP
Planning Manager

**DOWNERS GROVE PUBLIC LIBRARY
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING
WEDNESDAY JULY 24, 2013, 7:30 P.M.
LIBRARY MEETING ROOM**

MINUTES

1. **Call to Order.** President Kathleen DiCola called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m.
2. **Roll Call.** Present: Trustee Susan Eblen, Trustee Wendee Greene, Trustee Daniel Loftus, President Kathleen DiCola. Absent: Trustee David Humphreys, Secretary Thomas Read.

Also Present: Library Director Rick Ashton, Assistant Director for Public Services Bonnie Reid, Assistant Director for Support Services Sue O'Brien, Information Technology Manager Dale Galiniak, Children's Services Manager Sara Pemberton, Product Architecture + Design Principals Tiffany Nash and Daniel Pohrte, Resident John Abbatacola, Chicago Tribune Reporter Dawn Rhodes, Village Council Commissioner David Olsen.

3. **Welcome to Visitors.** President DiCola welcomed the staff members and visitors and thanked them for their interest in the work of the Board.
4. **Approval of Minutes, Regular Monthly Meeting, June 26, 2013.** It was moved by Greene and seconded by Eblen THAT the Minutes of the Regular Monthly Meeting of April 24, 2013, be approved. Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Loftus, DiCola. Abstentions: None. Nays: None. Motion carried.

5. Approval of Payment of Invoices and Related Financial Reports

The Board reviewed the list of invoices submitted for payment and other financial reports. It was moved by Loftus and seconded by Greene TO APPROVE payment of Invoices of \$77,774.60, credit memos of \$404.41, budget journal entries of \$184.80, and to recognize June 2013 payrolls of \$184,737.47. Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Loftus, DiCola. Abstentions: None. Nays: None. Motion carried.

6. Opportunity for Public Comment on Agenda Items

None.

7. Opportunity for Public Comment on Matters Not on the Agenda.

Village Council Commissioner David Olsen introduced himself and mentioned that he is the liaison to the Board from the Village Council.

8. Unfinished Business

- a. Report from Product Architecture + Design regarding Design Development for Library Building Renovation, including materials samples.

Tiffany Nash and Dan Pohrte presented their work to date, as Design Development, building detailed work on the previously-developed layout of the building, progresses. As part of this process they presented samples of carpet colors and designs, other flooring materials, and other finish materials. They invited Board examination and comment.

Board members responded, with the following major points:

Loftus asked about the spacing of the stacks on the 2nd floor. Nash noted it is the same 3 feet between stacks as is in the current configuration.

Greene asked if the plan included space for community bulletin boards similar to what is in the lobby now. Ashton replied that staff will need to consider this.

Greene asked if the round tables in childrens and teens should be square to facilitate creating different workspace configurations. Nash agreed this should be done in teens but not in childrens, due to safety concerns.

DiCola did not like either light fixture shown. The propeller shape is repeated throughout the building and 12 feet long figures seem really big. Nash will try to get a fixture so the Board can see it; Ashton noted the size would correspond to 4 of the current ceiling lights.

DiCola did not like the white circulation desk, it doesn't look rich like everything else does. Nash and Pohrte will look for something with a wood grain in a richer color.

Greene asked if the material on the stairs will be quiet. Pohrte said it would be louder than carpet. The wood and artwork in the stairwell will stay the same.

DiCola told the architects that she thought that overall, the design work was a great job and very nice.

- b. Approval of Design Development and Authorization to Proceed to Construction Documents.

It was moved by Eblen and seconded by Greene THAT the Board approve Design Development and authorize the architects to proceed with Construction Documents.

Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Loftus, DiCola. Abstentions: None. Nays: None. Motion carried.

- c. Approval of Short List of Construction Management Firms to be interviewed.

Ashton presented the recommendation of staff and architects that the Board interview Featherstone, Inc., IHC Construction, and Shales McNutt Construction.

It was moved by Loftus and seconded by Eblen THAT the Board interview the three identified firms with a view to selecting one of them to serve as Construction Manager for the Library Renovation Project. Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Loftus, DiCola. Abstentions: None. Nays: None. Motion carried.

- d. Approval of Date of Special Meeting for Construction Management Firm interviews and selection of Construction Management Firm.

It was moved by Loftus and seconded by Greene THAT the Board hold a Special Meeting on Wednesday August 14 at 7:30 p.m. in the Library Meeting Room to interview Construction Management Firms and proceed with the selection process. Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Loftus, DiCola. Abstentions: None. Nays: None. Motion carried.

9. New Business

- a. Review of Resident Comment concerning Building Renovation Project. (attached)

The Board reviewed the written comment from Ms. Terri Williams and directed Ashton to prepare a written response for President DiCola's signature.

10. Report of the Director

Ashton summarized his written report (attached).

Articles from the Downers Grove Reporter on the renovation and the ILA Reporter on the library's school partnerships were handed out before the meeting and noted.

- a. Self-check machine use.
- b. Process for review and approval of 2014 Operating Budget.

The Board directed Ashton to canvass all Board members to determine an appropriate date for a special budget meeting in early September.

11. Board Member Comments and Requests for Information

None.

12. Adjournment

President DiCola adjourned the meeting at 8:49 p.m.

**DOWNERS GROVE PUBLIC LIBRARY
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
SPECIAL MEETING
WEDNESDAY AUGUST 14, 2013, 7:30 P.M.
LIBRARY MEETING ROOM**

MINUTES

1. **Call to Order.** President Kathleen DiCola called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.
2. **Roll Call.** Members Present: Trustee Susan Eblen, Trustee Wendee Greene, Trustee David Humphreys, Trustee Daniel Loftus, Trustee Thomas Read, President Kathleen DiCola. Also Present: Library Director Rick Ashton, Assistant Director for Support Services Sue O'Brien, Assistant Director for Public Services Bonnie Reid, Information Technology Manager Dale Galiniak, Executive Assistant Katelyn Vabalaitis, Village Council Liaison David Olsen, Product Architecture Principal Tiffany Nash.
3. **Welcome to Visitors.** President DiCola welcomed visitors and announced that the purpose of the meeting was to conduct interviews of three finalist Construction Management firms and to rank the firms in order for selection purposes.
4. **Interviews with Construction Management Firms for Library Renovation Project.** The Board conducted the interviews with representatives of the three firms as follows:
 - a. 7:30 p.m. IHC Construction
 - b. 8:00 p.m. Shales McNutt Construction
 - c. 8:30 p.m. Featherstone, Inc.
5. **Opportunity for Public Comment.** No comment was offered.
6. **Ranking of Firms.** Following extensive discussion, including consultation with Tiffany Nash of Product Architecture, the Board took the following action. Upon Motion of Humphreys, seconded by Greene, the Board ranked the firms:
 1. Shales McNutt Construction
 2. IHC Construction
 3. Featherstone, Inc.

Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, DiCola. Nays: Read. Abstentions: None.

Upon Motion of Loftus, seconded by Humphreys, the Board directed the Library staff to enter into contract negotiations with the top-ranked firm with the goal of bringing an agreed-upon contract forward for Board consideration on August 28, 2013. Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Nays: None. Abstentions: None.

7. **Board Member Comments and Requests for Information.** None.
8. **Adjournment.** President DiCola adjourned the meeting at 9:50 p.m.

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
Stormwater and Flood Plain Oversight Committee Meeting
June 13, 2013 7:00 p.m.

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

I. CALL to ORDER

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

II. Roll Call

Members Present: Mr. Crilly, Mr. Gorman, Mr. Ruyle, Mr. Scacco, Mr. Schoenberg, Chairman Eckmann (electronically)

Members Absent: Mr. Austin

Staff Present: Karen Daulton Lange – Stormwater Administrator
Dawn Didier – Staff Attorney

Public Present: Robert Silich, 330 8th St., Downers Grove; Philip Shaw, 5117 Brookbank, Downers Grove; Joseph Phillips, 840 Jay Dr., Downers Grove

Per code, Chairman Eckmann was allowed to attend the meeting electronically on motion by Mr. Scacco, seconded by Mr. Crilly. Motion carried by voice vote of 5-0.

