

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
HUMAN SERVICE COMMISSION MEETING

January 5, 2011, 6:30 P.M.

Chairman Jacaway called the January 5, 2011 meeting of the Human Service Commission to order at 6:35 p.m. and asked for a roll call:

PRESENT: Chairman Jacaway, Ms. Carroll, Mr. Carter, Ms. Crowe, Mr. Grammich, and Mr. Meaney

ABSENT: Mr. Melton and Mr. Rogers

STAFF

PRESENT: David Fieldman, Village Manager; Allison Alonzo, Village Management Analyst; Stan Popovich, Village Planner

VISITORS: Nick Vogel, Downers Grove Reporter, Jon Hoekema, Horizon Community Church, 2129 63rd Street; Lucy Lloyd, Downers Grove Chronicle; Greg Bedalov, District 58 Education Foundation; Lois Kopis, Grove Foundation; Cahty Morava, SEASPAR; Pat Nugent, Metropolitan Family Services; Kathy Blair, Giving DuPage; Janet Derrick, Naperville Cares; Charlie Stroub, Grove Foundation; Jim Russ, Grove Foundation; Megan Schroeder, 6036 Ridge Court; Marge Earl, 4720 Florence Avenue; Brian Slodysko, Trib Local; Elaine Johnson, Downers Grove Patch; Ken Rathje, District 99 Education Foundation

DECEMBER 1, 2010 MEETING MINUTES – Mr. Meaney recommended two changes to the November minutes. The commission members agreed with the changes. **MS. CARROLL MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES WITH MR. MEANEY’S REVISIONS, SECONDED BY MR. CARTER. MOTION CARRIED BY VOTE OF 6-0.**

Chairman Jacaway asked for an update regarding the neighborhood organization discussion. Mr. Popovich noted in February both the TCD3 recommendation and the social service discussion will be on the agenda. He noted staff researched five additional communities and found four of the five use a neighborhood organization. The fifth community uses an open city hall format on their website for comments. Mr. Meaney noted the website opportunity is intriguing.

Mr. Greg Bedalov, District 58 Education Foundation, noted the 501c(3) not-for-profit foundation is nine years old. Their focus is on curriculum enrichment, staff development and technology. The foundation used to focus on a socio-economic challenged students through a Dr. Dale Martin helping hands grant that was funded by Dr. Martin. Dr. Martin’s departure left the socio-economic focus without funding.

The foundation holds two main fundraisers, a circus in the fall and an entertainment for education program in the spring. They also raise money internally through teachers and

incoming and existing parent voluntary contributions. The foundation works with the business community as well for an endowment program. However, private donations have stalled due to economic conditions. In their best years, they raised approximately \$100,000. In a typical year, they can raise \$20,000 to \$50,000. The foundation gives all the money they raise back to the schools and have increased the amount they give back to the schools.

Programs include Select 58 (civic involvement award for 58 eighth graders), a middle school sneak preview program for incoming seventh graders, a distinguished service award that recognizes a teaching and non-teaching professional, an annual \$500 mini-grant to each school, and an annual \$35,000 blind grant application process.

He noted within the last two years, the internal fundraising program, Kash for Kids, doubled to approximately \$4,500. A couple of years ago, the foundation hired a full-time paid executive director, but they no longer employ the staff member so it is a fully volunteer organization.

Per a question, Mr. Bedalov noted a grants committee reviews all the applications and forwards a recommendation to the full board of directors who approves or denies. The grant applications are reviewed based on a grading sheet. The schools present a report to the foundation with regard to how the \$500 mini-grant was used. All programs are well received.

The 18-member board includes three ex-officio members and meets monthly. Mr. Bedalov noted the grants committee reviews all the grant requests regardless of the grant request. The grant committee is made up of about six members including Mr. Paul Zaander, an ex-officio, who is the internal check to make sure the grants do not create additional school district requirements.

Mr. Charlie Stroub of the Grove Foundation noted the foundation has been in place for 17 years in support of the Park District. They have raised and dispersed approximately \$150,000 for recreational programs. They have been assisted Lyman Woods, Little Sprouts, SEASPAR, Downers Grove Youth Baseball, Helping Girls Navigate Adolescence, Senior Luncheons, Senior Volunteers and Helping Children Grow. The board consists of 12 people and the board meets and discuss the funding requests.

