

APPROVED 9/16/15

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
AND
AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
PUBLIC WORKS – LUNCH ROOM
5101 WALNUT AVENUE

SEPTEMBER 2, 2015, 6:30 P.M.

Chairman Matthies and Chairman Behm called the September 2, 2015 meeting of the Architectural Design Review Board and AdHoc Subcommittee on Historic Preservation meetings to order at 6:35 p.m. and asked for a roll call:

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

PRESENT: Chairman Matthies, Members Mrs. Acks, Mr. Casey, Mr. Riemer

ABSENT: Mr. Davenport, Mr. Larson, Ms. Englander

AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

PRESENT: Chairman Behm, Members Mr. Birch, Ms. Gassen, Mr. Geocaris, Mr. Jarosz, Mr. Leitschuh, Mr. Zimolzak

STAFF: Deputy Village Manager Mike Baker and Planning Manager Stan Popovich

VISITORS: Mr. Ross Johnson, 5221 Main St., Downers Grove; Chris and Patty Patterson, 4502 Prince St., Downers Grove; John and Kathy Hebert, 802 Maple Ave., Downers Grove; Don Richards, 4735 Main St., Downers Grove; Ms. Kathy Nybo, 5253 Blodgett, Downers Grove; Ms. Christine Martin, 701 Maple Ave., Downers Grove; Irene Hogstrom, Downers Grove; Ms. Melissa Nassen, 900 59th St., Downers Grove; Ms. Phyllis Serbou, 1905 Curtiss, Downers Grove; Mr. Matthew Maher, 819 Maple, Downers Grove; Mr. Scott Lazar, 808 Maple Ave., Downers Grove; Ms. Hilary Denk, 433 Wilson St., Downers Grove; Charlotte and Byron Holtzen, 5226 Carpenter St., Downers Grove

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – AD-HOC SUBCOMMITTEE – AUGUST 19, 2015

THE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 19, 2015 AD-HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION MEETING WERE APPROVED ON MOTION BY MR. BIRCH, SECONDED BY MS. GASSEN. ROLL CALL:

**AYE: MR. BIRCH, MS. GASSEN, MR. GEOCARIS, MR. LEITSCHUH,
MR. ZIMOLZAK, CHAIRMAN BEHM**

NAY: NONE

ABSTAIN: MR. JAROSZ

APPROVED 9/16/15

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 6-0-1

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – ADRB – AUGUST 19, 2015

THE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 19, 2015 ADRB MEETING WERE APPROVED ON MOTION BY MR. CASEY, SECONDED BY MR. RIEMER. ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. CASEY, MR. RIEMER, CHAIRMAN MATTHIES

NAY: NONE

ABSTAIN: MRS. ACKS

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 3-0-1

REVIEW AND SUMMARY OF AUGUST 5th and 19TH MEETINGS

Chairman Matthies summarized that from the two previous meetings it appears the groups have consensus on some points yet are far apart on other points. Tonight's meeting would focus on finding those points that the two groups have consensus on in order to move forward and allow staff to begin drafting its preliminary ordinance for village council. He briefly reminded members on the stipulations for the Open Meetings Act. Chairman Behm also asked the public to hold their comments to five minutes per person in order to conduct the meeting in a timely manner.

PROPERTY OWNER SURVEY DISCUSSION

Planning Manager Stan Popovich discussed the background of the previous historic building survey completed in 2013 which covered four areas of the village and included 865 properties of which 67 were identified as being significant. He noted the boards were tasked with surveying these properties. Of the 36 surveys that were returned with responses, there was a 50/50 split where half of the responders were not aware that the village had a historic preservation ordinance while the other half did. A quick overview of the survey questions followed, along with their results. Given the figures from this survey, Mr. Popovich summarized that four areas from the survey stood out: 1) too many regulations; 2) residents not understanding the process; 3) residents not understanding the ordinance; and 4) the financial costs involved. However, what was not addressed in the survey data, Mr. Popovich pointed out, were those individuals that were either aware they were eligible or those four homeowners whom would consider landmarking and why they did not apply or hold off.

Staff was asked to explain the split between residential and commercial structures and the reason for numerous PIN numbers or duplicated addresses. Chairman Behm then asked members to provide the comments they received on their surveys for their assigned areas. Mr. Zimolzak noted in the commercial area, the surveyed individuals did not want any other ordinance that would affect them, except to have some other protection, possibly grandfathered in or deal with sign-related issues. One member said one of the surveyed owners was representing three individuals in neighboring towns fighting their own historic districts. Clarifying the cost concern, one member said it was a matter of a compliance cost while Mr. Geocar is noted the application fee was a concern for the church in his survey area. Details followed regarding the

APPROVED 9/16/15

First Baptist Church and its changes over the years as well as a residential home that changed over the years.

Another issue that was raised by the members was the survey itself. For instance, Ms. Gassen's surveyed individuals questioned why someone else's home was considered significant and theirs was not; that in speaking to property owners, in general, they did not know they could landmark their home; and misunderstandings of what was contained in the ordinance existed. Similarly, there were comments that there was confusion between the landmark ordinance and the honorarium (plaque) from the Downers Grove Historical Preservation. Mr. Geocariss mentioned that other homeowners, who were, for example, third owners of a home and took much pride and effort in maintaining their home, would consider landmarking with more information. Mr. Casey shared that some of the owners did not want to attract attention to their home but thought it was great their home was considered significant, while another homeowner expressed interest in landmarking his/her home but did not have knowledge about the ordinance nor know that it even existed. A common theme that surfaced, as mentioned by Mr. Riemer, was the fact that many owners did not want something imposed upon them that they did not want and believed the process should be voluntary. Many residents (some on Prince) did not like the restrictions and saw no benefit to the process.

Mr. Jarosz summarized what he found with his five homes – two were knocked down for “McMansions”, one he was unable to contact the homeowner, one owner was surprised his home was in the survey, and the last owner at Prairie/Linscott appeared very proud of his home, was interested in landmarking it, but said if he sold his home he would want his home to remain as is. Chairman Behm commented on the very fine home the Pattersons owned (whom were present at the meeting). The status of the two remaining homes followed along with the pastor's response from Gloria Dei Church, which was very positive and whom wanted to learn more about the program. Regarding Downers Grove North High School, Chairman Behm said the superintendent expressed interest, suggesting that the matter could go to the school board for discussion. He encouraged the village to follow up with those two commercial properties and reiterated that education and more information needed to get out to the public.

Mr. Patterson, 4502 Prince Street, spoke and stated he was not aware of the survey nor his home's significance; however, he was interested in obtaining more information about the process, the benefits, any restrictions and have the home remain as is, if sold. His concern was if it was worth to invest in new windows or would the home become a tear-down. He commented he visited the village's web site and tried downloading information but it was too cumbersome.

Chairman Matthies then questioned whether the facades on buildings could be designated as historic versus entire buildings – citing the southern facade of the North High School. He asked if that could be researched.

Mr. Zimolzak noted an easy-to-read educational pamphlet would have to be instrumental in getting the message out to the public and contain information such as what tax savings a homeowner might expect in a hypothetical situation. Also, it was pointed out that of the survey conducted between the two committees, 4 out of 18 homeowners were interested in landmarking their homes, which was 22%, noting that if more of the public was aware of the process, the landmark designation would “fall into line” along with staff providing assistance to move the owners forward. Further discussion followed. Mr. Birch reiterated that regulation, education and staff support was key to the effectiveness of the entire effort.

APPROVED 9/16/15

One member felt that continued conversation with those owners who expressed interest in landmarking should continue, building on that momentum versus waiting for the village to decide on its preservation ordinance. Comments followed that, most likely, home owners would wait for the village to complete the ordinance review process.

Mr. Jarosz confirmed with staff that if a landmarked property was sold the landmark status would carry over. Staff confirmed same and stated it was recorded with the county. However, Mr. Popovich also clarified that any new owner would have to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness and go before the ADRB to obtain a demolition. Adding to the comments, Chairman Behm explained that an easement could be created and given to a third party, such as the Historic Illinois, who would then hold the protected easement and would have to agree to any major change or demolition to the structure. As to any punitive process involved, Mr. Popovich explained that most likely the village would issue fines which would have to be determined through discussions with legal counsel.

Chairman Matthies pointed out what he and Mr. Davenport discussed – that education and outreach to the public were key and the survey that was taken by both committees reflected same. However, some surprises that did arise when members were giving the survey to the residents was that some residents indicated they knew the ordinance very well but in further conversation, it became apparent they did not. Some asked what were the benefits. Mr. Jarosz suggested that when the new owners of the 67 identified significant properties move in to send them a letter welcoming them into their landmarked home; however, Chairman Behm believed a face to face meeting with them would be more beneficial. Ms. Gassen was curious as to how those owners who went through the Centennial Homes process would answer the survey.

Mr. Popovich then proceeded to discuss the village's CLG status and the update he received from IHPA (Illinois Historic Preservation Agency) regarding the discussions taking place at the village regarding preservation. He told the two committees that if the IHPA had any concerns about ordinance changes it would follow up with the National Park Service. As to obtaining grants, the Village is eligible to receive grant funds and in the past has partnered with non-profits for assistance. He confirmed grants were available and the ADRB could apply for grants in October, which Chairman Matthies confirmed and stated should be part of this groups' recommendations.

Regarding last comments about the survey, Chairman Behm believed the original survey and website needed to be updated with accurate information. Mr. Popovich asked that if members spoke to the owners they surveyed and their information was inaccurate for some reason, to contact him to update it. Mr. Geocaris then questioned a resident's comment on page 7 of the survey, stating it related to the culture of the community and, as a result, he believed a more tempered ordinance, versus aggressive ordinance, should be considered.

(The two committees took a five minute break at 7:30 p.m. and reconvened at 7:35 p.m.)

DOWNERS GROVE – KEY POLICY DIRECTION DISCUSSION

Chairman Matthies asked to focus on a few topics to reach a consensus in order to direct staff. Of note, he confirmed with both committees that they were of the consensus for removing the \$400 application fee for landmarking. However, in order to cover administrative costs, he

APPROVED 9/16/15

recalled there was discussion about increasing the demolition fee. Staff also explained how the \$400 application fee was determined initially. Dialog then continued that it was not up to the two committees to determine the actual fee amounts and where they should come from. Instead, staff, through this groups' recommendation, would determine the actual fees to be eliminated, i.e., demolition or permitting fees on renovations, and forward that recommendation to the village council, once the two groups reviewed staff's draft ordinance. Ms. Gassen also recommended removing the COA fees in addition to the application fee, but others agreed it would be better to waive all fees associated with the preservation ordinance.

Other ideas were voiced, including that a resident should not need to obtain a COA as part of the landmark status if the resident did not need a permit initially, i.e., primarily for maintenance items: landscaping, exterior painting, repairing roof shingles, etc. Members supported that recommendation. Windows were then discussed with staff differentiating between window replacements that were similar in size needing no permit versus windows being replaced of not similar size requiring a permit. Members then discussed the idea of reducing the COA requirements on some of the smaller items and items not seen from the street. The groups concurred on not requiring a COA for items not visible from a street. Due to a dialog about windows and siding and their importance, Chairman Matthies recommended discussing these two topics in the future. Members concurred.

Returning to the education goal, the two groups agreed that the village should apply for a grant or have staff seek a non-profit entity to partner with that could educate the public about the village's historic preservation ordinance. The two groups agreed an educational pamphlet at the counter was necessary as a first step, but then staff could draft a strategic outreach plan in the future addressing the various types of outreach that could occur. Chairman Behm noted these are all passive approaches and it was important to continue taking an active approach with targeted outreach.

Chairman Matthies then summarized that marketing the preservation ordinance would be important. Specifically, he reminded the two groups that the ADRB discussed at its prior meetings the following: 1) better exposure on the city's web site; a simplified explanation page; and a future interactive mapping system similar to Naperville's website. Mr. Casey mentioned that when the initial survey was done, the residents were contacted via one robo-call but no follow-up interaction was ever done afterward. Comments followed that personalization was important as was a plaque recognition program or a similar program awarding the best renovation or addition project, etc. Mr. Casey suggested the village could brand itself as "Historic" Dowers Grove when additional landmarks were created.