III. APPROVAL of April 11 and May 9, 2013 MINUTES

The April 11, 2013 meeting minutes were approved on motion by Mr. Crilly, seconded by Mr. Ruyle. No changes. Motion carried by voice vote of 5-0-1(Eckmann abstains)

The May 9, 2013 meeting minutes were approved on motion by Mr. Eckmann, seconded by Mr. Schoenberg. No changes. Motion carried by voice vote of 6-0.

A change in the agenda followed:

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Robert Silich, 330 Main Street, Downers Grove, asked if these meetings were for the general public, to which staff indicated they were and the minutes were available on the Village's web site except for the two recently-approved minutes. Mr. Silich voiced concern about the regulations for the discharge of sump pumps in the Village and asked how they were arrived at, i.e., five feet from the property line, wherein Ms. Daulton Lange explained her understanding was that it was in the code and was traditionally how sump discharges had been enforced. She discussed how this issue was currently being addressed by the Village's Community Development Department and has asked the department to update their code due to many drainage issues existing between neighbors, due to the five feet distance.

Mr. Silalach proceeded to ask whether this “decision” took into consideration certain sump pumps that rotate their discharge within the five feet distance wherein Ms. Daulton Lange explained that it did not matter how the water was discharging, i.e., circular or not, and she had not seen such type of pump. She offered to speak to Code Enforcement if they came across such pump. Other commissioners commented that the code probably pertained to the discharge point and not where the water lands, and, if the water was causing an issue in the right-of-way, then it could cause another nuisance code.

Mr. Phillip Shaw, 5117 Brookbank, Downers Grove, attended the meeting to see what it was about, since he was affected by the April rains and he abuts St. Joseph’s Creek. He discussed the significant amount of water he saw and discussed the damage to his property but added that half his house is located in the flood plain. Mr. Shaw proceeded to explain how the creek changed from late 1970s to the early 1990s, believing it was due to the large homes which had sump pumps and large roofs.

Because he stated he owns his property to the center line of the creek he felt it was a property rights issue. He believed the creek was being used as a dumping ground for more water and the neighbors were being harmed. Further damage description followed with Mr. Shaw summarizing that the Village had basically built, over the years, a dam on Brookbank as high as a foot through the center of the flood plain. Whereas, before, the water used to flow on either side of the bridge. He asked the stormwater and street departments to consider returning Brookbank to its former height.

Ms. Karen Daulton Lange confirmed she met with Mr. Shaw and took his issues to the Assistant Director of Public Works/Engineering, Andy Sikich, but clarified that the bridge on Brookbank was considered a bridge by IDOT and it was scheduled for maintenance/ reconstruction in the next year or so. However, the entire area Mr. Shaw was referring to would be reviewed by the Village’s consultant prior to improvements being constructed, per Ms. Daulton Lange.

In closing Mr. Shaw stated that the Village had always been very good about keeping the debris removed when an impending rain storm was looming.

Chairman Pro tem Gorman indicated the timing was good for Mr. Shaw, as staff would be able to visit the site and follow up with him. Additionally, Chair Pro tem Gorman added that it will be interesting to find out what the consultants have to report, but explained to Mr. Shaw that this committee was not authorized to direct on-site work. Chairman Pro tem Gorman briefly explained what this committee discussed.

(The commission returned to its regular order of business.)

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Public Hearing – SWU Appeal – 840 Jay Drive.

Chairman Pro tem Gorman reviewed the protocol for the public hearing.

Appellant, Mr. Phillips, 840 Jay Drive, was sworn in by the court reporter.

Mr. Joe Phillips, 840 Jay Drive, Downers Grove, thanked the commissioners for reworking the agenda. Mr. Phillips discussed that the basis for his appeal was that the council moved from stormwater funded by property taxes to a process of ERU use through the stormwater utility, which he believed started on January 1, 2013. He stated a consultant was brought in for the process which was to determine what was a better way to allocate the stormwater costs on some basis, which was decided as "impervious area." He summarized that the consultant coordinates the impervious area into an ERU, which is calculated for commercial property. For residential properties a shared process is used.

Discussing his property, Mr. Phillips stated that none of his gutters went near the streets or the stormwater system and the gutters on the rear of his home went into the middle of his back yard and his yard backed up to a park. He was not feeding into the stormwater system and he felt he should not be paying for anything since he does not use any part of the system. He stated his driveway flowed into the stormwater system.

He believed the entire ERU process excluded the streets and sidewalks from the calculation and, from the last he saw of a storm, a lot of the water that entered the stormwater system came from the streets -- about 50% as he calculated -- which had been excluded. He stated the Village excluded all of its city property, which he believed miscalculated the impact of the system to date. He understood he had to pay some portion of it, but stated he was a Tier 1 and not a Tier 2 because the back of his home was not part of the stormwater system and he was being billed for something that he was not using.

No questions followed from Village staff.

Village Stormwater Administrator, Ms. Daulton Lange, responded that the stormwater utility considers the street system as part of the stormwater system since curbs, gutters and ditches flow into the storm sewer system. Roads and sidewalks were excluded because of that. She said the Village pays a stormwater utility fee on all of its properties and all parcels, excluding right-of-way. Ms. Daulton Lange explained that the stormwater utility defines impervious area as the fee basis, whereas in the past, it was based on a home's property value, which had no bearing on the impact to the stormwater system. She stated impervious area is recognized as a more direct correlation to runoff than property values, but it does not take into account the variances in impermeability. Examples followed.

For the record, Mr. Phillips stated his property was there before the park property.

Because the stormwater utility is based on impervious coverage and impervious coverage was what it was, and not where it drained, Ms. Daulton Lange felt the Village's position should be upheld.

In response, Mr. Phillips asked what was the basis for impervious and why was it chosen, wherein Ms. Daulton Lange responded that impervious areas were chosen because of their direct correlation to the impact on the stormwater system than property value.

Mr. Phillips interjected stating that his understanding of this process was that an individual was billed for their use of the utilities' assets and that impervious had nothing to do with whether he had a house on it or not, and that does not cause cost to the stormwater utility.

Ms. Daulton Lange agreed with Chairman Pro tem Gorman that the matter was a policy issue and the use of impervious coverage was a more direct correlation. Followed was an example of Mr. Phillips using the Village's roadway system, noting he may use just a portion of the roadways owned and maintained by the Village, but instead, he pays a portion of his taxes for the entire system. Likewise, Ms. Daulton Lange said the stormwater utility includes an entire system which includes operations, maintenance, and improvements. And, impervious coverage was an equitable way to administer a stormwater utility because it was easily quantifiable and could be implemented on a Village-wide basis. Examples followed.

Mr. Phillips asked why there are not stormwater credits available for homeowners, wherein Ms. Karen Daulton explained the incentive program. Mr. Phillips confirmed his understanding of the Village's incentive program.

Chairman Pro tem Gorman responded by stating his understanding was that Mr. Phillips wanted clarification on the impervious coverage and that he believed he should be in Tier 1.

Comments from the commission included clarification that Mr. Phillips was not disputing the calculation of impervious on his site, but instead, was disputing where the water was going, to which Mr. Phillips concurred. Mr. Phillips believed his walkway was not impervious because the water could enter. Per a commissioner's question, Mr. Phillips explained how his rear gutters discharged in the middle of his backyard through a brick wall of the patio deck through a corrugated pipe and fell into the middle of his yard. Mr. Phillips produced photographs of his backyard. Mr. Phillips then surmised that the water from that pipe was absorbed into the property. Asked if Mr. Phillips had water running off his property during last month's rain storm, Mr. Phillips stated he "would have no way of knowing."