The Grove Foundation holds two fundraisers, a golf outing and a passport for fine dining associated with five downtown restaurants. He noted they are primarily based in Downers Grove, but SEASPAR stretches over the Village's boundaries. Their social programs are primarily the senior luncheon and senior volunteer program. The foundation does not have a desire to expand their social programs. The foundation likes to be flexible and responsive to the needs that arise. Mr. Stroub noted programs in the past started via acquaintances of board members. Typically there are no competing programs for the same funding. The board votes on all funding requests.

Mr. Stroub noted the foundation is all volunteer based with no staff and does not receive funding from the Park District. Per a question, he noted the foundation fundraising has been down about 10-15%. He noted the same people typically donate on an annual basis. He noted with the current economy it is difficult. Mr. Bedalov interjected and noted giving is extremely difficult. Major corporations have set up their own foundations, which make it difficult. Mr. Bedalov

believes fundraising is down about 50%. Mr. Stroub and Mr. Bedalov noted gifts or in-kind services are being donated instead of money.

Mr. Meaney noted social service providers raise their own funds, but if the village would propose to raise funds, it could disrupt an equilibrium that currently exists.

Ms. Janet Derrick, Executive Director of Naperville CARES, noted her organization formed after the Welfare Reform Act of 1996 when Naperville residents wondered if there were people in Naperville struggling with their basic needs. It was driven by congregations who did a nine month survey of the community. They surveyed churches and service agencies to see what was provided in the community and what the need in the community is. The study found there were many organizations doing good in the community but there was no real coordination of the services. At the start, 80% of the CARES funding was from churches and their staff included a case manager under the auspice of Catholic Charities. They also started a car donation program.

The group has evolved over the years. The first fundraiser they held raised \$13,000 and last years raised \$110,000. Most of the volunteers are dedicated and have been with them since the beginning. They are still mostly a volunteer organization with 18 board members. Ms. Derrick and a part time office manager are the only staff members.

Naperville CARES' mission is to not duplicate services and maximize the funding that is available. They do detailed assessments of applicants and get to the root causes of the problems. They have a response network that shares information about individuals requesting service. The foundation uses public sources of assistance first through available programs before going to individual churches for assistance. They have strong relationships with Nicor and the City of Naperville to assist with utilities.

Naperville CARES has a budget of about \$200,000 and has diversified their funding sources. Congregations now contribute about 21% of the funding. The City of Naperville has three grants that the foundation taps into and they look for other sources of funding as well. Ms. Derrick provided a graph of how they distribute their funds. The group does not have case managers; they utilize the City of Naperville's social workers or the county's.

Clients come to the foundation in various ways. On-going assistance typically will be managed by the foundation not by individual congregations. She noted there is a limit for some county or township services. Communication is important so services are not duplicated and they can find the underlying cause of the situation. Last year, Naperville CARES assisted over 800 families with \$175,000 in assistance, coordinated another \$154,000 in assistance and gave away 31 cars.

Naperville CARES works very closely with St. Vincent DePaul throughout Naperville. She noted a home visit is sometimes the best way to assess a situation.

Ms. Derrick noted the foundation receives Community Development Block Grant, social services grant and social and cultural grant funding from the City of Naperville. They received approximately \$85,000 from these three grant programs. While the funding has stayed about the same, the source of the funds has fluctuated. Ms. Derrick noted their overall funding has stayed

about the same or increased as many congregations have increased their donations to provide assistance for basic needs.

She noted there are completely independent from the City of Naperville, although they do work with the city's utility departments and social workers. She noted they have two fundraisers, one in the spring and one in the fall that accounts for approximately 34% of their revenues.

Per a question, Ms. Derrick noted it is important to not duplicate services. Make sure a survey is done to determine what service providers are already in the community and what services they provide. Who is doing what and bringing them to the table to get everyone on the same page is important.

Naperville CARES serves only Naperville residents or a member of a Naperville congregation.

Per a question, Ms. Derrick noted if a client comes in asking for assistance, they will coordinate with the county or township if they can qualify for those services. She noted the continuum of care includes many elements to assist people out of poverty. They will work with the client to connect them to whatever is out there that they can access.

Ms. Derrick noted the original study was a citizen study and that the study has not been updated because the organization sees the need everyday. The original study was a valuable tool to document the need and to obtain community buy-in. Some volunteers have social work backgrounds but the volunteer's backgrounds are diverse. Increases in funding have all gone to programs instead of bringing back a case manager.

