

Staff Responses to Council Questions
November 21, 2017

6. Consent Agenda

C. Resolution: Authorize an Agreement with SNI Solutions, Inc. for Liquid Deicer

Was last year's supply totally used? If applied to the salt supply that is stored in the off-season, is it effective the following year?

There is a remaining supply of the material from last year. Approximately 12,000 gallons were unused and are available for use in the 2017/18 winter season.

The Village no longer pre-treats salt. The salt that is currently in storage has not been pre-treated. Prior to the 2016/17 winter season, the Village's snow plows were outfitted with on-board, calibrated pre-wetting systems. With these systems, each truck carries a tank of liquid deicer which is sprayed on the salt as it is released from the truck. This provides a more consistent and efficient treatment of the liquid deicer.

D. Resolution: Authorize an Agreement with Midwest Meter, Inc. for Water Meter Transmitting Units

For meters not part of the replacement program (new construction) do we recover the cost of the meters? If not, why not?

Yes, the Village recovers the costs of the transmitting units and the meters for new construction.

8. First Reading

A. Resolution: Authorize a Third Amendment to the Sales Tax Rebate Agreement with Downers Grove Imports, Ltd. d/b/a Pugi of Chicagoland

Why this agreement at this time?

Pugi is requesting the approval of the agreement now because the improvements to the property which prompted the extension of the sales tax rebate payments are taking place now.

What happens if this agreement is not approved?

The parking lot improvements are nearly completed and would not be affected if the sales tax rebate agreement amendment is not approved. Pugi may reconsider the planned improvements to the Mazda building if the agreement is not approved. Further, Pugi may look for other locations for any future new dealership opportunities.

How does this agreement compare to other agreements with other dealerships (and what we can project what others will request in the future)? (chart form?)

Business	Rebate	Term
Zeigler	50% on first 700,000 of sales tax revenues; 75% of sales tax revenues over \$700,000	10 years
Packey Webb	50% of sales	10 years
Bentley/Lamborghini	50% of sales over incentive base of \$5.0 million	10 years
Aston Martin	50% of sales over incentive base of \$3.0 million	10 years
Lincoln	50% of sales over a five year period	10 years

Ordinances B-E: 2125 Ogden Avenue Vacation, Special Use and Final Plat of Subdivision

What restaurant is proposed? Did the petitioner indicate why they need a drive-thru for this restaurant?

The restaurant is an independent restaurant not a chain restaurant. The petitioner’s business model calls for a drive through.

The “process” for contacting the neighbors seems to be totaling lacking. It was the applicant’s responsibility but Staff seems to not know or have any knowledge other than the applicants feedback as to what happened. A neighbor contacted Staff and said something was unreadable but because there was no follow up by somebody it seems to have been ignored. Letters (unknown content) seemed to have been sent out to neighbors of a “certain radius”? Village Staff seems to not have a clue except feedback from applicant.

Pursuant to the Vacation Policy, the petitioner is required to obtain consent from the owners of property abutting the right-of-way to be vacated. In this case staff actively monitored the petitioner’s attempts to obtain consent of the proposed right-of-way vacation from the adjacent property owners. One resident responded to the petitioner’s request for consent with a letter outlining questions and concerns. Staff contacted this resident and discussed the issues. The resident requested additional time to formulate an opinion on the proposal and did not subsequently contact staff or the petitioner.

Staff is responsible for sending written notices of the public hearing to the owners of property within 250 feet (excluding rights-of-way). Staff confirms that public hearing notices were completed in conformance with the Village’s regulations.

There is a question of signatures from a single owner or the association and it may have been misrepresented at the Plan Commission meeting. What is the FULL story? Who really knows?

The petitioner sent registered letters to the individual condominium owners and to the condominium association that was listed in the tax records. A single condominium owner responded indicating that he supported the alley vacation. However, the condominium association board did not respond to requests regarding the alley vacation. As such, staff does not find the single owner's letter representative for the whole condominium association.

The petitioner also mailed letters and attempted to meet with the property owner of the vacant parcel at 4401 Belmont Road. The petitioner was unable to meet with and obtain a signature from this property owner. The petitioner and staff were communicating throughout the process as the applicant attempted to obtain consent of owners of abutting properties for the alley vacation.

Are the new owners going to install all new gas storage tanks? Have all appropriate IEPA and other appropriate agencies approved or inspected?

The owners will be installing new fuel storage tanks. All fuel tank work will be completed in accordance with all applicable rules and regulations.

There were gas storage tanks on site. There is some question as to whether these tanks are going to be used for water detention? All the tanks? Were any removed? Was there any certificate of remediation?

The existing fuel storage tanks will be removed and new fuel storage tanks installed with the new gas station. All fuel tank removal and installation will be completed in accordance with all applicable rules and regulations.

The existing detention basin that is open to the sky will remain in place but be modified to provide underground stormwater detention.

F. Resolution: Approve Final Plat of Subdivision for 3600 Lacey Road

Could you expound on the concerns of the member of the public on the traffic, the ORM zoning and uses? (pp 2 and 3 of 132 Plan Comm)?

The member of the public who spoke owns an adjacent unincorporated property to the south and was concerned about additional traffic and the assumptions and findings that the traffic study made. He wondered if staff had reviewed the traffic study and concurred with its findings. Staff noted the Village reviewed the study, provided comments to the applicant and concurred with the final report and findings.

The neighbor was also concerned about the proposed office/industrial use that is proposed for the property. He was concerned that the approval of this project may prohibit him from developing his land in the future. Should the neighbor wish to develop his property, his property can be annexed into the Village and developed in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan and Village ordinances.

Attachments

There are no rEmarks this week.