Then the topic of historic districts arose, wherein members agreed the topic did not have to be discussed currently and the focus should be on individual landmarks, which would, in essence, create a historic district as individual landmarks were added in the future. Some members preferred that the topic of historic districts be reviewed later; however, some members preferred to hear public comments on the subject. Consensus was to leave the language alone in the ordinance for now. As to the village's preservation application packet itself (42 pages), Ms. Gassen recommended to divide the village's current application into two separate applications -- one for landmarks and one for a historic district -- and make both concise. (The St. Charles' application packet was seven pages.)

APPROVED 9/16/15

Per a question, Mr. Popovich clarified that the reason the village's application packet was not on the web site was because staff preferred to meet with an applicant individually to explain the process. Detailed steps followed. It was noted staff could review the application with a keen eye and eliminate extraneous information and make it simpler. Chairman Matthies recommended that rather than presenting a 42-page application, staff may want to approach the process from a softer perspective and provide some general information initially to an applicant. If the applicant was still interested, then print off the application and walk through it with the applicant. It was suggested surveying neighboring towns to see if their application was on-line and what it entailed. Ms. Gassen suggested creating architectural guidelines (not rules) was also offered and could be for those owners who had older homes but wanted to keep the integrity/style of their home intact, which the chairman suggested to place on the village's web site.

Addressing the groups' goals, someone pointed out that back in 2007 the village council discussed the same goals/plans for the preservation ordinance as these two committees were. This same person questioned why the ordinance appeared to be stalled and asked whether it was because the ADRB was inactive at the time. He hoped this group could prevent that from occurring in the future. Mr. Popovich explained that in the first two years, there were two landmarks. After that some of it had to do with the economy and the fact that it was not a priority at the time. Mr. Zimolzak believed having an ongoing budget for the ADRB would also keep the effort from diminishing.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman Matthies opened up the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Ross Johnson, 5221 Main Street, said he owns a commercial property on Main Street and this was his first meeting. His property was on the list. He asked if the groups would consider a follow-up survey because he did not believe many in the village knew what the two groups are trying to accomplish or either the residents glossed over it. Because he felt the number of survey responses were low, he believed better preservation communication was in order and added that the face-to-face contact was difficult and time-consuming. If there was going to be limited participation, he thought the effort may not be worth it.

Mr. Scott Lazar, 808 Maple, with Downers Grove Families for Sensible Historic Preservation noted there were five members in attendance representing Maple Avenue and Denburn Woods. He turned members' attention to page 7 of the survey, specifically the statement, "I am likely to make an application to designate my house as a historic landmark," and stated that 50% responded were "somewhat" to "very likely" to do so and there was sufficient interest. In addition, since robust and voluntary participation in preservation was the ideal, the challenge of it becoming a reality involved two things, however: having a timeline and having a scope with the right expectations. Unfortunately he said because the issue around the ordinance was highly charged and had a perceived sense of urgency, he did not want to see the groups' efforts be thrown away because someone had different expectations about a realistic timeline. He encouraged the two groups to review the ordinance the right way and to not rush it. He believed the 90-day timeline was ridiculous. There was a reasonable perception that certain elected officials wanted a historic district and, regardless of the recommendations made, they may decide to make changes. He did not like the discussions about urban development zones since it took the decision away from homeowners. There was also the risk that changes could be made "through backdoor zoning" due to newly appointed ZBA members.

APPROVED 9/16/15

Chairman Matthies reiterated that the two groups had come to a consensus that they did not want to push the ordinance but to make it as “organic” as possible and voluntary, which would be done through education, marketing and refining the preservation ordinance to make it easier to read. Ultimately, if council decided to follow otherwise, the public always had the right to vote.

Mr. Lazar added few more points: He believed historic districts should be addressed now since the efforts on Maple Avenue were fresh in everyone’s mind because he did not like the alternative, i.e., conservation districts. He asked that when staff removes the fees to make it easy to understand and that when the preservation pamphlets go out, that the village controls the message and that they are authorized materials from the village.

Ms. Irene Hogstrom stated she was with the Pierce Downer Heritage Alliance, Friends of the Edwards House, and on the village’s Plan Commission. She stated the PDHA was very excited to assist with the outreach activity regarding the preservation ordinance. In October, the PDHA would be holding a public meeting with the hopes of having a historic preservation program on the agenda. She noted Mr. Popovich has come to a PDHA in the past to discuss historic preservation. On a personal note, she said she has requested a preservation packet from staff for her historic home.

Ms. Charlotte Holtzen, 5226 Carpenter Street, stated this was her first meeting with no one contacting her regarding the survey. Her home was renovated and plaqued (Centennial Home). While she appreciated the discussions taking place, she believed the village needed to speak to the residents who lived in the homes and find out what the issues they were running into when renovating their historic home. She noted the costs associated with renovations of historic homes.

Ms. Christine Martin, 701 Maple Avenue, is a member of the Friends of the Edwards House and believed her group of volunteers would be happy to assist with any distribution of pamphlets from the village.

Ms. Hilary Denk, 433 Wilson St., stated this was her first attendance at a meeting and appreciated the members’ time spent on this matter. She reminded everyone of the homes that were coming up for the next Centennial. More recently, a bungalow was razed on her street and only three bungalows remained, resulting in a significant change in neighborhood’s character. Ms. Denk invited the two groups and the public to attend two upcoming events -- one on September 12, 2015 to discuss the results from a suburban preservation survey (sponsored by Landmarks Illinois, the Illinois Association of Historic Preservation Commissioners, the Chicago Suburban Preservation Alliance, and the Evanston Historic Society, to be held in Evanston) and another event on September 16, 2015, hosted by IHPC president, Doug Karre, the historic preservation planner for the Village of Oak Park. Also at that meeting she said will be a speaker from the Morton Arboretum discussing the importance of tree preservation. She will be videotaping the September 16th event for those members from this meeting who cannot attend.

Last comments and for the record, Chairman Behm stated the two groups here were not political at all. They are not following guidelines from anybody and are speaking their minds. They are trying to cross the differences between historic preservation and property rights and have been diligent from the start. They are trying to look at what is best for the community as a whole. All sides of this challenging topic were being discussed.

APPROVED 9/16/15

ADJOURNMENT

MR. LEITSCHUH MOTIONED TO ADJOURN THE AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION MEETING AT 9:20 P.M. SECONDED BY MR. ZIMOLZAK. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 7-0.

MRS. ACKS MOTIONED TO ADJOURN THE ADRB MEETING AT 9:21 P.M. SECONDED BY MR. RIEMER. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 4-0.

Respectfully submitted,

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

**DOWNERS GROVE PUBLIC LIBRARY
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING
WEDNESDAY AUGUST 26, 2015, 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. Members absent: none.

Also present: Director Rick Ashton, Assistant Director for Public Services Bonnie Reid, Assistant Director for Support Services Sue O'Brien, Adult and Teen Services Manager Nicole Wilhelms, Friends of the Library President Joann Hansen, Library Board Appointee Edward Earl, Library Board Appointee Arthur Jaros, Council Liaison David Olsen, Downers Grove Bugle reporter Joan Rykal, residents Ed Pawlak, Terry Pavesich, Megan Schroeder, David Haugen, Tiffany Wong, Zachary Bravos, Laurel Bowen, Genee Murphy.

3. **Welcome to visitors.** President DiCola welcomed visitors and thanked them for their interest in the work of the Library Board.
4. **Approval of Minutes.**
 - a. July 22, 2015, Regular Monthly Meeting. Trustee Read requested that the first paragraph at the top of Page 3 be amended to read as follows: "As Treasurer of the DGPL Foundation, Trustee Read recommended that there be a review of the Foundation's investments through a meeting with the Foundation's investment advisor to review performance and strategy. Ashton agreed to assist in setting up a meeting." With this amendment, it was moved by Loftus and seconded by Greene THAT the Minutes of the July 22 Regular Monthly Meeting be approved. Roll call: Ayes: Greene, Humphreys, Read, DiCola. Nays: None. Abstentions: Eblen, Loftus.
 - b. August 12, Special Meeting for Consideration of 2016 Operating Budget and Levy. It was moved by Humphreys and seconded by Eblen THAT the Minutes of the August 12 Special Meeting be approved. Roll call: Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Nays: None. Abstentions: None.

5. **Approval of Invoices and Financial Reports.** It was moved by Read and seconded by Eblen THAT August operating invoices totaling \$120,321.29 and credit memos totaling \$187.03 be approved and that July 2015 payrolls totaling \$208,769.82 be approved. Roll call: Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Nays: none. Abstentions: none.
6. **Public Hearing on Proposed 2016 Operating Budget and Levy.** President DiCola opened the Public Hearing. Comments were received as follows, with staff and Board responses:
 - David Haugen inquired regarding the number of part-time employees and the strategy behind this. Is it cost savings or scheduling? Do part-time employees receive the same benefits as full-time employees? *RESPONSE: Employment of 85 part-time employees and 25 full-time employees has been used to save on personnel costs and allow the Library to cover a 7-day, 72-hour public service schedule efficiently. Part-time employees receive, on a pro-rated basis, the same pay levels, vacation and sick leave allowances, and other leave-related benefits as full-time employees. Part-time employees working more than 1000 hours per year are included in the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund. Part-time employees working more than 1000 hours per year are eligible for participation in medical, dental, and vision plans but must pay both the employee's and employer's share of the premiums.*
 - David Haugen inquired about expenditure lines 5430, Building Maintenance Services, and 5450, Cleaning Services. Are these services contracted or performed by Library or Village staff? *RESPONSE: These are contracted services.*
 - David Haugen inquired about investment income. Why is this only \$2,000 in a \$5,000,000 budget? *RESPONSE: Very low interest rates, combined with the Library's generally low cash balances, produce this result.*
 - Arthur Jaros inquired about expenditure line 5101, Exempt Staff Salaries. Why is an apparent 5.35% increase budgeted when the proposed salary increases are 3.5%? *RESPONSE: Budget lines are overall allowances, not built on actual salary figures. A proposal for specific salary adjustments will be brought to the Board before January.*
 - Trustee Read inquired concerning the Alternative Budget reviewed by the Board at the August 12 meeting. When would it be necessary to shift to this alternative budget? How would that be decided? *RESPONSE: The Alternative Budget was reviewed for illustrative purposes, assuming specific outcomes to now-undecided issues under the control of the State of Illinois. The assumptions were that an immediate and total property tax freeze would take effect in January 2016 and a state*

budget including no provision for Library Per Capita grants or the Personal Property Replacement Tax would be adopted. A decision to adopt the Alternative Budget would be the responsibility of the Library Board.

- Trustee Loftus commented that the Proposed Budget, not the Alternative Budget reviewed at the earlier meeting, was the question before the Library Board. If necessary, the Alternative Budget could be considered later.
- Trustee Loftus commented that he agreed with the resident who had questioned the proposed payroll increase, larger than is needed in the public sector. Having seen no increases at these levels in his work in the private sector in the past three years, he cannot support this increase.
- Trustee Humphreys commented that, while exempt salaries are increased approximately 5%, the non-exempt salary budget is reduced because of job reclassification. *RESPONSE: No specific salary increase proposal is now before the Board, and no 5% salary increase is contemplated. A salary adjustment proposal will be brought to the Board before January.*
- President DiCola commented that a 3.5% raise might not be unreasonable, since during the past several years there have been years with no raises. A 3.5% raise for a 20-hour part-time worker is not a large amount of money. She can support the proposed budget.
- President DiCola commented that the proposed budget, when combined with the planned expiration of the Library's debt service levy, will result in an overall property tax reduction of approximately \$4.44 per year for the average household.
- President DiCola closed the Public Hearing.

7. **Board Action on Proposed 2016 Operating Budget and Levy.** It was moved by Read and seconded by Humphreys THAT the Proposed 2016 Operating Budget totaling \$5,216,172.00 and Levy of \$4,826,000.00 be approved. Roll call: Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Read, DiCola. Nays: Loftus. Abstentions: None.