Chairman Jacaway invited other non-profits in the audience to share their experience. Mr. Jon Hoekema, Pastor of Horizon Community Church at Meadowbrook Shopping Center, spoke about a group of non-profits who recently got together to talk about these issues and came to the meeting tonight. He noted many organizations are providing assistance, but they may not be partnering and connecting with each other. His group is looking at what they can do and how they can come together to address what is being missed. He noted items the group felt were not being addressed include pre-school for poverty level families, transportation, literacy, case management, pediatric mental illness issues, substance abuse in teens and young adults, and housing. The group he represents started in November 2010 and has not yet thought about funding.

Mr. Meaney noted the list is similar to the DuPage County Community Needs Assessment table of contents and represents a continuum of care concept. The question is who is providing the services and where are the gaps. Mr. Hoekema noted his groups goal is to not duplicate what is already out there. He noted his support of this group and offered his assistance.

Ms. Kathy Blair with Giving DuPage noted the groups on Mr. Hoekema's handout are primarily volunteer based. She noted fundraising is difficult but people are willing to donate for the basic needs. A lot of the programs on Mr. Hoekema's list could be provided by volunteers.

Mr. Ken Rathje, with the District 99 Education Foundation, noted the foundation was formed in 1994 and at the time there were shortfalls in the district being able to fill certain needs, such as computers. The foundation at that time funded technology and the arts. Annually, the foundation provides between eight and ten \$1,500 grants to teachers. Smart boards are the newest technology items, so they have provided some \$5,000 grants for those items.

Mr. Rathje noted their fundraising has been very grassroots such as cookbooks and raffles. Large grants early led to investments but that has been harder recently. The foundation is very low-risk with regard to their fundraising efforts. They have worked with some grant writers to learn about funding sources, but found that institutions that provide grants what to be the deciding body in how the grants are used and that was not the direction the foundation wished to go.

The foundation is looking at new ways in how to serve the high school districts. He noted the school district is not supportive of the Foundation soliciting funds that would require the district to make additional investments to maintain a new program or opportunity. The foundation has done a lot of small fundraising events and donation solicitation from the alumni.

The foundation helps teachers with technology, special needs groups, and at-risk groups. Mr. Rathje noted the foundation has spread out a little bit from the arts and technology.

Per a question, they are separate from the school district and have a separate mission statement. Mr. Rathje noted the board is currently 12 voting members, but the optimum number is 15. The grants committee is four people who recommend the grants to the full board who vote on the grant applications. The superintendant provides input into the grant requests but is not a voting member.

Chairman Jacaway thanked all those that gave a presentation.

Chairman Jacaway asked the commission if any member had questions of Mr. Fieldman with regard to the staff's memo. Mr. Fieldman confirmed Associates in Family Care has continued to provide counseling services to Village residents. In a sense, these services have been privatized. Service hours have been reduced due to some clients finding other providers during the switch to Associates in Family Care. Mr. Meaney noted the City of Chicago has privatized tax return assistance and asked if there are other opportunities for privatization. Mr. Fieldman noted the staff innovation team continually looks for low-cost ways to provide Village services.

Mr. Popovich reviewed the number of social service inquiries that staff has historically received and the number of calls that were received during a week in December. The numbers are down because the Village has been out of the social services business for about a year now and people are aware of this. The Village does not have a good mechanism to track calls now because the social services department has been eliminated.

Ms. Carroll noted Meals on Wheels has specific and strict federally mandated eligibility requirements that are not listed in the staff memo. Chairman Jacaway noted the taxi subsidy program still exists but has been scaled back.

Per a question, Mr. Fieldman stated he has briefed the Council on the Commission's proceedings and provided the December audio file to the Council. The Council direction is really for staff to assist the Commission in whatever direction the Commission wants to go. The Commission has heard about various models and received answers to some questions. Staff's role is to help the Commission in whatever direction they choose to go.

Chairman Jacaway asked where the Commissioners stand at this time. Mr. Carter noted there was a lot of information presented and wished to talk about this next month. Ms. Carroll noted she was still processing the information from the guest speakers. She cannot imagine that there are not groups in Downers Grove meeting to talk about gaps in services and the needs. Those groups need to be connected and there should be someone getting those groups together. She asked if there was a needs assessment done specifically for Downers Grove.

Chairman Jacaway noted there is a feeling that the group should digest this information and come back to talk about where to go next.