Mr. Ruyle, who visited the site, noted that there was a swale between the property lines on Jay Drive and the park itself. The pitch appeared to be coming from the east and the west of the paved pathway. Details followed on the exact location of a storm sewer grate in the park. This same commissioner assessed how the water would flow in a flood situation. The grate was pointed out for Mr. Phillip.

Mr. Phillips, stated his water did not travel the route described because there was an incline there and he had walked it. He disagreed with Mr. Ruyle.

Mr. Eckmann suggested that Mr. Phillips keep in mind that the Village had to stay within the ordinance. He pointed out that if nothing existed on Mr. Phillips' property, there still would be run-off, with an impact. In regards to the stormwater system being referred to, the only thing excluded was a direct discharge, which if Mr. Phillips' water was conveyed outside and downstream of the Village's stormwater system, that was outside the Village, but he was located inside the Village.

Mr. Phillips, responding to the comment that all land has an impact, said his understanding when looking at the tier system that has been impacted, Tier 1 is a range from 1 to 2,500 square feet and that if he translated that to zero, then an owner would not be assessed a stormwater fee. Dialog followed that vacant parcels were defined as 0.3 ERU. Secondly, while Mr. Phillips said he appreciated Mr. Ruyle visiting the property, he did not think his discharge traveled anywhere near the stormwater drain referenced because he believed it was where the discharge was occurring and it was being absorbed into the air. He stated it was "an uphill process there" and the water sat at the back of the yard and went into the ground water system.

Third, he fundamentally agreed that he should pay a portion of the bill and he would pay his Tier 1 portion, but he believed the Village was unfairly impacting him and was not giving him a reason, from a policy perspective, and was not giving anyone an incentive to do what the Village was asking people to do. Lastly, he appreciated the statement that all of the streets were part of the stormwater system but he would have liked to think that the square footage was not being allocated fairly across the process.

Ms. Daulton Lange closed by reiterating that the way the stormwater utility was set up in the Village's ordinance was that the fee structure chosen be based on impervious area of a parcel (as defined in the code) and the ERU. Where the water drains or whether it is absorbed into the ground was not part of the tier system and other mechanisms existed to acknowledge that -- the credit and incentive programs.

The committee proceeded to deliberate: Mr. Scacco stated that the committee's hands were basically tied in terms of what it could and could not do and the ordinance was drafted in a way that did not include input from this committee. While the impervious area of the lot was not in dispute -- give or take a couple hundred square feet -- Mr. Scacco said it would not adjust the tier as calculated. And the committee could only go on that information since that was how the ordinance was written. Since there was no dispute regarding the amount of impervious area, Mr. Scacco did not see how the denial of the request could be upheld. Others concurred. Mr. Crilly believed the ordinance was written in such a way that it could be enforced and equitably distributed across the entire Village, and the fact that small technicalities would probably not have any large impact anyway -- too many variables existed. He agreed with Mr. Scacco.

Mr. Schoenberg believed that the stormwater utility intends to include the entire impervious area of every block and the purpose of the utility and the definition of impervious was very clear. He believed if one looked at the direct discharge credit under the utility fee credit for those areas that directly drained into other Villages, it strongly implied that anyone residing in the interior of the Village would have his entire

lot counted. He explained how he envisioned this happening and did not support the appeal.

Chairman Pro tem Gorman, however, added that stormwater utilities have been through the court system and have been upheld as a legal fee based on total impervious area and ERUs being one way of calculating that. He did not see grounds to reduce the impervious coverage and move the subject property into a lower tier.

Mr. Scacco made a motion to deny the appeal and uphold the decision of the Village manager, seconded by Mr. Eckmann. Roll call: Aye: Mr. Scacco, Mr. Eckmann, Mr. Gorman, Mr. Ruyle, Mr. Crilly, Mr. Schoenberg. Nay: None. Motion carried. Vote: 6-0.

Ms. Didier explained the next steps to Mr. Phillips, stating he had a right to appeal the decision with the Circuit Court of DuPage County.

The public hearing was declared closed on motion Mr. Eckmann, seconded by Mr. Scacco. Motion carried unanimously. Vote: 6-0

V. STAFF REPORT

Ms. Daulton Lange reminded members that she was going to provide a report at the end of June discussing the April flood events. In July she intends to hold public meetings with the residents as to where improvements are needed and to coordinate it with next year's budget.

VII. OLD BUSINESS

Ms. Daulton Lange provided highlights from a recent Village meeting which included discussions with residents along Grand and Hill and the Fairview area about improving the operations of a certain grate. It was an area of study. Details followed.

VIII. ADJOURN

Mr. Scacco made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:17 p.m., seconded by Mr. Crilly. Motion carried by voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,

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

APPROVED August 14, 2013

**TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION
Minutes**

June 19, 2013, 7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers - Village Hall
801 Burlington Avenue, Downers Grove

Chairman Pro tem Schiller called to order the June 19, 2013 meeting of the Transportation and Parking Commission at 7:00 p.m. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited by all in attendance.

Roll call followed and a quorum was established.

ROLL CALL:

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

Absent: Chairman Stuebner and Commissioner Cronin

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

Others Present: Roger Bauman, 4500 Prince St., Downers Grove; Ms. Connie Sprovieri 1525 Brook Dr, Downers Grove; Linda and Dennis Shives, 1234 Chicago, Downers Grove; Ruth and John Wander, 4714 Oakwood, Downers Grove; Cheryl Gesior, 4505 Linscott Ave., Downers Grove; B. and M. Andrews, 4641 Seeley Ave., Downers Grove; Phil Amoruso, 4835 Saratoga, Downers Grove; Dawn Kiesling, 4958 Forest Ave., Downers Grove; Brian Dietrich, 4832 Saratoga, Downers Grove; Justin Sait, 1436 Grant, Downers Grove; Lorie Pilster, School District 58, Downers Grove; Bruce Larson, MD, 4958 Forest Ave., Downers Grove; David Haugen, 4826 Forest Ave., Downers Grove; Sandy DiGilio, on Oakwood, Downers Grove; Barbara Thompson, on Oakwood, Downers Grove; Ben Kramer, 4908 Middaugh, Downers Grove; Jamie Calhoun, 4717 Linscott, Downers Grove; William Lockett, 4712 Montgomery, Downers Grove; Alex Miller, 4612 Middaugh, Downers Grove

A review of the meeting's protocol followed, with the chairman noting the meeting was being recorded on village-owned equipment.

A change in the agenda followed.

APPROVAL OF APRIL 10, 2013 MINUTES

MR. WROBEL MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS PRESENTED;
SECONDED BY MR. SARICKS. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 5-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT (non-agenda items) - None.

File # 02-13 – Traffic Study Area #2 – Detailed Parking Restrictions

Traffic Manager, **Dorin Fera**, announced that this meeting was moved back one week due to staff vacation and that the letter of invitation sent to the residents included a link to the packet for tonight's meeting.

Mr. Fera recalled that in April 2013 this study area was presented as a more in-depth study and most recommendations made at that meeting were approved by this commission, including the parking. However, staff felt that due to its broad range, a block by block focus under three separate areas, was in order. Those areas included a school zone, a downtown effect zone, and a left-over neighborhood zone. A more detailed description followed.

Another item that would be discussed, but would not be revised, would include the village's overnight parking restriction. **Mr. Fera** reminded the public that tonight's discussion would not be final but would include public input, with a follow-up meeting in the future, to discuss those streets that have difficult circumstances. He referenced the many-received email comments and voicemails from the residents already which would be take into consideration.