8. **Public Comment on Agenda Items.** President DiCola invited comment.

Commissioner David Olsen spoke on behalf of Mayor Martin Tully and the entire Village Council. He thanked President DiCola and Trustee Loftus for their service as members of the Library Board and wished them all the best.

9. **Public Comment on Other Library Business.** President DiCola invited comment.

There was none.

10. Unfinished Business.

- a. Proposed Policy on Donation of Works of Art. Requested Action: Approval. It was moved by Greene and seconded by Eblen THAT the Proposed Policy on Donation of Works of Art be approved. Roll call: Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Nays: None. Abstentions: None.
- b. Proposed Donation of a Work of Art. Requested Action: Acceptance of Donation. Ashton presented the proposal from Carrie Ann Schumacher to donate a cut-paper sculpture to the collection, in memory of Nadine Walsh. It was moved by Eblen and seconded by Humphreys THAT the proposed donation (the work with the full skirt) be accepted. Roll call: Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Nays: None. Abstentions: None.

11. New Business.

- a. Proposed Partnership with Downers Grove Music Club. Requested Action: Authorize Secretary and Director to Negotiate Agreement. Ashton presented the proposal, built around the Club's gift of a new grand piano to the Library. Because of time constraints involved with the beginning of the concert season on October 6, Ashton proposed that the Board authorize him and Secretary Thomas Read to negotiate an agreement for the partnership, with the Board reserving final approval authority. It was moved by Loftus and seconded by Eblen THAT the Secretary and Director be authorized to negotiate an agreement as outlined in the proposal, at a cost to the Library of no more than \$2,000. Roll Call: Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Nays: none. Abstentions: none.
- b. Recognition of Board Members completing their terms of service: President Kathleen DiCola and Trustee Daniel Loftus.
 - Trustees Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, and Read individually expressed their appreciation to both members. They thanked Ms. DiCola and Mr. Loftus for their leadership, organizational expertise, financial acumen, expert knowledge, and cooperative work ethic.
 - Trustee Loftus thanked the Board members for their kind words and expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to work with them.
 - President DiCola mentioned that her youngest son, now age 25, was 5 years old when she joined the Board. She said that the time had gone quickly and that she enjoyed every minute. She thanked the Board members and the community for their faithful support.

- Ashton informed the Board that the Library has ordered two 8-inch-by-8-inch bricks for the Library's Garden Walk, inscribed with the Library's thanks to Ms. DiCola and Mr. Loftus. These will be installed in September.
- c. Welcome to Board Appointees: Arthur Jaros, Jr. and Edward Earl. President DiCola welcomed the two appointees, whose terms were scheduled to begin September 1, 2015, and wished them successful service on the Library Board.

12. Report of the Director (attached).

Ashton summarized his report.

In addition, he displayed a poster entitled "Our Promise," designed to be posted in staff areas of the Library building as a reminder of the Library's and the staff's customer service commitments. He noted that a simpler version of the poster, designed for public areas, is in production. With the support of the Board, the Library staff will make every effort to deliver on its promise.

13. Board member comments and requests for information.

Trustee Eblen announced a meeting of the Downers Grove Public Library Foundation Board on Wednesday, September 23 at 6:30 p.m. in the Library Meeting Room, before the Library Board meeting scheduled for that date.

14. Adjournment. President DiCola adjourned the meeting at 8:18 p.m.

**DOWNERS GROVE PUBLIC LIBRARY
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
AUGUST 26, 2015**

**AGENDA ITEM 12
REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR**

- a. Library expenses, January-July 2015. During the first 7 months (58.3% of the year), the Library has expended 54.5% of its operating budget. Personnel and library materials appropriations are within normal tolerances, and the capital-related lines are currently underspent, pending the initiation of the second floor fiction area lighting project.

- b. Summer Reading Club Reports. The League of Super Readers, the 2015 summer reading club for children, teens, and adults, was a successful undertaking. For the children's version of the club, 2241 kids registered, as compared to 2170 in 2014 and 2155 in 2013. They reported that they read 50,230 books, over 22 books per registrant. Among adults, 554 people signed up, submitting reports of 4116 books read, nearly 7.5 per registrant. Teen club figures included 195 registrants (nearly twice as many as in 2014), but book-reading figures have not yet been reported.

- c. July circulation figures. Report-generation difficulties with our newly-adopted integrated software system have caused delays in these figures.

- d. Recent media coverage. Nothing to report.

**DOWNERS GROVE LIQUOR COMMISSION
VILLAGE HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
801 BURLINGTON AVENUE**

Thursday, September 3, 2015

I. CALL TO ORDER

Staff called the September 3, 2015 Liquor Commission meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Mr. Austin, Mr. Clary, Mr. Jacobson, Ms. King, Mr. Krusenoski

ABSENT: Chairman Strelau, Ms. Fregeau

STAFF: Liaison to the Liquor Commission Carol Kuchynka, Asst. Village Attorney Dawn Didier

OTHERS: Laddawan Hardy, Jill Allen, Dan Nelson, Gretchen Chesley, Court Reporter

III. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN PRO TEM

In the absence of Chairman Strelau, staff requested a motion to appoint a Chairman Pro Tem for the meeting.

MS. KING MOVED TO APPOINT MR. KRUSENOSKI TO ACT AS CHAIRMAN PRO TEM FOR THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2015 MEETING OF THE LIQUOR COMMISSION. MR. AUSTIN SECONDED.

VOTE: **Aye:** Ms. King, Mr. Austin, Mr. Clary, Mr. Jacobson, Mr. Krusenoski

Nay: None

Abstain: None

MOTION CARRIED: 5:0:0

The motion carried.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked for approval of the minutes for the June 4, 2015 Liquor Commission meeting and asked members if there were any corrections, changes or additions.

Hearing no changes, corrections or additions, the June 4, 2015 minutes of the Liquor Commission meeting were approved as written.

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

V. APPLICATION FOR LIQUOR LICENSE

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski made the following statements:

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

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

"The Liquor Commissioner, who is the Mayor of Downers Grove, will, pursuant to Section 3-12 of the Ordinance, render decisions regarding issuance of available liquor licenses within 60 days."

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

Thai Restaurants d/b/a Thai First

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski stated that the next order of business was an application hearing for DJ Thai Restaurants d/b/a Thai First located at 2249 Maple Avenue. He stated that the applicant was seeking a Class "R-2", beer and wine, on-premise consumption liquor license.

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

Ms. Laddawan Hardy was sworn in by the court reporter. Ms. Hardy introduced herself as the owner and liquor manager of Thai First.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked the applicant to present its case.

Ms. Hardy stated that formerly she was a partner in another Thai food restaurant. She stated that she owns and has operated Thai First since June 1st. She was seeking a beer and wine license based upon requests received from her customers. She stated that the Batavia establishment she was a former partner at held a BYOB liquor license.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked for questions from the Commission.

Mr. Jacobson reviewed the manual and cautioned her to make sure servers check the age of patrons. He asked if she will take the vertical license. Ms. Hardy replied no.

Mr. Jacobson asked if she is working at the Batavia location. Ms. Hardy replied no. She stated that she is at the Downers Grove location full time.

Mr. Clary asked Ms. Hardy about her liquor handling experience. She stated that she worked part time at the Batavia location for two years and they held BYOB license. Mr. Clary asked Ms. Hardy if the Batavia restaurant had any liquor violations. Ms. Hardy replied no.

Ms. King asked Ms. Hardy if she recalled any challenges with the BYOB license. Ms. Hardy replied no. She stated that most customers were regulars and an older clientele. Ms. King asked if she ever had an issue with a patron over serving themselves. Ms. Hardy replied no.

Mr. Austin asked Ms. Hardy about her BYOB experience at the Batavia establishment. He asked if families brought in kids. Ms. Hardy replied that most clientele was older.

Mr. Austin stated that BYOB and the actual serving are significantly different and if they have a family setting, there may be issues with adults sharing drinks with minors. He stated that they may not realize that they cannot serve their college child while dining. Mr. Austin noted that is a serving violation. Mr. Austin was concerned about the amount of her experience and asked if any other employees have liquor handling experience.

Ms. Hardy replied that if the license is granted, she plans to hire someone with experience. She stated that most families brought in younger kids and it was an older clientele. Mr. Austin stated that the BYOB serving experience was different in that customers served themselves rather than serving people as wait staff. He noted her lack of experience with being part time and involved in only BYOB sales.

Mr. Austin asked if any other employees had liquor handling experience. Mr. Austin asked Ms. Hardy if she has someone in mind for the position. Ms. Hardy replied yes. Mr. Austin asked if they were BASSETT Certified. She stated that they will have to take the test, get certified and review her manual.

Mr. Austin asked Ms. Hardy how many employees she has. Ms. Hardy replied four. She stated it was a small 42-seat restaurant.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked out of the four current employees, how many servers would serve alcohol. Ms. Hardy replied herself and one other server. He asked if they will be BASSETT certified. Ms. Hardy replied yes.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked Ms. Hardy if she was on-site every day. Ms. Hardy replied yes, as they just opened. He asked if she planned to hire someone to help handle alcohol sales. Ms. Hardy replied yes.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski stated that the BYOB environment is different from a licensee serving alcohol. He asked Ms. Hardy if she was aware of the Control Buy Program. Ms. Hardy replied yes. He cautioned her that a violation would be expensive given the very little amount of alcohol sales she projects.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski stated that she should create a culture for employees to card patrons, follow her procedures and be vigilant in not selling to anyone who is underage. He stated that some establishments with the best manuals have failures as some employees simply did not follow the rules. He stated that she should regularly enforce the message to follow procedure.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked Ms. Hardy if she plans to hire a manager to take some pressure off her who will have experience and BASSETT training. Ms. Hardy replied yes.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked staff for recommendations or comments pertinent to this application. Ms. Kuchynka replied that issuance of the license is contingent upon receipt of satisfactory background checks, annual fee, dram shop insurance and employee certifications.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked for comments from the public. There were none.

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

MR. JACOBSON MOVED TO FIND DJ THAI RESTAURANTS D/B/A THAI FIRST LOCATED AT 2249 MAPLE AVENUE, QUALIFIED FOR A CLASS R-2, BEER AND WINE, ON-PREMISE CONSUMPTION LIQUOR LICENSE. MR. CLARY SECONDED.

VOTE: **Aye:** Mr. Jacobson, Mr. Clary, Ms. King, Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski

Nay: Mr. Austin

Abstain: None

MOTION CARRIED: 4:1:0

Coffee House Holdings, Inc. d/b/a Starbucks

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski stated that the next order of business was an application hearing for Coffee House Holdings, Inc. d/b/a Starbucks located at 5002 Main Street. He stated that Coffee House Holdings, Inc. was seeking a Class "R-2", beer and wine, on-premise consumption liquor license.

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

Mr. Daniel Nelson and Ms. Gretchen Chesley were sworn in by the court reporter. Mr. Nelson introduced himself as the liquor manager of the Ogden Avenue Starbucks. Ms. Chesley stated that she was the attorney representing Starbucks.

Ms. Kuchynka stated that Coffee House Holdings, Inc. is also seeking a Class "R-2", beer and wine, on-premise consumption liquor license and a Class "O" outdoor liquor license for the Starbucks located at 1149 Ogden Avenue. She stated that the Commission can ask questions concerning both locations, however, she noted that separate motions would need to be taken on each location and for each classification requested.

Ms. Kuchynka asked the Starbucks Regional Director to step up and be seated. Ms. Kuchynka asked that she be sworn in by the court reporter and to state and spell her name for the record. Ms. Jill Allen was sworn in by the court reporter. Ms. Allen introduced herself as the Regional Director for western suburban Starbucks locations.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked if the Main Street location was near the Main Street train station and if the Ogden location was near Downers Grove North High School. Ms. Kuchynka replied yes.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked the applicant to present its case.