Mr. Meaney found the discussion was very helpful and useful. The next step may be to hear from service providers in the Village. To see what they do and if there are any gaps. If they identify gaps, maybe that gives the commission some idea on what they should examine and explore further. He thought a hands-off approach from the Village might be best.

Mr. Grammich echoed the previous statements, although he isn't sure the Village needs another 501c(3). He thinks individual donors are willing to support basic needs. The first thing would be to approach existing groups to see what they do, the need that exists and if there is a gap. Is there a coordinating role the Village could play? He is concerned about the struggle for fundraising and how a Village backed effort could cause some distress.

Mr. Meaney felt it was important to identify the gaps first and then think about the structural ways those gaps could be addressed. Chairman Jacaway noted a homework assignment would be to see what type of structure comes to mind to discuss the topics tonight.

Ms. Crowe noted donations for basic needs are being made. It leads her to think there may be room for a service similar to Naperville CARES. Mr. Grammich noted the importance to not duplicate services and provide coordination. Ms. Crowe noted the interaction with churches that Naperville CARES still maintains and the very active churches in Downers Grove and the opportunity for partnerships. Mr. Meaney thought it would be important to hear from the local groups.

A discussion ensued about why some of the existing groups are not expanding their social service roles, which may be related to the fact the groups are primarily volunteers. It was noted coordination could not coordinate something that is not already being done, but can coordinate what is already being provided. A good coordination effort could include helping a church member get to a doctor's appointment by making the church member aware of the Village's taxi subsidy program.

Chairman Jacaway noted a homework assignment to talk about commissioner ideas/scenarios on how something could work. He would like to hear everyone's ideas and still do fact finding, but to move forward, the commission should talk about ideas. It was discussed how members could call local service providers or speak with their church leaders about the services they provide to the community. Mr. Fieldman stated the Commission members can speak to these groups to get some anecdotal evidence. If the Commission wants more structured or comprehensive information, there are surveys staff could undertake to provide additional information.

Mr. Fieldman noted staff is not as aware of local service providers as the commission. There may be dozens of service providers, so additional discussion on who to invite would be needed. Mr. Carter asked if that was beyond the scope since the last meeting was about thinking small and identify one issue the Commission could address. It was discussed that the Commission could invite the local groups and then narrow the focus.

Mr. Popovich noted the next agenda would include both the TCD3 discussion and the social service discussion. Keeping in mind the TCD3 recommendation, Chairman Jacaway asked the commission members to be ready to discuss the TCD3 recommendation to see where everyone stands on that issue. Per a question, Mr. Fieldman noted there are no particular time frames with regard to the TCD3 recommendation and the social service questions.

Per a question, Mr. Bedalov noted a fundraising challenge is creating a clearly defined sense of separation from the unit of government the foundation is associated. As an example, the District 58 Education Foundation explains how they are not the school district. They do not have meetings on District 58 properties; they want complete separation from the district. He also explained issues with the Blodgett House. Mr. Bedalov noted the Village could help by providing good press, such as asking Council members to mention events or working with the Village's Communication Director to get the foundation's name out in printed material. When the education foundation awards grants, they present the award at a school board meeting to get some publicity.

A discussion ensued whether a coordination model is feasible. Maybe a status report to the Council is appropriate. Mr. Meaney felt any group should be hands-off and should focus on a coordinating role.

Chairman Jacaway opened the meeting up to Public Comment.

Ms. Marge Earl, 4720 Florence Avenue, noted duplication of services does not just mean in fundraising effort. It is about not having the same person get services from all the groups in town. Maybe there is a central coordination point where service providers can see where this person has received assistance. Maybe it is a bigger issue that needs to be addressed.

Ms. Megan Schroeder, 6036 Ridge Court, noted the least the Village could do is to have a website listing of all these groups. It is important to let everyone know what these groups do and maybe focus on Meals on Wheels. She noted on the information about Meals on Wheels it would be good to have the number of residents being served for each city that funds the program. Maybe direct people where they can make donations to these groups.

Mr. Carter wants to take action and still think in terms of a foundation. He discusses Meals on Wheels because it is something the group can grab onto and help. Then it could grow into something like a Naperville CARES, a foundation separate from the Village to address these issues. He does not want to get into the coordinating business, as it is difficult to define what coordination means.