Mr. Fera asked for a show of hands of those residents residing in the three various zones, which he noted were about evenly distributed. He discussed the involvement of this commission and the many reviews it had over the years regarding the proposed parking changes at Downers Grove North High, Pierce Downer and Herrick Schools and clarified that he did not want to make changes to those schools where the parking appeared to be working, but that monitoring of those areas would continue.

Mentioning the street of Saratoga Ave, near Ogden Ave, **Mr. Fera** explained the street was unique in that it carried more traffic on it from Prairie Ave to Ogden Ave due to the signal control. His goal was to leave the parking restrictions on Saratoga Ave the same. Regarding Warren Ave from Forest Ave to Belmont Ave, he was not proposing to address it at this time because it had different roadway and parking features and also different uses and, therefore, would be addressed under a separate study. The Downers Grove North High School area would also be under separate study to address the bus issues and weekend operations. In general, he reminded everyone that the last recommendation by this commission was to reduce the number of parking restrictions, make them more uniform, and more reasonably enforceable.

Chairman Pro tem Schiller invited residents from the Neighborhood Zone to speak.

Mr. B.J. Andrews, who resides at the corner of Seeley Ave and Chicago Ave, preferred that the parking restrictions return to the way they were when in he moved into his home during 1981, i.e., no restriction on the north or south side of Chicago Avenue.

Mr. William Lockett, 4712 Montgomery Ave, stated that the proposed restrictions between Prairie Ave and Chicago Ave (7AM to 9AM) on Montgomery were installed via a petition, due to the high school students parking there and the restrictions were working well and should not be changed.

Mr. John Wander, 4714 Oakwood Ave, also favored the current restriction on Montgomery because it was working. However, he voiced concern about Chicago Avenue, west of Oakwood, and does not want to allow parking on both sides of the street since it was a busy street and was near the elementary school. Also, there was no crossing guard there.

Chairman Pro tem Schiller asked **Mr. Fera** to follow up on the above two and provide a summary at the next meeting as to what action may be taken.

Ms. Marilyn Andrews stated her house faces Chicago Ave at Seeley Ave. She asked that the parking on the north side of the street be restricted from Monday through Friday to free up both sides of the street for the weekends.

Mr. Fera also stated that he spoke with Downers Grove North High School staff regarding how to apply the parking restrictions once school was out but cautioned that not everyone knew what the school days were. He hoped that with the new school parking lots now in use, less parking would occur on the neighborhood streets. However, he stated, there is an annual student parking cost associated with parking in the school lots.

A student from the high school confirmed spoke and confirmed there was a fee to park and that many students parked near her house or in her driveway because it was cheaper and they were willing to walk to school from her house.

Commissioner comments/questions followed: Had the school board considered making their parking fees more reasonable to the students or discount them if they ride-share; was there a reason why Lee Street (south of Ogden Ave.) was marked with no restrictions (due to nearby car dealership); has any one spoken to the school district to encourage students to use the buses.

Chairman Pro tem Schiller invited residents from the Downtown zone (4 hour restriction) to speak:

Ms. Sandy DiGilio resides on Oakwood between Warren and Prairie. She stated many of the homes have single-car driveways and due to people parking on the street, it makes it difficult for residents to back out of their driveway safely. She believed if the village lifted the parking restrictions, it would create more traffic difficulties on her block. Additionally, the village completed the rehab of the bricks on the street and she believed more traffic load would become an issue. She asked that the village consider who are the people using those parking spaces because they will be parked there the entire day.

Dr. Bruce Larson, Larsen Eye Center, located at the corner of Forest Ave and Warren Ave, stated he located his building at this corner due to the available street parking and stated that tonight there was not one car parked on the block. He stated that if he knew there were going to be restrictions on Warren he was not sure he would have purchased his lot. To date, he has purchased two permits for his employees and he believed the restrictions were causing more problems than solving them. He supported the village removing all of the restrictions along Warren but he did not know where his employees were supposed to park. As to the concern of commuter parkers taking over the spaces by his business, **Dr. Larson** stated the commuters never did before.

Ms. Barbara Thompson, lives on Oakwood Ave between Warren Ave and Prairie Ave. She was concerned about the removal of the restrictions because she also had a single-car driveway and needed some place to park her other cars. She believed if the restrictions were removed, commuters would use the spaces, so she favors keeping the parking restrictions as is.

Mr. Phil Amoruso, 4835 Saratoga Ave, stated the current two-hour restriction on his street works and should be kept. But he also mentioned that the village's building department "encouraged one-car driveways now" due to the square footage usage of property. He believed the four-hour restriction was "overkill." He believed enforcement for the current restriction was easier. Also, the festivals were the only time when his street was crowded. He asked that the village also redirect trucks off of his brick street.

Mr. Brian Dietrich, 4832 Saratoga Ave, supported keeping the existing 3-Hour restriction on his block. He stated he and his neighbors shuffle cars but the majority of the cars on the street are his neighbors. The parked cars also had a traffic calming effect on the street.

Mr. Phil Amoruso, 4835 Saratoga Ave, returning to the school zone discussion, stated that when he went to high school he had to pay \$10.00 for a parking permit and today, the kids could "well afford" \$187.00 for a parking permit.

Mr. Ben Kramer, 4908 Middaugh Ave, south of Franklin, stated that when Middaugh Ave was redone some years ago, the contractor made the street narrower than the rest of the streets in town and to park on both sides of the street would make it very restrictive. He also noted that the concerns of the residents and businesses could be solved by issuing resident and employee parking permits and it should not be a revenue-generating prospect for the residents.

Asked if Middaugh Ave had parking on both sides of the streets, would emergency vehicles be able to clear the street, **Mr. Fera** responded that this area of Middaugh, along with some other streets, is a gray area for parking characteristics and would need further review, and he offered to look at this issue since it was raised by other residents through email.

Mr. David Haugen, 4826 Forest Ave, between Prairie Ave and Franklin Ave on the south, stated the current parking restriction was either two or four hours and he believed it was a "left over" restriction from when there was an effort to maintain the residential character of the block. He asked whether the time of day restriction would remain or not, but it did not make a difference to him. On the topic of sight lines issues at the intersection of Forest and Prairie, he stated the trees and village signs were an issue due to the way a driver views them -- such as looking through a picket fence. He suggested clipping the smaller growths on a tree located on Prairie Avenue (on north side between Main and Forest). Also, a large hedge on a resident's property existed on that corner. **Mr. Haugen** voiced concerns as a pedestrian, traversing the three-way intersection at Franklin and Forest and, lastly, he did not like the term Downtown zone because it implied the business district where before the area was described as the "Near Train" zone. He suggested renaming it the "Near Town" zone or labeling the zones as "A, B, or C".

Chairman Pro tem Schiller invited residents from the School zone to speak.

Ms. Jamie Calhoun, 4717 Linscott Ave, stated there currently was a 7:00 AM to 1:00 PM parking restriction between Prairie and Chicago and she did not want students or commuters parking on the street, as she also had a one-car driveway. She would like her visitors to be able to park; however, she voiced concern about the proposed 8:00 AM to 11:00 AM restriction and suggested a different time change (10:00 AM to Noon) and less hours, yet reaching the same goal. She thought the three-hour restriction was "overkill." However, she stated that in reviewing the entire map, the four-hour restriction solved a lot of the issues being raised by the residents. She supported having a resident and/or guest parking permit system.

Mr. Dennis Schives, 1234 Chicago Ave (Middaugh and Chicago), supported the current four-hour restrictions but said the student parking would always be issue and the question was whether they "will" afford the \$187.00 fee or use it for something else. He believed it was best to leave the school out of the issue and that the village solve the issue by using parking restrictions in the neighborhood.

Mr. David Haugen, 4826 Forest Ave, mentioned he had a single-car driveway that widened at the street and offered it as a suggestion to the residents.