Mr. Nelson stated that the Main Street Starbucks has been in operation for over 20 years. He stated that the Ogden location has been in operation for just over a year.

Mr. Nelson stated that the addition of wine and beer sales, along with high scale, small plate food, is a company wide initiative. He stated that the program is a result of customer feedback. He stated that their evenings are slow. He stated that Starbucks offers a cozier atmosphere than a bar and will be cheaper than a restaurant. He stated that the program is geared toward college students, commuters and will meet the needs of those who do not drink coffee but would like to meet up with friends at Starbucks and have other beverage options.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski stated that he was familiar with the Burr Ridge location and believe they started the evening program there about a year ago. He stated that the list of locations offering beer, wine and tapas is growing. He stated that the next closest locations are Schaumburg and Yorkville.

Ms. King noted her concern about Starbucks having enough food to compensate with alcohol sales. She stated that she was concerned that patrons would leave with an alcoholic beverage and was concerned with the young clientele at the Ogden location and its proximity to the high school.

Mr. Nelson stated that the addition of food was one of their main reasons in offering liquor. He stated that their biggest increases have been in food sales. He stated that they anticipate beer and wine sales to be less than 1% of the total beverages sold for the day. He stated that their main goal was to draw customers in to consume food and increase evening sales.

Ms. King asked what the hours are for serving alcohol. Mr. Nelson replied that 2pm would be the earliest they start to serve. He stated that at 2pm they transition from their breakfast and pastry selection and put out the evening food selection.

Ms. King asked how they plan to serve. Mr. Nelson replied that beer and wine will be served in glassware. He stated that part of the routine involved with the program additional staff will be responsible for "table touching" and regularly rotate throughout the restaurant. He stated that they will visit tables and have direct contact with the customers. He stated that they will be responsible for monitoring guests as well.

Ms. King asked about BASSETT training. Mr. Nelson stated that the entire staff will be BASSETT trained. Ms. Allen noted that the district managers and regional directors will be certified as well. She stated that all employees will be at least 21. She stated that staff members that are under 21 will be relocated to other stores that do not serve beer and wine.

Mr. Austin asked about the set up and asked if a different area will be designated for liquor service. Mr. Nelson replied beer and wine will be allowed in the entire café. Mr. Austin asked if the liquor will be served from a different area from the coffee. Mr. Nelson replied that liquor will be ordered at the counter where customers will be asked for identification and the liquor will be given to the customer directly. He stated that no alcohol will be left for pickup like coffee at the counter.

Mr. Austin asked about the age of staff. Mr. Nelson replied he has one 19 year old that will be transferred out of the store to another location. He stated all others are at least 21.

Mr. Austin stated that he reviewed the menu and that they have "small" plates. He was concerned that they were snacks and was struggling whether these small plates would be considered a meal or not. He stated that Downers Grove has required restaurants to have meal service. Mr. Nelson replied that their menu is "tapas" style in which food items are larger than a snack but a number of them can be combined and/or shared in order to make a varietal meal.

Mr. Austin asked how the menu items are prepared. Mr. Nelson replied that pre-packaged items are prepared in a microwave turbo chef oven. He stated they will be warmed and transferred onto plates. Mr. Nelson noted that in addition to the tapas evening menu, Starbucks offers items from the bakery, a variety of sandwiches, panini and salad options which would continue to be available the entire day.

Mr. Austin stated his concern that if a restaurant license is granted to Starbucks they may be diluting the restaurant classification and its significance. He stated that the nature of Starbucks is a coffee house and they have never considered themselves as a restaurant. Ms. Allen replied that they consider Starbucks a café.

Mr. Nelson noted that 35% of the units sold daily are food items. Mr. Austin stated that he would consider them a café and noted that Downers Grove requires food service.

Mr. Clary stated that they already addressed his concern about what type of container the beer and wine would be served in, which is glass. Mr. Nelson agreed.

Mr. Clary asked if there have been any liquor violations at the other stores that sell beer and wine. Mr. Nelson replied he was not aware of any.

Mr. Clary asked how many stores nationwide have alcohol. Ms. Allen replied 30, eight of which are in the Chicagoland area. She stated it is growing across the United States. Ms. Chesley noted that first test markets are in Seattle, Chicago and Portland.

Mr. Jacobson asked where the alcohol will be stored. Mr. Nelson replied that the overstock of chilled beverages will be stored in the back of the house in a locked refrigerator and non-chilled beverages will be stored in a caged area that will only be accessible to the store manager and shift managers. He stated that daily stock will be in an unlocked refrigerator behind the counter. He added that no employees will work in the store who are under 21, so no underage employee would ever have access to it.

Mr. Jacobson asked what would stop an employee from serving beer and wine before 2pm. Mr. Nelson replied store policy and culture. He stated that they have a policy against serving before 2pm and training will cover that policy. He stated that Starbucks has a culture in which employees are expected to follow policy.

Mr. Jacobson asked if they have a POS system that can lock out liquor sales until 2pm. Ms. Allen replied no, and noted that they do not have that technology on their register system.

Mr. Jacobson stated that some POS systems require employees to key in a date of birth or scan the driver's license for authenticity. He asked if Starbucks has considered this system. Ms. Chesley was unsure if corporate has considered it. Ms. Allen stated that they have not implemented it and it is not anything that they are currently utilizing.

Mr. Jacobson was concerned about the proximity to the high school and asked what they will implement to prevent underage sales. Mr. Nelson replied that it is Starbucks policy to ask for identification from everyone. He stated that they will not accept the vertical id.

Mr. Jacobson asked how many employees work each shift. Mr. Nelson replied on a typical night there are four employees on staff until 6:30 pm. He stated that there are three employees on staff until 9 and two employees on staff after 9. He noted that with the evening program they will increase and adjust the amount of staff to have more employees in the evening.

Mr. Jacobson asked what increase in staff they anticipate. Mr. Nelson replied that he estimated needing four employees until 8pm and a third employee until close.

Mr. Jacobson noted that Starbucks locations are not set up to watch people leaving with coffee. He noted that employees will have to do more work to watch the floor during the night time sales. Mr. Nelson noted that the employee assigned as "table toucher" will be monitoring the floor and tables. He stated that they will increase staff accordingly to deal with additional business.

Ms. Kuchynka noted that regardless of store policy and beginning sales at 2pm, they may legally serve at any time of day as prescribed by the Downers Grove Liquor Code.

Mr. Jacobson stated that they indicated that they will serve until close.

Mr. Jacobson stated that he heard that Starbucks applied for a license in Naperville and it was turned down. Ms. Chesley replied that Naperville tabled the decision on the license until there are additional markets in Chicago and gain experience serving beer and wine.

Mr. Jacobson asked about language in the manual where they will not allow customers to consume alcohol later than one hour past closing. Mr. Nelson replied that corporate copied the Downers Grove Liquor Code language about allowing patrons to stay after close. He stated that alcohol will be served until close.

Mr. Jacobson noted a typo in the second bullet point where the word "by" should be replaced with "that". Mr. Jacobson stated that employees will address patrons if they are sharing a drink with their minor child. Mr. Nelson replied yes.

Mr. Jacobson asked for clarification that "partners" throughout the manual is a term for employee. Mr. Nelson replied yes.

Mr. Jacobson asked if both locations have the same policy and will be operated the same. Mr. Nelson replied yes.

Mr. Jacobson asked if Ms. Allen is BASSETT certified. Ms. Allen replied that she is going through her certification class now.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski stated that he frequents the Burr Ridge store. He stated he has been denied alcohol service before 2pm at that location. He stated that the Starbucks overall culture and adherence to process is impressive.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked what the percentage of alcohol sale is at the Burr Ridge Location. Ms. Allen replied that 8-12 units are sold daily, which is less than 1% of their entire sales. She stated that store has been open for a year.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked if any of the Burr Ridge experienced employees will oversee staff at the Downers Grove locations. Ms. Allen noted that local employees will be taken to the Burr Ridge store for training so they can see how the evening operation works.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked if they had any challenges at the Burr Ridge store or thoughts from their experiences over the year. Ms. Allen replied that they have not had any challenges in serving wine and beer.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski stated that the restaurant classification can be interpreted broadly enough to include a café. He stated that through his personal experience and eating there, the food transcends to more than a snack.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski stated that he would not have any special concern about Starbucks proximity to the high school as the Main Street location has a lot of foot traffic from underage children.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski stated that they touched on a point of sale system. He noted that there are national convenience store chains that have that technology. He noted that there is a bypass on the system and although employees are required to either scan or put in the date of birth, they have been involved in a sale to minors. He stated that the best processes, register systems and manuals will fail if procedures are violated. He stated that in the violation hearing "I don't know" is the reasoning the server/seller gave when asked why they sold liquor to a minor.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski stated that some licensees have daily or weekly huddles to talk about the importance of not selling alcohol to minors.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked about the outdoor seating barrier at the Ogden location. Mr. Nelson replied that the area is enclosed with a 48" high fence. He stated that they also plan to add some landscaping along the enclosure to inhibit the passing of a drink over the fence. He stated that at other patios an alarm gate is installed.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski noted that guests cannot access the patio area without going through the store. Mr. Nelson stated that is the same as the Ogden location with an alarmed exit.

Ms. Kuchynka mentioned the patio at the Main Street location and advised that a sign will be posted on the exterior door stating "No Alcohol Beyond This Point".

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked about the Main Street outdoor seating. Ms. Kuchynka replied that the Main Street location operates its patio on a portion of public property and enters into a license agreement for the use of that public property. She stated that Starbucks opted not to allow liquor on this patio due to space constraints and fencing. She stated that in the event they wish to serve beer and wine outdoors, they would need to apply for the Class O license. She stated that the license agreement for their use of public property would need to be amended to allow beer and wine, an increase in insurance coverage along with addition of outdoor serving provisions.

Ms. King asked staff what classification The Cellar Door holds. Ms. Kuchynka replied that they hold a W-1, wine boutique license. She stated that classification allows both on and off premise sales.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked if they also sold beer. Ms. Kuchynka replied yes.

Mr. Austin asked staff what would stop Dairy Queen from applying for a restaurant license as they also serve food. He did not want to set a precedent that snacks constitute a meal under the restaurant classification. Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski disagreed with Starbucks menu options from being considered snacks and stated that they were substantive. He stated that The Cellar Door menu could be considered "small" plates as well. He noted that the Village adopted a tap house license class that has no food service at all. Mr. Austin stated that is a specific license and wanted to stay in line with the restaurant definition. He stated that there are specific license classes issued for certain activities.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked if all the Starbucks are corporate owned. Ms. Allen replied all but the airports, convention center, Target locations and a few hotels. Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked if there was any store franchising. Ms. Allen replied no.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked staff for recommendations or comments pertinent to this application. Ms. Kuchynka replied that issuance of each license is contingent upon receipt of satisfactory background checks and employee certifications.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked for comments from the public. There were none.

Hearing the testimony given in this case, Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked for a recommendation from the Commission concerning its finding of "qualified" or "not qualified" with respect to the applicant with regard to the Class "R-2" liquor license application for the 5002 Main Street location.

MS. KING MOVED TO FIND COFFEE HOUSE HOLDINGS, INC. D/B/A STARBUCKS LOCATED AT 5002 MAIN STREET, QUALIFIED FOR A CLASS R-2, BEER AND WINE, ON-PREMISE CONSUMPTION LIQUOR LICENSE. MR. CLARY SECONDED.

VOTE: **Aye:** Ms. King, Mr. Clary, Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski
 Nay: None
 Abstain: Mr. Austin, Mr. Jacobson

Mr. Austin abstained because he believed that the R-2 classification was not appropriate and he questioned whether Starbucks would qualify as a restaurant. Ms. Didier replied that he should vote no.

Mr. Jacobson abstained because he has a client who is in litigation with Starbucks and did not feel it appropriate for him to vote.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked if the 3:2 vote carries the motion. Ms. Didier replied yes.

MOTION CARRIED: 3:0:2

Hearing the testimony given in this case, Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked for a recommendation from the Commission concerning its finding of "qualified" or "not qualified" with respect to the applicant with regard to the Class "R-2" liquor license application for the 1149 Ogden Avenue location.