Mr. Meaney discussed the number of communities that support Meals on Wheels. He wondered as to why some communities have increased their funding. Mr. Fieldman noted staff did not compile the information.

There being no further comment, Chairman Jacaway closed public comment.

Mr. Popovich noted the next Commission meeting is the first Wednesday in February, which is February 2.

It was discussed as to whether this committee would move past the Meals on Wheels discussion. It is concrete and is something that the Commission could have success with but it is important to see what else is out there. Could Meals on Wheels be the first step to something bigger?

Chairman Jacaway noted the next meeting would include discussions about the TCD3 recommendation and social services in the Village.

MR. MEANEY MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. MR. CARTER SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:50 P.M.

/s/ Stan Popovich
Stan Popovich
(As transcribed by MP-3 audio)

APPROVED 2/28/11

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
PUBLIC HEARING

JANUARY 24, 2011, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Jirik called the January 24, 2011 meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and asked for a roll call:

PRESENT: Chairman Jirik, Mr. Beggs, Mr. Cozzo, Mrs. Rabatah, Mr. Waechtler, Mr. Webster

ABSENT: Mrs. Hamernik, Mr. Matejczyk, Mr. Quirk

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director, Tom Dabareiner, Mr. Devin Lavigne, Houseal Lavigne Associates; Planning Manager Jeff O'Brien;

VISITORS: Transportation and Parking Commission Chairman John Wendt, 1701 Concord Avenue; Greg Hose, 445 Austin; Marge Earl, 4720 Florence

Chairman Jirik led the Plan Commissioners in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

JANUARY 3, 2011 MEETING MINUTES - MR. COZZO MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES, AS PREPARED, SECONDED BY MRS. RABATAH. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 6-0.

File PC-17-10 (continued from 12/6/2010 and 1/3/2011 meeting) The purpose of the request is to consider the draft Downers Grove Comprehensive Plan, which, if adopted will become the official plan for the Village as required by Section 1.12 of the Municipal Code. The proposed comprehensive plan will replace the 1965 Comprehensive Plan; Village of Downers Grove, Petitioner.

Chairman Jirik reconvened the public hearing for File PC-17-10 and reminded the commissioners as to how the comprehensive plan would be broken down for review and public comment, with this particular meeting focusing on two key issues: 1) Design Guidelines (Commercial and Residential), and 2) Historic Preservation. His hope was to complete all public comment by March 2011.

Chairman Jirik offered to swear in the public. No public came forward.

Chairman Jirik asked if the commissioners would be satisfied with discussing the two key issues but review them by major blocks, i.e., discuss the Design Guidelines and Historic Preservation for residential (pp. 49 to 56), followed by the same two for commercial, and with the remainder to discuss afterwards. Commissioners concurred with the Chairman's suggestion.

Comments were as followed:

Planning Manager, Mr. O'Brien, confirmed Mr. Beggs' question by explaining that Historic Preservation was mainly focused in the residential section of the plan but that there were references to maintaining key historic properties in the downtown area in the commercial areas plans.

Page 56, Item 7, Mr. Webster felt the statement was not very strong. Mr. Devin Lavigne, Houseal Lavigne Associates, discussed preserving character, which was not typically associated with 1970's housing. He agreed there was not much discussion about furthering current preservation efforts and agreed the statement was not especially strong. However, the commissioners were welcome to discuss the matter further.

Chairman Jirik reminded the commissioners that it was a question of how far does it want to legislate or regulate historic home design and pointed out that the plan was not advocating a strict regulatory program but, instead, was recognizing value to the community and providing principles to the community. He believed the statement offered more flexibility.

Page 56, Item 2, as to the variety of housing stock and where the statement came from and its intent, Mr. O'Brien explained that it was a recognition that residential neighborhoods do best when a variety of housing stock exists, including senior housing, multi-family housing, etc. Mr. Lavigne emphasized that this statement was in the plan so as not to promote a homogenous single-family community. Commissioners agreed that a statement of clarification needed to be inserted and to refer to the land use map in this paragraph.

Page 66, Item 5, per Mr. Webster's question about the expansion of Special Services Areas as they relate to the design guideline recommendations, Mr. Lavigne explained they were to be used as an implementation tool and funding mechanism. Mr. Beggs commented that he did not know the effects of such tools and, nonetheless, preferred to leave them in the document. Mr. Webster agreed with this statement and envisioned using similar tools on Ogden Avenue.