Mr. William Lockett, 4712 Montgomery Ave., has observed the school bus route in his neighborhood and believes the current restriction (7 AM to 9 AM) has worked well for the buses, and should be kept. He also has noted that afterwards the high school driving instructors bring the Drivers Ed students over to his area, since it is convenient for their driving training program.

Mr. Alex Miller, 4612 Middaugh Ave, supported the restrictions in his area to eliminate student parking since they were working. He agreed car shuffling was an issue and supported the comment that the residents should have the right to park on the street via a permit system of

some type. He also agreed the residents should be able to park on the street during the summer months. Lastly, he agreed to no parking on both sides of the street since Middaugh was a narrow street.

Due to the many comments received, **Chairman Pro tem Schiller** believed this matter should be tabled; others concurred.

MR. SARICKS MADE A MOTION TO TABLE THE CURRENT RECOMMENDATION UNTIL RESIDENTS' COMMENTS WERE REVIEWED MORE THOROUGHLY AND SUMMARIZED.

MR. WROBEL SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 5-0.

Mr. Fera asked for instructions on how to proceed for those streets receiving no comments. **Chairman Pro tem Schiller** explained that staff should take the time to study the issues more thoroughly rather than approving something and then having petitioners requesting to undue a restriction. **Mr. Fera** concurred, mentioning these comments were all part of a puzzle and that he did have to follow-up on the emails and various phone calls he received on this matter. **Chairman Pro tem Schiller** stated he favored the idea of a resident parking permit and asked **Mr. Fera** to follow up on what it would take to implement such a program.

File # 08-13 – Belmont Road/Finley Rd./Warrenville Rd. Turn Restrictions

Mr. Fera reported this request came to the village through the DuPage County Division of Transportation (DOT). He highlighted the area on the projector, explaining that the issue arises when vehicles coming from the west traveling to Finley Rd were making a right turn and then a quick left turn, which they were not permitted to do. Due to the county's extension of the median, however, the turn was now adjusted; however, the turn that was difficult was the one coming from Warrenville Rd and turning right onto the southbound lane and then moving to the left lane to go east on Ogden Ave.

Per **Mr. Fera**, the county asked staff to research this area with the understanding that the county would install appropriate signage and keep the cars from Warrenville coming straight south and travelling south on Belmont Rd only.

Commissioner concern was raised that this was only an interim solution. The question was raised as to why not make it a mandatory right turn onto Cross St. for any traffic that needed to proceed east on Ogden Ave and make Warrenville Rd westbound only between Finley Rd and Cross St. Another concern was whether Cross St could handle the additional traffic. **Mr. Fera** indicated that Cross St was managed by the DuPage County DOT and if the increased traffic became an issue during the peak hour, the county would look at ways to mitigate that situation.

Mr. Wrobel asked if a traffic count was done on eastbound Warrenville Road and also commented that it would be a relatively small amount of people that would be encouraged to travel west in order to travel east. **Mr. Fera** did not have the traffic counts since this location is not Village-maintained, but was sure the DuPage County DOT office would have that information. He estimated there are about 25,000 vehicles on Finley Rd with another 35,000 vehicles on Ogden Ave traveling through the intersection but that not many vehicles were needed to disturb the flow of the movement. After reading a comment from the report regarding enforcement, **Chairman Pro tem Schiller** suggested installing the proposed signage in order for the police to enforce the area and see its results.

Mr. Saricks voiced concern about the proposed signage being the only signage for the area, wherein **Mr. Fera** explained that there was warning signage located prior to the intersection. Other examples of restrictive signage were discussed.

Ms. Marilyn Andrews, 4641 Seeley Ave., discussed her traveling route in this area and stated there should not be any exit to eastbound Ogden Ave from that intersection at any time because lane blockage occurs during rush hours as well as other hours. She stated the current signage was confusing.

Mr. Saricks believed to address the issue, to install signage both at Cross St and at Warrenville and Finley Roads to inform drivers there is no eastbound access to Ogden Ave unless one turns at Cross St. Further dialog followed that in addition to the comments made above, there was nothing stopping the village from installing additional signage for clarification, to which **Mr. Fera** indicated there was not; however, he explained that the Warrenville signage was the county's jurisdiction. He confirmed that the recommendations offered could be approved with some additional clarification and added that the county was looking to make minimal changes at this time, but that monitoring would be ongoing. Comments followed that the restrictions should include hours beyond rush hour.

MR. SARICKS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATION, AS PRESENTED, WITH THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONS:

INSTALL "EASTBOUND TO OGDEN AVENUE PROHIBITED 6:00 – 9:00 AM AND 3:00 – 6:00 PM" TURN RESTRICTION ON WARRENVILLE ROAD, WEST OF FINLEY ROAD.

INSTALL PROPER DIRECTIONAL SIGNAGE AT WARRENVILLE RD / CROSS STREET TO SUPPLEMENT THE FINLEY ROAD SIGNAGE.

SECONDED BY MR. WROBEL.

MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 5-0.

File # 09-13 – Brook Drive – Mid Block Pedestrian Crossing.

Mr. Fera located the area under discussion on the overhead map and explained that the company, Flavorchem, has properties on both sides of Brook Drive. Apparently, employees are constantly walking to and from both properties and Flavorchem has asked the village to review the area to make their employees safer when crossing four lanes of traffic. In response, **Mr. Fera** recommended installing a striped mid-block crossing, with signage, explaining that Flavorchem would assist with the cost of the treatments at the curb lines.

Commissioner questions included the speed on Brook Drive and the number of vehicles that travel it per day to which **Mr. Fera** estimated about 1000 vehicles per day travel the area in a 30 MPH speed zone.

Additional commissioner recommendations included the addition of a caution light and a speed bump. **Mr. Fera** indicated the caution light was more costly than just the signage but he stated he would rather monitor the situation to see whether the caution light would be necessary. As to the speed bump, he stated it was a village decision but that certain improvements were being planned to a nearby intersection, and there is a possibility to consider traffic calming measures in this area as well.

Ms. Connie Sprovieri, with Flavorchem, 1525 Brook Drive, Downers Grove, discussed the fact that her company purchased a number of properties in the area, the village installed some sidewalks along Finley (which are not connected), and that in addition to the employees, a number of other people from other businesses used the sidewalks for exercise and to walk to nearby stores. She agreed with the recommendations of a speed bump or flashing light, as mentioned above. **Ms. Sprovieri** further explained that the street had no lane lines and safety was an issue when crossing, especially since her company rented to other tenants who also used the sidewalks and wanted to cross the street. She hoped the village would complete the sidewalks also. Further, she pointed out that the 18-wheeler trucks were usually picking up speed at the location under discussion.

MR. WROBEL MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE AND DESIGNATE A NORTH-SOUTH "MID-BLOCK PEDESTRIAN CROSSING" LOCATION AT APPROXIMATELY 1525 BROOK DRIVE, WITH PROPER PAVEMENT MARKINGS AND SIGNAGE.

SECONDED BY MS. LOEHMAN.

MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 5-0.

File # 10-13 – Burlington Ave. – West of Main St – 15-Minute Parking Space.

Mr. Fera reported this petition came to him requesting one additional 15-minute parking space in the downtown area. Per a question, the 15 minutes allowed was enough time being provided. Asked if the commissioners would agree to posting the signage between certain hours, a question was asked if there were any complaints being received regarding the other 15 minute parking spaces, to which **Mr. Fera** stated there were not and the usage of those short-term parking locations is evidently working as designed. **Chairman Pro tem Schiller** suggested not making any hourly changes at this time. **Officer Sembach** stated that occasionally he would receive a complaint from a business regarding abuse of the 15 minutes.