MR. CLARY MOVED TO FIND COFFEE HOUSE HOLDINGS, INC. D/B/A STARBUCKS LOCATED AT 1149 OGDEN AVENUE, QUALIFIED FOR A CLASS R-2, BEER AND WINE, ON-PREMISE CONSUMPTION LIQUOR LICENSE. MS. KING SECONDED.

VOTE: **Aye:** Mr. Clary, Ms. King, Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski
 Nay: None
 Abstain: Mr. Austin, Mr. Jacobson

Mr. Austin abstained for the same reason.

Mr. Jacobson abstained for the same reason.

MOTION CARRIED: 3:0:2

Hearing the testimony given in this case, Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked for a recommendation from the Commission concerning its finding of "qualified" or "not qualified" with respect to the applicant with regard to the Class "O" liquor license application for the 1149 Ogden Avenue location.

MS. KING MOVED TO FIND COFFEE HOUSE HOLDINGS, INC. D/B/A STARBUCKS LOCATED AT 1149 OGDEN AVENUE, QUALIFIED FOR A CLASS O, OUTDOOR LIQUOR LICENSE. MR. CLARY SECONDED.

VOTE: **Aye:** Ms. King, Mr. Clary, Mr. Austin, Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski

Nay: None

Abstain: Mr. Jacobson

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked if the outdoor license was irrespective of the indoor license. Ms. Didier replied yes.

Mr. Jacobson abstained for the same reason.

MOTION CARRIED: 4:0:1

Mr. Jacobson asked how soon they plan on adding the new products. Mr. Nelson replied that they plan on rolling it out on or about November 3rd.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

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

Ms. Kuchynka noted that she forwarded month end reports over the past few months.

Ms. Kuchynka stated that the renewal process was successful. Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked if any licensees were denied a renewal. Ms. Kuchynka replied no. Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked if all licensees renewed. Ms. Kuchynka replied that Rita's, Shanahan's, CVS and United Liquors did not renew. She corrected her last comment and clarified that Walgreens on Lemont, not CVS, did not renew.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski stated that he was in the Bed, Bath and Beyond in California and they had the exact same set up as the Downers Grove location.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Kuchynka stated that an application was on file and that there will be an October 1, 2015 meeting.

Mr. Jacobson asked why the Commission no longer received DUI Notification information. He stated that a licensee's renewal could be held if they received a number of these. He questioned whether or not the Commission has ever had hearings on these matters. Ms. Kuchynka replied yes. She stated in years past there were problems at North Beach and they were brought before the Commission for a renewal hearing. She stated that no licensee was ever denied a renewal as a result of such hearing.

Ms. Kuchynka replied she was unaware of any notifications. She stated that the arrestee does not have to answer where they have been drinking prior to the arrest. She only recalled one being from Rita's however, they have since closed.

Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski asked if the number of DUIs has gone down. Ms. Kuchynka replied from years pasts, DUIs have decreased.

Mr. Jacobson mentioned zero tolerance cases. Ms. Kuchynka stated that the Village gets notified from the Secretary of State when underage people are caught with possession of alcohol.

VIII. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were none.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Concluding business for the evening, Chairman Pro Tem Krusenoski called for a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Jacobson moved to adjourn the September 3, 2015 meeting. The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 7:40 p.m.

APPROVED 9/14/15

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
PUBLIC HEARING

AUGUST 3, 2015, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Rickard called the August 3, 2015 meeting of the Downers Grove Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and led the Plan Commissioners and public in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Chairman Rickard, Mr. Bassler, Mr. Cozzo, Ms. Hogstrom, Mr. Quirk, Mrs. Rabatah, Mr. Thoman (ex.-officio Souter)

ABSENT: Mr. Webster (ex-officios Davenport, Menninga)

STAFF: Planning Manager, Stan Popovich, AICP; Village Planner Patrick Ainsworth, AICP and Planning Intern Ross Pietrzak

VISITORS: Mr. Ken Rathje, Rathje Planning, Downers Grove; Messrs. Mike Ricamato and Randy Thomas with The Alter Group, Skokie; Mr. Michael Cassa, president, Downers Grove Economic Development Corporation; Residents Ron and Rose Wirge, Tom LeCran; Mr. Jeff Mond, 4605 Cross Street, Downers Grove; Ms. Donna DeLou, 4617 Druendel Road, Downers Grove; Aaron Zeigler, 4201 Stadium Drive, Kalamazoo, Michigan

Chairman Rickard led the commission in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance and explained the protocol for the meeting.

APPROVAL OF JULY 6, 2015 MINUTES

MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2015 MEETING WERE APPROVED ON MOTION BY MR. THOMAN, SECONDED BY MS. HOGSTROM. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 4-0-3 (ABSTAIN: MR. BASSLER, MS. HOGSTROM, MR. THOMAN)

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Chairman Rickard explained the protocol for the public hearings and swore in those individuals that would be speaking on the following petitions:

FILE 15-PLC-0017 (previously continued): A petition seeking approval of a Special Use for a fueling station to redevelop the existing gas station. The subject property is zoned B-3, General Services and Highway Business. The property is located on the west side of Finley Road between Ogden Avenue and Warrenville Road, commonly known as 2212 Ogden Avenue, Downers Grove,

APPROVED 9/14/15

IL (08-01-402-006, -007, -008). Ambrose Design Group, LLC, Petitioner; TrueNorth Energy, LLC, Owner.

Chairman Rickard stated that the petitioner has requested to continue the hearing to the October 5, 2015 meeting.

MOTION BY MRS. RABATAH, SECONDED BY MR. COZZO TO CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING TO OCTOBER 5, 2015. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 7-0.

FILE 15-PLC-0025: A petition seeking approval of a Final Plat of Subdivision to subdivide the existing property into two lots. The property is currently zoned R-3, Residential Detached House 3. The subject property is located on the east side of Victor Street, approximately 130 feet north of 6th Street, commonly known as 5307 Victor Street, Downers Grove, IL (09-09-323- 013). Xhevrije Osmani, Petitioner and Fikri Osmani, Owner.

Chairman Rickard stated that the petitioner has requested to continue the hearing to the September 14, 2015 meeting.

MOTION BY MR. QUIRK, SECONDED BY MS. HOGSTROM TO CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING TO SEPTEMBER 14, 2015. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 7-0.

FILE 15-PLC-0021 (previously continued): A petition seeking approval of a Final Plat of Subdivision to subdivide the existing property into two lots. The property is currently zoned O-R-M, Office-Research-Manufacturing. The subject property is located at the southeast corner of Ogden and Walnut Avenues, commonly known as 2801 Ogden Avenue, Downers Grove, IL (08-01-304-002, -003, -022, -028 and 08-01-307-001, -002, and -003). The Alter Group, Petitioner and Owner.

Mr. Ainsworth reviewed the location of the 18.1-acre site which sat vacant. The lot is co-owned by the Alter Group and the Downers Grove Park District. The proposal is to redistribute the seven existing lots into two new lots. Lot 2 would be owned by the Downers Grove Park District and contain the existing wetland while Lot 1 would be owned by the Alter Group. No development plans were planned for the two lots at this time. Originally the entire site was set aside in the Comprehensive Plan for big box retail; however, due to development issues, the proposal tonight was for Lot 1 (3.3 acres) to go to the Alter Group and Lot 2 (14.8 acres) to go to the park district. Mr. Ainsworth discussed how certain provisions in the Comprehensive Plan encourage recreational opportunities within the village.

Continuing, Mr. Ainsworth reported the village would be entering into a subdivision improvement agreement with the two property owners for future public improvements based on future developments. Details followed. There were no standards for approval on this proposal although both lots met the lot dimension requirements in both the Subdivision and Zoning Ordinances.

Questions followed as to how the irregular shape was benefiting the owner, i.e., it allowed development to take place on Lot 1 and would have a buffer zone around the wetland, per county regulations. Asked if Lot 1 would have access to Walnut Avenue, Mr. Ainsworth explained it

APPROVED 9/14/15

would depend upon the development coming in. Determining lot depth to Ogden Avenue was then discussed. Staff was satisfied with the lot depth.

Mr. Ken Rathje, Rathje Planning Services, 412 Chicago Avenue, Downers Grove, stated he was representing both owners and explained that the proposal was more of a lot consolidation into two lots versus a subdivision. A history of the parcels followed, noting that the park district had always planned to acquire the piece of property, for as long as 20 years, as open, passive space. Continuing, Mr. Rathje described that the Alter piece of property on the north would include access, at minimum, along Walnut Avenue with a possibility of a right-in/right-out on Ogden Avenue. Lot dimensions followed. To date, he said the park district had no plans to develop the property but was responsible for providing appropriate storm water management and appropriate public improvements when development came in. The same followed for the Alter Group. The depth of the property was, again, discussed, noting the narrowest part of Lot 1 was about 230 feet.

Mr. Quirk found it interesting that the site, even though being eyed by the park district for many years, was listed as a catalyst site for big box retail and mixed into the comprehensive plan. However, Mr. Rathje explained that many times public entities, when interested in acquiring property will not disclose, publicly, their interest and it was not unusual for a comprehensive plan to not disclose something similar. Mr. Rathje did acknowledge that there was language in the comprehensive plan that did anticipate the possibility of open space. He further explained the initial challenges of the property with the Alter Group.

Chairman Rickard opened up the meeting to public comment.

Ms. Donna DeLou, 4617 Druendel Road, Downers Grove, was pleased to see that the park district was acquiring the open space because she always had concerns about the property. Also there were many empty stores in the strip mall nearby. She was glad to see the open space because it helped with the flooding in the area but also helped with the wildlife. She asked that if future development does come in to keep the 100-year old tree on the site and the parties work with the park district.

No further comments followed.

Mr. Rathje emphasized that both parties will be obligated to provide stormwater detention for the development of their property, as appropriate and as required by the ordinance.

Chairman Rickard closed the public hearing and opened up the discussion to the commissioners.

Commissioner comments were that the proposal appeared to be a win for both parties; by having the wetlands removed from the lot, it made Lot 1 more marketable; and it was consistent with the comprehensive plan.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE 15-PLC-0021, MR. COZZO MADE A MOTION TO FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL, SUBJECT TO THE TWO (2) CONDITIONS LISTED IN STAFF'S MEMORANDUM.

SECONDED BY MRS. RABATAH. ROLL CALL:

APPROVED 9/14/15

**AYE: MR. COZZO, MRS. RABATAH, MR. BASSLER, MS. HOGSTROM, MR. QUIRK,
MR. THOMAN; CHAIRMAN RICKARD**

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 7-0

FILE 15-PLC-0022: A petition seeking approval of a Special Use to permit the operation of a Warehousing Business (Internet Retail Sales). The property is currently zoned O-R, Office-Research. The property is located at the southwest corner of Highland Avenue and 31st Street, commonly known as 1001 31st Street, Downers Grove, IL (06-32-100-012). Pro Stock Hockey, LLC, Petitioner and Steel Family Real Estate, LLC, Owner. e. 15-PLC-0024:

Planning Intern Ross Pietrzak located the site on the overhead and reported that the proposal had been in the works for some time. The village council approved a text amendment in June 2015, which allowed for a special use of Warehousing in the O-R Office-Research zoning district. Currently a 3-story building and parking lot existed on the site and the building was designed in such a way that the first floor was considered the lower level while the second floor was considered the first floor with a main lobby. Currently, the Pro Stock Hockey business conducts phone sales and has no on-site sales; just a storage area and a few offices.

Per staff, the site was being designated as Warehousing because the primary use was to store equipment that included used professional hockey equipment sold to the general public at a lower price. A list of the equipment followed. Access on 31st Street was noted as well as the circulation for the various delivery trucks, such as Fed-X and UPS. Direct access was located at the northwest corner of the building.

Mr. Pietrzak reviewed the standards for the warehousing use in the O-R district and explained how the proposal met the standards, except for the need of one handicap parking space, as stated in staff's report. By filling a vacancy in the building, the business made the area more desirable and more active and there was no detrimental concern to the health, safety and welfare of the residents. The proposal met all the standards for approval in the Zoning Ordinance. Staff recommended a positive recommendation to the village council.

Comments followed that this case was brought before the village council prior who directed the applicant to work with staff on a text amendment for a special use in the O-R Office Research zoning district.

On behalf of the petitioner, Mr. Ken Rathje with Rathje Planning Services, appeared along with Mr. David Duerr, CEO of Pro Stock Hockey and Straight North Corporation. In summary, he explained his client's business was an Internet retail sales business. A history of how he became familiar with his client as well as a history of the used hockey equipment business followed. Mr. Rathje confirmed that Pro Stock Hockey does not allow the public to visit their office site and merchandise is shipped to the buyer via Fed-X.

Mr. Rathje closed by stating the petitioner satisfied all of the requirements and met the warehousing use which was recently adopted by the village council and became an authorized use under the underlying O-R Office Research zoning district. Mr. Rathje reviewed each of the standards of the

APPROVED 9/14/15

special use and explained how the proposed use met those standards. He emphasized that staff worked with his client since the start of the petition and he hoped the commission would forward a positive recommendation to the village council.

Per a question regarding the hours of operation, Mr. David Duerr, 11844 Crosscreek Court, Burr Ridge, responded that typically employees arrive between 7:00 AM and 8:00 AM and leave between 4:00 PM and 5:00 PM and do not work weekends nor after hours. Asked if there were shared employees between Straight North and Pro Stock Hockey, Mr. Duerr said there were about a dozen employees that worked between the two companies and were either graphic designers, marketing reps, or web developers. Both companies were located on the same floor of the building: one business on the west side and one on the east side. Details followed. Average shipments for the day: during summer months was about 5 to 10 orders; during the peak period was about 15 to 30 orders. Dialog followed regarding the level of noise coming from the company's Flex-check machine which checked the flexibility of the hockey sticks. Per Mr. Duerr, there were no complaints received from any other building tenant.

Chairman Rickard opened up the meeting to public comment. None received.

Mr. Rathje closed by thanking staff for their assistance on the petition.

Public comment was closed.

Mrs. Rabatah asked staff for clarification regarding staff's Recommendation No. 1 as it related to any change in the operation of the business, expansion of the business scope, or increase in floor area and having to return to the village. Mr. Popovich explained that if the business operations intensifies and expands into any other space than what has been approved, the petitioner would have to return to the village to amend their Special Use approval. However, minor changes in the special use could be approved administratively by staff. Examples followed. As to a question about making one of the parking spaces a handicap spaces, Mr. Popovich confirmed that staff requested the petitioner to provide another handicap space to meet the parking requirements, if this petition was approved. Mr. Cozzo also confirmed that the standards for approval on this petition had been met.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE 15-PLC-022, MR. QUIRK MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL, SUBJECT TO THE TWO CONDITIONS IN STAFF'S MEMO.

SECONDED BY MS. HOGSTROM. ROLL CALL:

**AYE: MR. QUICK, MS. HOGSTROM, MR. BASSLER, MR. COZZO, MRS. RABATAH,
MR THOMAN, CHAIRMAN RICKARD**

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 7-0

FILE 15-PLC-0024: A petition seeking approval of a Special Use to permit the operation of a Personal Vehicle Sales and Rentals (Automobile Dealership) business. The property is currently

APPROVED 9/14/15

zoned B-3, General Services and Highway Business. The property is located at the southeast corner of Cross Street and Ogden Avenue, commonly known as 2501 Ogden Avenue, Downers Grove, IL (08-01-306-024). AJZ-Downers Grove II, LLC, Petitioner and Old Second National Bank, Owner.

Mr. Ainsworth located the 1.77-acre site on the overhead for the commissioners stating the site was improved with a one-story vacant commercial/retail building with a large open space and surface parking lot. The prior use for the site was an automobile dealership but due to the length of time the site sat vacant, the owner could not re-establish the former special use by-right. The village's new ordinance required that after a site has sat vacant for more than six months, the owner has to return to the Plan Commission to reactivate the special use, which the petitioner was doing tonight.

A current site plan was presented and reviewed. The access off of Ogden Avenue would remain the same and the parking lot would be re-stripped designating employee parking and a two-way drive access aisle which circled around the building. There would be increased landscaping, the two-bay doors on the west elevation would become offices, and the owner intended to do some minor aesthetic improvements to make the building more customer-friendly. There is some intent to redevelop the property but that was not under consideration for tonight's meeting.

Mr. Ainsworth described how a car carrier would access, stage, and then drive around the site to exit the site. No repairs, maintenance or detail operations would be done on the site. He reminded the commissioners how the Comprehensive Plan supports such uses along the Ogden Avenue Corridor for automobile-type businesses. Per Mr. Ainsworth, the proposed site and the reactivation of the special use met the requirements of the village's Comprehensive Plan. However, staff listed ten (10) conditions in its staff report to ensure that the petitioner remained a good neighbor.

Chairman Rickard asked staff to point out the No Parking Anytime restrictions over the septic area wherein Mr. Ainsworth proceeded to do so. He did confirm that prior, vehicles were parked on the septic area. Mr. Thoman voiced concern and asked whether the septic fields were checked for any damage to which Mr. Ainsworth responded that he asked the same question and, to date, there were no issues with the septic field. He reminded the commissioners that if any septic field issues did arise, the owner would have to work with the DuPage County Health Department to mitigate them. Regarding the green space on the northeast corner of the site, Mr. Ainsworth explained it had been part of a lot consolidation but now was part of the subject property and would have minimum requirements to be maintained as green space. Lastly, regarding staff's Recommendation No. 9, as it related to vehicle test drives, Mr. Ainsworth discussed that the recommendation were listed to prohibit tests drives on residential streets.

Petitioner, Aaron Zeigler, 4201 Stadium Drive, Kalamazoo, Michigan, shared that in 2010 he constructed the Chrysler/Dodge dealership down the road from the subject property. Due to lack of land at his current location, he was planning to expand operations by using the subject site as a Dodge Promaster franchise. No service, maintenance or detail work would be done at the site. Per an earlier question about the septic, Mr. Zeigler confirmed that he did have an inspection of the septic system, it passed inspection, and had a letter to confirm same. He was not planning to park vehicles on the septic area.

Questions followed regarding the lighting for the property, wherein Mr. Zeigler stated there was some lighting but he was planning to bring the lighting up to code, with possible LED lighting in the future.

APPROVED 9/14/15

Chairman Rickard opened up the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Jeff Mond, 4605 Cross Street, Downers Grove, lives down the street from the lot and has lived in his house since 1981. He expressed concern about test driving and stated that there has been test driving from Zeigler Motors, Max Maddson and previous dealerships. He stated that young families are moving in with young children. His street is a straight pass to the Burlington train tracks and there has been an increase in traffic since the redevelopment of the tracks. He asked if something could be done so that there are no test drives down his street or to use Walnut Street, since it was less residential than Cross Street. Also, he stated there was no left turn onto Cross Street because it was a dangerous area and he recommended that there be no left-turns at all in the area. Lastly, Mr. Mond expressed concern about car carriers parking on Cross Street, noting it was very narrow and he saw trucks getting stuck while trying to turn around.

Mr. Michael Cassa, president of the Downers Grove Economic Development Corporation, spoke about the positives of the proposal, reminding the commissioners that the petitioner was going to be taking a vacant Catalyst site and turning it into a vital business which will generate approximately \$240,000 per year in sales tax revenue for the village. He thanked both the petitioner and staff for making the proposal a reality.

Mr. Zeigler declined a closing statement and the public hearing portion was closed by the chairman.

Commissioner questions followed regarding enforcement issues arising and what the neighbors could do if test drives occurred. Also, the positives of the business and the petitioner were mentioned by Mr. Thoman, noting the owner did a fine job at his current dealership.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE 15-PLC-0024, MR. THOMAN MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL, SUBJECT TO STAFF'S 10 CONDITIONS IN ITS MEMO.

SECONDED BY MR. QUIRK. ROLL CALL:

**AYE: MR. THOMAN, MR. QUIRK, MR. BASSLER, MR. COZZO, MS. HOGSTROM,
MRS. RABATAH, CHAIRMAN RICKARD**

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 7-0

Mr. Popovich announced that the next meeting will be scheduled for September 14, 2015 and Planner Kelly Chrise resigned last week and will be working for the Village of Wood Dale. He also expects the village council to appoint a commissioner to this commission at its last meeting this month.

**THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:36 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. QUIRK,
SECONDED BY MR. COZZO. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE
OF 7-0.**

/s/ Celeste K. Weilandt

APPROVED 9/14/15

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

APPROVED 9/14/15

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
PUBLIC HEARING

SEPTEMBER 3, 2015, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Rickard called the September 3, 2015 meeting of the Downers Grove Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and led the Plan Commissioners and public in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Chairman Rickard, Mr. Cozzo, Ms. Hogstrom, Mrs. Rabatah, Mr. Thoman

ABSENT: Mr. Bassler, Mr. Cronin, Mr. Quirk, (ex-officios Davenport, Menninga, Souter)

STAFF: Planning Manager, Stan Popovich, AICP; Marcia Schirdewahn

VISITORS: Bob Peterson, 6861 Camden Road, Downers Grove

Chairman Rickard explained the protocol for the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Chairman Rickard explained the protocol for the public hearings and swore in those individuals that would be speaking on the following petitions:

FILE 15-PLC-0034: A petition seeking approval of text amendments to Article 9, Signs. Village of Downers Grove, Petitioner.

Planning Manager Stan Popovich reviewed the Reed vs. Gilbert U.S. Supreme Court decision from June 2015. He noted this case involved non-commercial sign regulations that incorporated different rules and sign regulations based upon the type of non-commercial message being delivered, e.g. religious versus political signs. He noted that the Supreme Court declared that this differentiation rendered non-commercial sign restrictions to be content-based speech regulations subject to strict scrutiny, the most stringent standard of judicial review.

Mr. Popovich noted the Village's non-commercial portion of the Sign Ordinance possesses some similarities to the Town of Gilbert's regulations. Provisions such as these had previously been held constitutionally valid non-commercial speech regulations prior to Reed, but with the Reed decision, the U.S. Supreme Court has found these types of regulations to be content-based speech regulations. The U.S. Supreme Court has historically held that non-commercial speech gets greater First Amendment protection than commercial speech.

Mr. Popovich stated the commercial portion of the Sign Ordinance is viewed as a time, place and manner regulation that is content neutral. Previous U.S. Supreme Court rulings have noted these types of regulations are content neutral.

APPROVED 9/14/15

Mr. Popovich noted that to protect the Sign Ordinance from constitutional challenges, the Village is requesting two amendments to the Sign Ordinance. The first is a substitution clause. A substitution clause would permit non-commercial copy to be substituted in place of any commercial copy. The clause allows commercial signs to be substituted with a non-commercial message. As such, non-commercial speech is never discriminated against. The substitution clause has the legal effect of regulating all varieties of non-commercial speech in the same manner. Mr. Popovich provided an example of the substitution clause and noted the clause's proposed language on the overhead.

Mr. Popovich noted the second change is the inclusion of a specific severance clause in the Sign Ordinance. Although the state has a general severance clause and the Village has a severance clause in Section 1.130, the specific proposed clause in the Sign Ordinance would provide that valid sign regulations can stand on their own and be severed from sign regulations that are found to be invalid. Mr. Popovich noted the clause's proposed language on the overhead.

Mr. Popovich noted the two standards for approval for text amendments. He noted the requested revisions are consistent with the policy and intent of the Comprehensive Plan. The plan wishes to maintain the Village's image and desirability, improve economic vitality and calls for review and updates of the Sign Ordinance to be flexible. Standard two is also met as the proposed amendments meet a challenging and changing condition. Reed has changed how municipalities must administer and draft sign regulations to ensure non-commercial speech is not discriminated against.

Mr. Popovich recommended the Plan Commission forward a positive recommendation to the Council.