MS. LOEHMAN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE AND INSTALL ONE (1) SHORT TERM (15-MINUTE) PARKING STALL ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF BURLINGTON AVENUE, WEST OF MAIN STREET, AS SHOWN ON EXHIBIT 1 IN STAFF'S MEMORANDUM.

MR. SARICKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 5-0.

OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Fera reminded everyone that the downtown Rotaryfest was going to be underway soon. Upcoming petitions and projects were briefly highlighted. Announced was the cancellation of the July meeting. **Mr. Fera** offered to tabulate the emails and phone messages regarding Traffic Study Area #2. Appointments were briefly commented upon. Per **Mr. Wrobel**, the bike and pedestrian plan was tabled at last night's Village Council meeting.

ADJOURN

MR. SARICKS MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:10 P.M. MS. VLCEK SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 5-0.

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

**VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
JULY 24, 2013 MINUTES**

Call to Order

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

Roll Call

Present: Mr. Domijan, Ms. Earl, Mr. McCann, Ms. Souter, Ch. White

Absent: Mr. Enochs, Ms. Majauskas

A quorum was established.

Chairman White explained that a majority of four Board members must vote to approve a variation.

**Staff: Stan Popovich, Senior Village Planner
Damir Latinovic, Village Planner**

**Also Present: Lauren Gullatte, 3945 Washington Street
Robert Smith, 3945 Washington St.
John Heye, P.O. Box 602, Downers Grove, IL
Rob Cynowa, A-1 Storage, 2701 Wisconsin Ave.**

Minutes of June 26, 2013 meeting

Ms. Earl clarified on page 4 line 22 she asked a question about the monument sign and not Ms Souter. Ms. Souter pointed out on page 6 line 22 that she recalls having some questions for the petitioner following the vote. Discussion followed. Mr. McCann said he only clarified the vote and what is expected from the petitioner prior to next ZBA meeting. Chairman White agreed and recommended the revision is not needed on that paragraph.

Ms. Earl moved to approve the minutes of the June 26, 2013 meeting as revised. Mr. Domijan seconded the Motion.

All in favor. The Motion passed.

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 Cases ZBA-03-13 and ZBA-04-13. He called upon anyone intending to speak before the Board on the Agenda items 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 petitions prior to the meeting. In order for a requested variation to be approved there must be a majority of four votes in favor of approval. Chairman White added that the Zoning Board of Appeals has authority to grant petitions without further recommendations being made to the

Village Council. He noted that Staff will make its presentation first, followed by comments by the Petitioner. If anyone in the audience wishes to speak either in favor of or in opposition to a petition, they will be able to do so following the Petitioner's presentation. When the public participation part of the meeting is closed, the Board will deliberate on the information provided and vote to either approve or deny the petition.

.....

ZBA 03-13 (Continued from 06/26/2013)

A petition seeking a front yard parking setback variation for an addition of four (4) parking spaces. The property is currently zoned M-1, Light Manufacturing. The property is located on the south side of Wisconsin Avenue approximately 270 feet east of Walnut Avenue, commonly known as 2701 Wisconsin Avenue, Downers Grove, IL (PIN 08-12-303-004, -006); Robert A. Cynowa, Petitioner & Owner.

Staff's Report

Mr. Damir Latinovic, AICP, Planner for the Village, provided a general review of the case before the Board, noting that the area is zoned M-1 Light Manufacturing and the property known as 2701 Wisconsin is located in the Ellsworth Industrial Park, east of Walnut Avenue. The property is home to the A-1 Storage facility and is improved with four one-story multi-unit self-storage buildings and one mixed-use building with office space on the lower level. It also includes a residence for the caretaker on the second level. The petitioner has also started a U-Haul Rental Truck business as part of the self-storage use. Mr. Latinovic said that the petitioner is requesting a zoning variation to expand the existing parking in the front where there are presently five parking spaces. The four additional spaces proposed by the petitioner would be located in-line with the existing parking spaces and would meet the required ten-foot side yard setback from the west property line. He noted that the petitioner already has the ability to add two parking spaces by-right, which meet the required 35-foot front yard setback; however, he is seeking a variation to add four spaces. It is the third and fourth parking spaces, which are the subject of the variation request before the Board.

Mr. Latinovic then described the layout of the property, stating that a total of 65 parking spaces were approved on the site, 58 of which are within the fenced-in area. Thirty-one of those spaces are generally for temporary use and are currently not striped. They are located along the self-storage buildings for use by customers loading and unloading their personal belongings. All spaces in the north and south parking lots within the fenced-in area are currently leased for long-term storage of recreational vehicles, recreational equipment and other motor vehicles. Mr. Latinovic explained that the petitioner is required to provide a 6-foot high solid fence along the south parking lot and additional landscaping which may consist of deciduous and evergreen shrubs, ornamental grasses, trees and perennials, along 50% of both the north and south parking lots because the parking lots are now used for storage.

Based upon Staff's review of the petition, Staff is recommending denial of the request as Staff finds no unique circumstances or physical hardship associated with this property that warrant granting the requested variation. He noted:

1. There is no physical hardship or practical difficulty associated with this property, which would require the construction of new parking spaces to be placed within the required front yard.
2. The petitioner has sufficient parking on-site for general customer parking, truck rental parking and vehicle storage. The petitioner has chosen to seek a variation to construct more parking spaces for truck rental vehicles rather than reduce the number of parking spaces used for vehicle storage.
3. The petitioner has the ability to add two parking spaces to the front parking lot and meet the required front yard setback.
4. If the Board approved the requested variation, it could be construed to be applicable to other properties in the Village where no unique circumstance or physical hardship exists.

Mr. Latinovic then reviewed the nine Standards for Granting Variations, as noted in Staff's report dated June 26, 2013. Staff found that eight of the nine standards have not been met and therefore recommends denial of the request. Only the requirement of Standard #7 has been met.

At the meeting on June 26th, a number of Code violations on the property were brought up that caused the continuance to allow the petitioner time to correct the violations. The petitioner has corrected all of the violations with the exception of the parking lot fencing and landscape-screening requirement of the north and south parking lots. They have submitted a plan that was approved, and they have received an extension to September 30th, 2013 to complete the screening requirement due to the summer months not being a good condition to plant new landscaping.

The trampoline located in the stormwater detention area was removed. The dumpster has been properly located inside the enclosure area. Accumulated materials along the rear retaining wall have been cleared away. The blockage at the rear fire hydrant has been removed. The U-Haul truck formerly parked in the drive-aisle has been relocated to an appropriate parking spot.

Mr. Latinovic then said that if the Board decides to approve the requested variation, it should be subject to the following three conditions:

1. The proposed parking lot addition shall substantially conform to the Concept Plan prepared by Nekola Survey, Inc., attached to Staff's report, except as such plan may be changed to conform to Village Codes, Ordinances and policies.
2. A grading plan shall be submitted for the building permit showing existing and proposed grades and must specify that all surfaces of striped areas will be protected from soil erosion.
3. The petitioner shall provide landscaping along the new parking spaces per Section 28.1406 of the Village's Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. McCann asked whether the detention pond serves numerous sites in the area, or just the subject property. Mr. Latinovic responded it serves only the subject property.

1 There being no further questions, Chairman White called upon the Petitioner to make its
2 presentation.

3
4 **Petitioner's Presentation:**

5
6 Mr. Bob Cynowa of 2701 Wisconsin emphasized that the detention area is a unique
7 circumstance. The majority of the land in front is for detention. The proposed new parking
8 spots are within the front yard setback and line up with the front of the detention area. From a
9 street perspective there is no change to the character of the area. He is proposing parking spaces
10 not a building within the required setback. He believes the detention area causes the hardship for
11 increasing the property. The previous owner constructed and completed the detention area as it
12 exists today and he has inherited that configuration. The area is stone covered and looks like a
13 parking or paved area. As to special privileges, two blocks to the west on Thatcher Road parking
14 is allowed five feet from the property line per Code.

15
16 There being no further comments or questions for the petitioner, and no one present to speak
17 either in favor of or in opposition to the petition, Chairman White closed the public portion of the
18 meeting.

19
20 **Board's Deliberation**

21
22 Chairman White called for comments from the Board.

23
24 Mr. McCann said his overriding concern is always whether it is truly a hardship, and whether the
25 proposed variation will affect other properties. He said the one thing that struck him about this
26 property is the detention area that was designed for the specific property. It lends to the
27 argument that the property is unique; however, finding in favor of the variation would encourage
28 other properties to come to the Board requesting a similar variation.

29
30 Mr. Domijan said that one of the unique aspects of the property is the requirement that there are
31 15 spaces for the property, yet there are 65 spaces. This can be considered three businesses: 1)
32 self-storage, 2) parking storage for recreational vehicles, and 3) U-Haul vehicle rental. It is
33 unfortunate that the detention was placed in the front and not in the back, but that does not make
34 it unique. He feels they should deny the variation, and the petitioner can construct the two
35 parking spaces that are allowed.

36
37 Ms. Souter noted that relative to the number of parking spots, they are looking at three different
38 businesses. But the self-storage area is made up of temporary parking spots that cannot be used
39 by anyone renting a vehicle. The permanent parking spaces are all leased. The front spaces are
40 used for parking of vehicles when a customer rents a truck. She agrees that the detention pond is
41 unique. It is very close to the property line and she doesn't agree that it does not serve the
42 adjacent property to the east. The detention pond is unique in that respect, in that it is serving
43 other properties nearby. She would tend to vote in favor of the variance for that reason.

44
45 Ms. Earl said she doesn't think the stormwater detention is all that unique. She questioned how
46 many properties in that area are completely paved. The subject property is completely paved.
47 That is how the owner chose to do it and it was the only way they could build out that property to
48 its maximum amount. She said she didn't think when they built this property out they intended

1 to have as many uses on it. When you have this many businesses maybe you need to be thinking
2 about leasing property someplace else. She doesn't think there's anything unique about this site,
3 and thinks it would be granting a special privilege as opposed to other properties. For that reason
4 she would not vote in favor of the variation.

5
6 Chairman White said there is some uniqueness but he is looking at it in terms of reasonable
7 return on the property. On this property, what they're looking to do is add yet another use on a
8 property that's maxed out already. There is some uniqueness, not enough to warrant granting this
9 request.

10
11 Chairman White pointed out that parts of the existing storage buildings could be also demolished
12 to add the two parking spaces subject of the variation or even more if parking is so needed.

13
14 **There being no further discussion, Ms. Earl moved to deny the requested variation for case**
15 **ZBA-03-13. Mr. Domijan seconded the Motion.**

16
17 **AYES: Ms. Earl, Mr. Domijan, Mr. McCann, Ch. White**

18 **NAY: Ms. Souter**

19
20 The Motion to deny passed 4:1.

21
22
23
24

25 **ZBA 04-13** (Continued from 06/26/2013)

26 A petition seeking a side yard setback variation for an addition to the
27 existing house. The property is currently zoned R-4, Single-Family
28 Residential. The property is located on the east side of Washington Street,
29 approximately 475 feet south of 39th Street, commonly known as 3945
30 Washington Street, Downers Grove, IL (PIN 09-05-107-024); Lauren
31 Gullatte and Robert Smith, Petitioners & Owners.

32
33 Stan Popovich, Village Planner explained that the petitioner is requesting a side yard setback
34 variation for a garage addition. The property is located between 39th and 40th Streets on
35 Washington Street, and is improved with a one-story single-family detached home and two small
36 sheds. The petitioner proposes constructing a 760 square foot addition to the southeast corner of
37 the house to expand the existing garage. The home currently has a two-car garage. The
38 petitioner wants to expand the garage to provide additional parking, storage and work space.
39 That would result in the removal of the two freestanding sheds along the rear property line that
40 are currently used for storage. The required setback is 10 feet and the petitioner is proposing a
41 setback of 5.30 feet.

42
43 Mr. Popovich explained the LPDA located on site and that the petitioner provided a photograph
44 after the recent April storms that depict the resultant flooding. The house and garage are
45 considered non-conforming structures because they fail to comply with the ten-foot side yard
46 setback. The Zoning Ordinance allows nonconforming structures to be reconstructed and altered
47 as long as the nonconformity is not increased and provided all new construction conforms to the
48 current zoning requirements. The petitioner's request would expand the nonconformity as the

1 south wall of the house is proposed to extend horizontally 30 feet to the east, more than doubling
2 the expanse of the south wall. Staff believes even with the LPDA on the property, the petitioner
3 has the ability to construct a code-compliant garage. If approved, this could be construed as
4 applicable to all nonconforming structures in the Village where no unique circumstance or
5 physical hardship exists.
6

7 Mr. Popovich then reviewed the Standards for Granting Variations, saying that seven of the
8 standards have not been met and only two of the standards have been met. He then went through
9 each standard as shown on Staff's report dated July 24, 2013. Based on topographical
10 information obtained in the last month, there is sufficient space for construction of an expanded
11 garage without approval of a variation. Allowing the variation can allow a precedent for other
12 properties in the neighborhood, and can alter the character of the neighborhood by bringing two
13 properties closer together.
14

15 With regard to Staff's recommendation, Mr. Popovich said that Staff believes there is no
16 physical hardship or unique circumstance associated with this property. Based on the analysis by
17 Staff of the Standards for Granting Variations, Staff recommends denial of the request. He
18 added that if the Zoning Board of Appeals voted to approve the requested variation, the variance
19 should be subject to the following condition:
20

- 21 1. The proposed addition shall substantially conform to the architectural plan
22 prepared by John M. Heye, Architect, dated April 4, 2013 and topographical
23 survey prepared by Schomig Land Surveyors, Ltd., dated July 8, 2013 attached to
24 Staff's report, except as such plans may be changed to conform to Village Codes,
25 Ordinances and policies.
26

27 Ms. Souter asked whether Staff's alternative proposal would allow enough space to park two
28 cars comfortably. Mr. Popovich replied that it would not be wide enough for two cars
29 comfortably. They would have about a car-and-a-half garage.
30

31 Mr. Domijan said that the information regarding the address as shown is incorrect. Mr. Popovich
32 said that was a typographical error. Mr. Domijan then asked whether Staff had received any
33 communication from surrounding neighbors. Mr. Popovich replied that no contact was received
34 from surrounding neighbors.
35

36 Ms. Souter noted that when she went past the property earlier in the day the Public Notice sign
37 was not on the site. Mr. Popovich explained that this petition was originally scheduled for the June
38 meeting and the sign was posted for that date. This meeting is a continuation of the June
39 meeting. Notices were sent out to neighbors prior to the June meeting which note the petition
40 may be continued without further notice.
41

42 Mr. McCann asked when this home became nonconforming. Mr. Popovich said the residential
43 zoning ordinance was changed in 2006 to create the 5' or 10% of lot width. Prior to that, there
44 was a calculation to determine setbacks. The house sits on portions of lots. He showed a map of
45 how the property is laid out, made up of portions of other lots.
46

1 Mr. Popovich said that any addition over 350' would have to be constructed on a lot of record, so
2 the petitioner would have to administratively consolidate all three of the lot portions through the
3 Community Development Department.
4

5 Mr. Domijan asked if this were a detached garage would he be allowed to put it 5' from the
6 existing lot line. Mr. Popovich replied that a detached garage can be 5' from the existing lot line.
7 He showed on the site plan how the garage would have to be placed. He referred to a photo
8 provided in the Board's packet of information.
9