It was confirmed for Mr. Thoman that a severance clause already existed in the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Thoman received further clarification on what non-commercial speech could be substituted for commercial speech. He was concerned about hateful speech and the allowance for that under non-commercial speech. Mr. Popovich explained that permits are not required for non-commercial speech. Mr. Popovich noted if a commercial message was replaced by a non-commercial message, it would most likely be a Code Enforcement Officer who would notice it first since they are on the streets more often.

Mr. Thoman noted other municipalities have similar substitution clauses wherein Mr. Popovich noted there were not any glaring concerns from other communities with these clauses. Mr. Popovich noted it was important not to discriminate against non-commercial speech.

Mr. Rickard inquired about home occupation signs being placed in a yard where political signs are located. Mr. Popovich explained home occupation signs are commercial speech and have specific time, place and manner restrictions. If the professional wished to replace his home occupation sign with a political sign that would be permitted under the substitution clause.

Mr. Popovich was not aware of how long other communities have had a substitution clause but noted it is becoming a trend in municipal sign regulations. Following up, Mr. Cozzo noted the challenging situation municipalities will be facing based on Reed.

Ms. Hogstrom inquired about non-commercial sign size regulations, wherein it was explained that the Village cannot differentiate based on the type of non-commercial messages being conveyed.

APPROVED 9/14/15

Chairman Rickard opened up the meeting for public comment.

Mr. Bob Peterson, 6861 Camden Road, Downers Grove, spoke and noted he owns Leibundguth Moving and Storage and was suing the Village over the Sign Ordinance and his painted sign on the back of his building. Mr. Peterson expressed his discontent with the Sign Ordinance. He noted the smaller signs are harder to read and cause people to slow down and have to turn around to read a sign. He was concerned that this would allow graffiti and disparaging remarks about the Village to be displayed. He has spoken to other businesses who have noted displeasure over the sign ordinance as well. He cautioned that the Sign Ordinance is hurting businesses, which in turn causes the middle class to pay more taxes because the rich hardly pay anything and the "poor don't have it". He noted there used to be a lot more car dealers, hardware stores and gas stations in downtown but they are all looking for bigger businesses and move out of downtown, but the sign code makes them get smaller signs.

Mr. Popovich noted property maintenance codes deal with graffiti. Mr. Popovich noted the criteria for a text amendment were met and asked that the Plan Commission forward a positive recommendation to the Village Council.

Chairman Rickard closed the public participation portion of the meeting.

Mr. Thoman noted his concern about obscenity or hate laden non-commercial messages, but felt there had to be something in the municipal code already about community standards. He is supportive of the two changes and inquired when the entire Sign Ordinance would be reviewed.

Mr. Cozzo felt the ruling itself is difficult to deal with for municipalities. It could be a mess for communities and could open up a lot of gray situations. Other members agreed. Ms. Hogstrom noted similar thoughts in other articles about the Reed decision. Mrs. Rabatah felt the proposed amendments were sufficient for right now.

Mr. Cozzo agreed with Mr. Thoman's concern about hate language but felt this was a necessary first step to address the Reed decision. He felt the standards for approval of the proposed text amendments were met. Mr. Thoman concurred.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE 15-PLC-034, MR. COZZO MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL.

SECONDED BY MRS. RABATAH

ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. COZZO, MRS. RABATAH, MS. HOGSTROM, MR THOMAN, CHAIRMAN RICKARD

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 5-0

APPROVED 9/14/15

Mr. Popovich announced that the next meeting is scheduled for September 14, 2015 and there are three items on the agenda. Mr. Popovich thanked the commission members for their attendance tonight and thanked Marcia Schirdewahn for helping with meeting notes.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 7:40 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. THOMAN, SECONDED BY MS. HOGSTROM. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 5-0.

/s/ Stan Popovich, AICP
Stan Popovich, AICP

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
Stormwater and Flood Plain Oversight Committee Meeting
June 11, 2015 7:00 p.m.

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

I. CALL to ORDER

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

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Chair Gorman, Mr. Civito, Mr. Crilly, Mr. Ruyle, Mr. Schoenberg, Mr. Wicklander

Members Absent: Mr. Scacco

Staff Present: Karen Daulton Lange, Stormwater Administrator

Public Present: Jo Potts, 216 Lincoln.

III. APPROVAL of February 2, 2015 MINUTES

Mr. Ruyle made a motion, seconded by Mr. Crilly, to approve the February 2, 2015 minutes as presented. Motion carried by voice vote of 6-0.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None at this part of the meeting.

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. Stormwater Utility Credit & Incentive Manual

Staff gave a brief summary of conversations from Council to increase some of the incentives in the Manual. They will discuss further in the future in conjunction with the budget discussions.

B. Stormwater Policies

Chair Gorman has asked that the Committee be made aware of stormwater policies in Downers Grove. Staff directed the Committee to the Council link on the home page and on the right hand side there is a list of links to Village policies. The Cost Share Policy and Guide was distributed, along with Maintenance of Stormwater Control Structures and Creek Channels, Wetlands and Natural Stream Preservation, and Land/Property Floodplain Purchases. Chair Gorman reiterated it was important for the Committee members to be familiar with the policies so they understand the levels of service the Village provides. While some of the policies may be older, the understanding of them will help the Committee make recommendations to the Council on any potential changes.

C. Preliminary Floodplain Maps

FEMA issued preliminary maps on June 3, 2015, to all communities in DuPage County. On Wednesday, July 29, 2015, the ISWS, on behalf of FEMA, is hosting an Open House meeting to present the newly produced digital Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) and Flood Insurance Study (FIS) for DuPage County, Illinois and Incorporated Areas. Staff will attend.

In Downers Grove, approximately 600 parcels will be newly classified into floodplain and 400 parcels removed. The preliminary maps, while not regulatory yet, are being used as “Best Available Information”, which is a defined term that allows us to use the elevations now with reviews and permitting.

Staff partnered with the Village of Lisle to host a second Open House on the FEMA Preliminary Floodplain Maps this past Tuesday evening, giving our residents another opportunity to meet with staff to discuss the potential impacts of the new mapping.

The SW&FPOC looked over the printed floodplain maps that staff brought to the meeting. It was discussed that FEMA updates the maps every ten years or so, and these maps reflect newer modeling and survey information. It is Staff’s understanding that the modeling was done prior to the April 2013 floods, and staff has noticed that the Preliminary maps actually reflect to a great extent what was observed in the 2013 floods.

Mr. Ruyle asked about the Brookbank sewer being submerged; staff will investigate why it was designed this way.

Chair Gorman explained the Comment & Appeals period that would be forthcoming after the County hosts the Open House on July 29th. Staff explained they were looking through the list of Letter of Map Changes that have been superseded by FEMA with the preliminary maps and determining if we agree. Discussion ensued about LPDAs with regards to flood insurance and building regulations.

VI. STAFF REPORT

See Attachment 1.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No further public comment.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Civito inquired about the PCBMP net new impervious threshold of 700 SF that the Village adopted. Discussion regarding the methods to provide PCBMPs, such as dry wells, permeable pavers, rain gardens, etc. Staff stated that the PCBMP Manual is on the website on our Stormwater Management Page. Photos and typical details are included in the Manual.

IV. ADJOURN

Mr. Wicklander made a motion, seconded by Mr. Civito to adjourn the meeting at 8:00 p.m. Motion carried by voice vote of 6-0.

Staff Report – Attachment 1 June 11, 2015

A. HMGP

Appraisals for the four homes in FP were received and reviewed with owners. They are in process of signing statement of voluntary interest and we are getting RFPs for title reports. Hope to close by August.

B. New CFMs

Susan Quasney, Staff Engineer in Public Works, and Julie Lomax, Development Engineer in Community Development, both passed the Certified Floodplain Managers (CFM) exam. The CFM is a national program for certifying floodplain managers. The exam measures a person's knowledge of a community's responsibilities under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) and related floodplain management topics. The Village now has five CFMs: Karen Daulton Lange, Kerry Behr, Bill McClain, Susan and Julie. The designation gives confidence and enhances the knowledge we give to our residents when responding to inquiries on floodplain management and regulations,

C. Stormwater Presentations

The Stormwater Administrator made two presentations in May. The first to the 5th Annual Sustainability Conference in Schaumburg on Village practices that further sustainability, and the second at the IAFSM Stormwater Utility Seminar in Chicago. Next week she will be addressing the 2015 Illinois Collection Systems Conference on the Downers Grove SWU.

D. St. Joseph Creek Stream Corridor Assessment

CBBEL has completed their inspection of the creek from Carpenter to the DGSD plant and will be preparing a report on the condition of the creek. The purpose of this project is to study and identify areas of St. Joseph's Creek that have seen streambank erosion infestation by invasive species, blockages and any other deficiencies that may need repair or restoration.

E. Urban Flooding Awareness Act

Last week U.S. Representative Mike Quigley (IL-05) and U.S. Senator Dick Durbin (D-IL) introduced the bicameral Urban Flooding Awareness Act to address increased flooding in urban communities and to find solutions for the urban communities impacted. Over the past six months, staff participated in preliminary meetings hosted by IDNR to give input into the UFAA. These meetings were think-tank type of environment to explore the issues of urban flooding including review and evaluation of methods of identification of areas at risk for urban flooding, current policy, and procedures, recent research, best practices and identification of actions to prevent, fund, and control urban flooding.

TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION
Minutes

July 8, 2015, 7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers - Village Hall
801 Burlington Avenue, Downers Grove

Chairman Stuebner called to order the July 8, 2015 meeting of the Transportation and Parking Commission at 7:00 p.m. and led the commissioners in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll call followed and a quorum was established.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chairman Stuebner, Commissioners Carter, Saricks, Schiller, Wilkinson

Absent: Commissioner Cronin, Golomb, Wrobel

Staff Present: Transportation Division Manager Matt Mayer

Chairman Stuebner reviewed the protocol for the meeting.

MINUTES

MINUTES OF THE MAY 13, 2015 MEETING WERE APPROVED ON MOTION BY MR. SCHILLER, SECONDED BY MR. SARICKS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 5-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT (on non-Agenda items) – None.

File #08-15 Village Traffic Projects and Priorities – Traffic Division Mgr. Matthew Mayer explained that he was seeking commissioner input as to new projects that he could undertake either internally or with consultants, as a two step process. He would try his best to answer any questions. He shared that later in the discussion he would be able to provide some updates. However, tonight's meeting would focus on the purpose of the commission, what projects should it be or not be reviewing, etc., and taking a holistic view. The chairman immediately stated that any and all transportation issues should be considered by the commission but some of them have been ignored previously or forwarded to the Plan Commission or directly to the Village Council. The chairman believed much experience existed on this commission which could provide a great resource to the village.

Mr. Mayer stated the goal for tonight was for staff to provide a list of projects that staff identified for additional evaluation, come up with an order of priority projects, and consider the best way to allocate village funding resources to the project. He shared the variety of projects that have come before staff. As to whether there was a formal process in place for transportation issues to be brought to the commission, Mr. Mayer explained that a petition process existed. Asked if there was any formal process that staff used to document inquiries, Mr. Mayer stated calls or complaints were entered into the CRC database, and were assigned to village staff members. As the issue/complaint gets resolved, it is updated and tracked through the CRC database. More specifically, Mr. Schiller inquired as to how Finley Mall came to this commission, i.e., was it a call from a store owner, police, etc., wherein Mr. Mayer proceeded to explain more detail on how the matter came about.

Chairman Stuebner clarified for staff that it appeared the commission did not have the public input it used to have and he was trying to understand why. He asked if transportation issues were being directed to staff, were they being tracked, and how was it determined whether they

Transportation and Parking Commission

July 8, 2015

were going to be part of a public hearing or was it a decision that staff made on the issue? Mr. Mayer shared how he addressed speeding issues step by step but stated some of the other issues required a formal petition to begin the process.