10 In response to Chairman White, Mr. Popovich said a driveway would be needed between the
11 existing house and the garage but no separate driveway would be necessary.
12

13 **Petitioner's Presentation:**
14

15 Mr. Robert Smith and his wife, Lauren Gullatte, made their presentation. He thanked the Board
16 for reviewing their request, and Mr. Popovich for guiding him through the process. The lot
17 consolidation is in progress at this time.
18

19 Mr. Smith addressed Mr. McCann's comments regarding uniqueness. He said the house was
20 built in 1957 and is 5' from the property line. One of the things he attempted to do in designing
21 this change is to minimally impact the neighborhood. He wanted to stick with the site lines. If
22 there is anything unique, it is because the lot is now judged by 2006 standards as being 100'
23 wide. When it was created in the late 1950s it was truly offset in the subdivision, to the point
24 where it's within the minimum 5' of the property line next door. In 2006 it leaves him with a
25 disadvantage of being a nonconforming structure. He said they have a storage problem in the
26 home. They love the home and it is the perfect size for them. Previously they lived in
27 Connecticut, and they moved back to Downers Grove for employment reasons. This home is
28 perfect for a first-time family or retirees. There is no basement and every home they've owned
29 had a full basement, with his hobbies and workbench housed there. That doesn't exist here.
30 When they saw the home his concern was the size. He wanted to take it a step forward. Larger
31 houses today have three cars, either utilizing the driveway or having a three-car garage. He said
32 using the attic and crawl space is difficult, and having space to house a third car is important.
33 He tried to address every element within the requirements and hoped the Board would take that
34 into consideration. He said that next door to him a smaller home was destroyed to put up a much
35 larger home. He saw this happening in New England and his concern is: "Where will the retirees
36 go? Where will first young families go?" He thinks there is a need, desire and demographic that
37 you want to have in the Village that would cater to this type of dwelling. They are trying to
38 address modern day needs. He has no basement and tinkers with everything mechanical. They
39 want to bring features to the home that will continue to keep it fresh and modern and in the
40 market for the future. He hoped the Board would see this as a wise and desirable thing to do.
41

42 Ms. Souter referred to Staff's proposed alternative and asked what their objectives are to the
43 alternative. Mr. Heye, architect for the site, said his first option on the project was to move the
44 location of the garage near the existing bedroom and bathroom, which was unacceptable. They
45 then considered a detached garage, however, the LPDA designation posed a problem, as well as
46 the 10' setback between the two buildings. Another alternative would result in a wide one-car
47 garage, and that is how they arrived at seeking a variance. They would attempt to match the

1 masonry, mortar, roof overhang, etc., to make the addition look as though it has been there since
2 the beginning.

3
4 Mr. Domijan asked about the large trees in back of the property, and asked if the variation
5 request would eliminate any of the trees on the property. Mr. Heye said that the proposed
6 solution would have to lose the trees, which are also affected by the overhead power lines.

7
8 Mr. Smith said he is committed to replanting trees in the back yard to replace those that would
9 have to be replaced. He is working with someone from DuPage County to choose “prairie” trees.

10
11 Mr. Domijan asked if the neighbors have commented. Mr. Smith said being new on the block,
12 he contacted the neighbors and overall received a supportive response. Each one points out that
13 anything I do to the home to improve curb appeal would increase the value of the neighborhood.

14
15 Mr. Smith said he hopes the Board finds in favor of their original plan. They’d like the space as
16 wide as possible and less intrusive onto the lot depth. Staff’s proposal would require deeper
17 entry into the back yard.

18
19 Mr. Domijan asked if they’ve considered splitting the difference from front to rear. Mr. Smith
20 said they have not considered that because they didn’t think the elevation from the front would
21 look natural. Mr. Domijan said if you look at the structure immediately to the south it is much
22 further out.

23
24 Mr. Smith referred to the aerial view of the site, noting that a concern is the area near the existing
25 roll-up door. That is the electrical load center and it restricts the width to a door narrower than
26 what exists. If he were allowed to remove the wall he would have a much greater space. For a
27 compromise he asked that perhaps the area could be indented by five feet to capitalize on the
28 larger, open area.

29
30 Mr. Domijan said that would probably not be permitted because of the electrical panel. Mr.
31 Smith said they would propose underground service to a main panel and this would be a
32 termination box. The partial wall that remains is a support wall.

33
34 Mr. Smith hoped the Board would allow him to continue to work at improving the property. He
35 doesn’t think allowing him to do this would automatically mean that others would come in
36 seeking the same approval.

37
38 Mr. Popovich said that financial considerations are not noted in meeting the Code. He said that
39 there are tandem garages in other parts of the Village as well. Staff’s intent is to meet the Zoning
40 Ordinance requirements and not extend a nonconformity.

41
42 **Board’s Deliberations:**

43
44 Mr. McCann said what Mr. Smith proposes to do makes perfect sense. However, the problem he
45 has is that petitions requiring just a few feet variance are seen on a regular basis. As a result, in
46 that neighborhood are many homes built in the same general time, and this could cause a
47 precedent. Typically justifications are aesthetics, functionality, and other considerations, etc.
48 Sitting on the Board the petitioner’s request may make sense; however, the Board still has to

1 meet the Code as written, and not set precedents for other variation requests. The petitioner
2 proposes valid arguments; however, the Board cannot rewrite the Code. He is inclined to deny
3 the petition. It is his understanding that the Plan Commission is reviewing the Code. He expects
4 Public Hearings will be held and he recommended that the petitioner appear before the
5 Commission and explain the problems they've encountered in seeking a variation.
6

7 Ms. Souter explained that the reason they are present is to look at times when the Code appears
8 not to be working. She appreciates the attempts made to work within the Code. She said Staff's
9 alternative doesn't provide the same amount of usable space that the petitioner is seeking. She
10 tends to be in favor of granting the variance in this case.
11

12 Ms. Earl said they have five cars, two of which are collectible. She also has an LPDA in her
13 backyard and the same situation where the garage is 5' off the property line. She would love to
14 push it back and make it double deep. In addition, they are on a corner, which complicates
15 things even more. There is nothing unique about her house, or the petitioners' house or the
16 situation. She feels they could find a way to do it within the Ordinance, and does not see the
17 situation as unique.
18

19 Mr. Domijan said he also knows about the situation and they try to look at all the individual
20 cases including landscaping. In this case no matter which way they choose to go, they will take
21 out large trees. There is no uniqueness in this situation. He would love to see the garage built
22 for them, but he cannot support the request based on the given situation.
23

24 Mr. McCann said if the variation were necessary to give them a second parking spot, that would
25 be more of a hardship. He doesn't see storage space as a hardship.
26

27 Mr. Domijan noted that the detached garage would be permitted in this case at 5' from the lot
28 line and he recommended that they look at that, given the 10% rule.
29

30 Chairman White said it is not the Board's job to rewrite the Ordinance. Certain things may seem
31 unfair, but they have to stand by the Ordinance as written.
32

33 **Mr. Domijan moved to deny the variation as requested in case ZBA-04-13. Mr. McCann**
34 **seconded the Motion.**

35 **AYES: Mr. Domijan, Mr. McCann, Ms. Earl, Ch. White**

36 **NAYS: Ms. Souter**

37 **The Motion to deny passed 4:1.**

38
39

40 There being no further discussion, Chairman White called for a Motion to adjourn.
41

42 Mr. Popovich said that Ms. Jones has left the Village and gone to Lemont. Mr. Popovich has
43 recently been promoted to Senior Planner. There is one case scheduled for August 28th.
44

45 **Mr. McCann moved, seconded by Mr. Domijan, to adjourn the meeting.**

46 All in favor.
47

48 Chairman White adjourned the meeting at 9:00 PM.

APPROVED 8/28/13

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

Respectfully submitted,

Tonie Harrington
Recording Secretary