While Mr. Schiller explained his understanding of the current process and what staff was now asking the commission to do, in all honesty he did not know how to prioritize such tasks nor know what was important to the residents or what the sense of public safety issues were for Finley Mall, for example. The chairman and others then proceeded to voice their support for the neighborhood traffic studies with the chairman expressing his support for the installation of traffic calming devices when the roadways were being rebuilt because it made financial sense.

Additional comments/concerns raised included the recent Neighborhood Traffic Study No. 4 that went before the village council and the residents and council voicing their comments but none of those comments returned to this commission. On that point, Mr. Mayer indicated that the neighborhood study was approved by council last night where the topic of double-yellow centerline striping was initiated by a resident. Further details followed.

Chairman Stuebner then asked Mr. Mayer about the five year plan as it related to streets and how traffic calming was factored into the process. Asked at what point did the residents get to provide their input on whether the traffic calming would be part of their street rebuild, Mr. Mayer could not answer but would follow up. Furthermore, the chairman stated this commission was the voice for the residents and now he questioned whether that voice was important to the village. He asked where the council liaison and police liaison were. His concern was the lack of feedback from the residents and informing the residents as to what was going to be occurring in their neighborhoods.

Mr. Saricks recalled at earlier meetings there were discussions about future traffic calming in conjunction with scheduled repairs of roadways. However, Chairman Stuebner responded that was what the commission "was told" and then proceeded to share that the traffic calming matter slowly went away due to not being enough money in the budget and no manpower to install them.

To the point, Chairman Stuebner inquired of staff who made the determination for where a traffic issue is sent -- to the council or to the Transportation and Parking Commission -- and was there a formal process? Mr. Schiller reminded everyone that the commission used to hear the pros and cons after a traffic study was done, discussed the matter with the attending residents, and then made some form of a recommendation. It was never the purview of this commission, as Mr. Schiller understood, to tell staff to conduct a study of Finley Mall in a certain prioritized manner.

Questions followed as to where the agenda was getting published and/or noticed, wherein Mr. Mayer explained the steps he recently went through with obtaining feedback from the residents around McCollum Park. Staff was then asked when the residents would be notified about Traffic Area No. 5, wherein Mr. Mayer explained that staff had not identified whether there would be a Traffic Study No. 5 and, in fact, it was a matter of getting the commission's feedback on the value of the neighborhood traffic studies and seeing the "return on that investment" from resident tax dollars, village staff hours and what goes into each study. The chairman emphasized that the commission never received feedback on how effective the four traffic studies were. To that point, Mr. Mayer explained that would be addressed on tonight's agenda in order to get a feel from the commission on where the importance should be placed, i.e., the traffic manager or the public works, and what issues the commission wanted to see brought forward in future meetings. The chairman stated he was beginning to question the value of what "this commission was about" because it had changed over time.

Transportation and Parking Commission

July 8, 2015

Mr. Mayer understood and believed everyone involved wanted to steer the commission in the right direction, get the best value out of everyone's time, and provide the best value to the village. He believed the value of the commission was the resident input and proceeded to review a PowerPoint presentation on the overhead, noting the projects were not in any specific order.

Regarding the Finley Mall project, Mr. Mayer explained the goal for this project was to identify various signal, cut-through traffic and pedestrian issues at Finley and Brook Roads and to mitigate them. Commissioner comments followed that there were challenges to the intersection and it would be important to hear from the business owners there to hear how the issues impact their sales. Mr. Mayer explained it would take staff a significant amount of effort to collect the data for the large site regarding the cut-through traffic. He noted in 2012 a signal validation study was completed for the signal at Downers and Finley Mall to validate its existence. If resolutions for the cut-through traffic and pedestrian issues could be eliminated, and a signal eliminated, yet maintain an appropriate level of safety and operations, Mr. Mayer stated it was one less location for the village to maintain.

Continuing, Mr. Mayer addressed the next project – School Districts 58 and 99 – which related to pickup/drop off operations, off-site parking conditions, bus routing/circulation, as brought to staff's attention by various school administrators and residents. He outlined the steps that would be taken to review each school. The chairman asked whether North High School was in one of the commission's previous studies, wherein Mr. Mayer indicated it was and the on-street parking recommendations were addressed and put into place. This review would return to see if the modifications were working efficiently. He also added that this project would focus on those schools that demonstrate consistent issues raised by the administrators and residents.

Mr. Saricks, however pointed out that individual schools had come before the commission in the past with concerns and the commission had made recommendations that appeared to have been working. He believed schools had to be looked at individually. Trying to determine a "blanket" solution for all of the schools would not work. Additionally, he believed those schools that were experiencing the traffic/parking issues should speak to the schools that had implemented the solutions and bring forward their specific recommendations to the village. Mr. Mayer clarified that his "comprehensive" study meant he would look at each individual school and tailor a similar plan, but not exactly the same plan, for the schools.

Going to back to the North High School topic, Chairman Stuebner expressed the challenges that were there regarding the new parking lot and he believed the high school needed to be part of the study. Going forward for this project Mr. Saricks asked to see the specific recommendations and suggestions that come from the individual schools and to work with them, because they were engaged in the process. Mr. Mayer agreed with Mr. Saricks in that staff should work "from the bottom up" with the schools. Again, the chairman reminded everyone it was a matter of the school not communicating with its neighborhood.

The third project, as explained by Mr. Mayer, would be a follow-up study to Neighborhood Traffic Studies 1, 2, and 3 with the goal to assess what was implemented, what remained to be implemented, what has worked/not worked, and what issues remained, if any, etc. The chairman, again, stated that every time one of these studies occurred, there was a promise of follow-up, and, to date, it has not happened. The commissioners supported this project. To that point, Mr. Mayer indicated that all of the short-term mitigation solutions for the three studies (signage/stripping modifications) were completed. Regarding the middle- to long-term mitigation recommendations, he not familiar enough to know what was implemented for the three studies. The chairman believed it was necessary to know the effectiveness of the short-term

Transportation and Parking Commission

July 8, 2015

recommendations and to know whether the village wasted its money on hiring a consultant for the medium and long-term recommendations. And the commission also needed to know if there was a plan within the village to implement the medium and long-term recommendations.

Due to the number of questions being raised about the status of other projects, the chairman asked that Mr. Mayer return with a comprehensive answer to the various plans, and not necessarily all at one time; Mr. Mayer agreed. Mr. Schiller summarized that with projects of this size and scope, it would be prudent for the village to follow up, as a built-in process similar to an audit, to see if the village's money was well spent and if a project was getting the results a consultant had promised. And, if not, then maybe the later phases of a project should not be implemented. As a follow-up to that suggestion, Mr. Wilkinson suggested looking at those things that change within the study areas such as a new store, a new road, and evaluate how those changes impact the project today.

The chairman asked that Mr. Mayer provide the cost effectiveness for the prior study areas, how much had been implemented and what would be the long-term plan to implement the recommendations because he believed it could drive the scope of Traffic Area Study 5. Mr. Mayer agreed and acknowledged that the commission saw value in receiving community input. However, he believed that understanding what had been employed, what had been placed in the field, and the results of those studies, along with understanding them, were more important before moving onto the next traffic area study. To date, Mr. Mayer stated there was no area identified for Study No. 5.

However, Mr. Mayer did proceed to explain that he was in conversations with the public works department to identify the next study area, as he believed there was value in having a fifth study. The chairman believed the next study area should be a smaller study around Downers South High School, and he agreed with staff that it was important to get feedback on the first four area studies before giving staff direction as to whether a more detailed study or broad study, was necessary, especially if the commission was going to try to meet the medium and long-term goals put forth by the consultant. Asked if there was going to be an independent consultant auditing the recommendations of the first consultant, Mr. Mayer did not know.

Discussing the topic of budget, Chairman Stuebner pointed out that traffic was such an important safety issue that he found it hard the village would not have regular resources set aside for such ongoing issues since things are changing all the time. Mr. Mayer explained the village had an annual program for traffic studies but as to the follow-up and whether it was to be done internally or by an outside consultant, was unidentified presently. Per a question, Mr. Mayer explained in detail the steps he would take to bring forth a follow-up study for the commissioners.

Turning to the fifth item on the agenda, Mr. Mayer explained it was more of philosophical question regarding stop signs versus yield signs and whether it should be a uniform policy throughout the village without going through the expense and time of a neighborhood traffic study. To that statement, the chairman asked Mr. Mayer to provide him with an understanding of what the federal and state guidelines were on this matter and recommended following one of the two guidelines, or, a combination of both. Per a question on what an established minimum level of traffic control meant, Mr. Mayer clarified that not every village intersection would have a four-way stop sign but there still could be a stop sign.

The chairman asked Mr. Mayer to explain how a stop sign was more effective than a yield sign when he did his research and since there was confusion voiced that on the one hand the commission was told warrants were necessary for stop signs but was now being told that signs would be disbursed throughout the village. Mr. Mayer indicated that in the past the two-way

Transportation and Parking Commission

July 8, 2015

stop system was used every other block to provide some form of control and in prior cases, speed-bumps were used as well as a couple of traffic circles and bump-outs. The chairman asked if Mr. Mayer could find out whether those traffic control devices were still part of the traffic controlling policy.

The last project Mr. Mayer discussed was the signal timing for Maple and Fairview Avenues. A description of the immediate road area followed along with the concern of vehicles being on the railroad tracks during a stop light. He believed the timing on Fairview needed to be addressed to allow for better progression. A review of the lane assignment was also in order. Detailed steps of the project followed with Mr. Mayer explaining the goal was to optimize the signal timing to provide enough time for the heaviest movements and improve the level of service and safety.

Mr. Mayer stated he spoke with the ICC regarding the signalization at the intersection and also was aware of Burlington's program to fund such projects but Mr. Mayer felt it may not be worth pursuing because of the offset from the actual rail line and the cost of the project being in the millions. Chairman Stuebner offered to find out what the signalization would cost from his employer.

Mr. Schiller vaguely recalled that the Maple and Fairview intersection was one of the first locations where the village installed electronic no-left turn signs and collected various data. He suggested Mr. Mayer review that information and compare it with any new study. Mr. Saricks asked if there were any new configurations planned for the intersection wherein Mr. Mayer explained that a prior study was done as part of a transit oriented development plan that came up with three long-range alternatives for the area. Details followed. In summary, he explained that the project under discussion for today was for an immediate solution with timing and pavement striping.

Because there was concern about safety and the train tracks involved, dialog followed that the project could be addressed fairly quickly and be moved up on the priority list versus the other projects. Mr. Schiller thought the second project should be with the school districts regarding the school bus issues and student safety. However, due to it being summer, he suggested staff first start speaking to the districts to resolve the communication issues and the follow up with traffic volumes/bus routes when school was in session. For Mr. Mayer, he believed it was more of a monitoring process for the school districts and that unless there were issues presented by the administration or the neighbors, there was nothing to do except to be prepared if issues do arise.

Mr. Mayer recommended the commission contact him with any questions. In the meantime, he would draft a priority project list for the next meeting. Commissioners emphasized that neighbors should be notified if any project comes forward and a public hearing should also be held to receive public input. But, if that was not the policy, the chairman then recommended that a meeting be tendered with the council liaison, the village manager and the director of public works to explain what the value of the commission was.

OLD BUSINESS

Chairman Stuebner recalled he brought up a discussion about the crude tanks coming through the village and had a representative from BNSF speak to the commission which was very informative. However, there was never any discussion about how prepared the village was should a catastrophic incident occurred. He only recalled that the village's first responders were going to receive training but he was not sure if that occurred.

Transportation and Parking Commission

July 8, 2015

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Wilkinson inquired whether this commission or staff was involved in community development projects – as it related to traffic and parking plans, wherein Mr. Mayer said he did get included in the planning review and did provide transportation-related comments on the plans (examples followed). Mr. Wilkinson cited the challenges he experienced with McCullum Park and reminded staff to be proactive. Other comments followed from the chairman that when the reconfiguration plans for North High School were going on, the traffic and parking plans were not presented to this commission and were dealt with by the Plan Commission.

COMMUNICATIONS - None**ADJOURN****MR. SCHILLER MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:41 P.M.****MR. CARTER, SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 5-0.**