Page 66, Item 9, regarding the reinvestment at Finley and Butterfield Roads, Mr. Lavigne explained this issue pertained to the Butterfield Corridor from Interstate 355 to Interstate 294 and the fact that rents are lower in the area and occupancy is low, as compared Oak Brook. Calling attention to Lombard's reinvestment, he believed reinvestment for the Downers Grove section of the corridor was positioned very well for the right developer. Reinvestment was explained as "full scale redevelopment." Positive comments followed on how the location was positioned very well once the economy turned around.

Some comments followed regarding the Butterfield Road and Highland Avenue intersection. Mr. Beggs suggested this area could be enhanced it as an entrance to the Village.

Regarding the Highland Avenue/Interstate 88 configuration, Mr. Lavigne explained it would be beneficial to consolidate the access points at this interchange since the westbound access is located one half-mile to the west. He envisioned the new configuration would occur with the redevelopment of the former-Circuit City site. Mr. Dabareiner mentioned the Ad Hoc Committee discussed the different kinds of markets where this would appeal to redevelopment, especially since a nearby office market existed.

Mrs. Rabatah asked if specific gateways to the Village were discussed, wherein Mr. Lavigne suggested inserting the community gateways as a map symbol on page 67.

Returning to the residential areas, Mr. Beggs was satisfied with the presentation of the three categories of housing.

Regarding the topic of sidewalks, Mr. O'Brien discussed the goal of the Village, which was to have sidewalks on at least once side of a street. Further dialog followed. In general, commissioners were satisfied with the language in the plan.

Mr. John Wendt, 1701 Concord Drive, Chairman for the Transportation and Parking Commission, mentioned some of the discussions that came before his commission regarding sidewalks, specifically, that some residents did not want sidewalks due to existing and unresolved drainage issues or, the fact that there were safety issues and sidewalks should be installed. He believed that when addressing the sidewalk topic, it was from the aspect that the Village wanted to make the streets safer and to separate pedestrians from vehicles.

Turning to page 56 of the plan, Mr. O'Brien, noted that Recommendation No. 6 discussed residential design guidelines and whether the Village should have such a tool to guide new construction in residential areas. Mr. O'Brien asked for comments on this recommendation. Mr. Webster believed the recommendation was open and flexible, similar to the historic preservation recommendation, and he was supportive of same concept for residential design.

Mr. Beggs mentioned that the Community First group from Naperville put forth a book that uses such a tool for new construction, with a couple of nearby communities utilizing the booklet as well. The chairman summarized that, in effect, the Village was trying to respect the rights of the property owner yet at the same time understand the character of a neighborhood, i.e., providing the right type of balance.

Chairman Jirik added some minor verbiage changes. In general, commissioners were fine with the recommendations, agreeing that the text was written to allow for flexibility.

For the next meeting, February 7, 2011, Mr. O'Brien stated the commissioners will be reviewing three (3) key issues: 1) recommendations for the Property Maintenance/Code Enforcement programs; 2) the Construction/Development Permitting Process; and 3) the Community Facilities and Village services. The month of March will center on focus area plans, land use, and transportation plans. April will be the final discussion/wrap-up.

Additionally, Mr. O'Brien announced that the February 28, 2011 meeting will have a few applications and that he expects to hold two meetings a month through April. Pages for next meeting's discussion will be sent to the commissioners. Mr. Webster asked for clarification on what key issues will be discussed next month. A summary followed.

APPROVED 2/28/11

MR. BEGGS MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR PC 17-10 TO A DATE CERTAIN, THAT DATE BEING FEBRUARY 7, 2011, SECONDED BY MR. WEBSTER.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. BEGGS, MR. WEBSTER, MR. COZZO, MRS. RABATAH, MR. WAECHTLER, CHAIRMAN JIRIK

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 6-0

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:40 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. WEBSTER, SECONDED BY MRS. RABATAH. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 6-0.

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

APPROVED 2/28/11

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
PUBLIC HEARING

FEBRUARY 7, 2011, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Pro tem Webster called the February 7, 2011 meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and asked for a roll call:

PRESENT: Chairman Pro tem Webster, Mr. Beggs, Mr. Cozzo, Mr. Matejczyk, Mr. Quirk, Mr. Waechtler

ABSENT: Chairman Jirik, Mrs. Hamernik, Mrs. Rabatah

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director Tom Dabareiner, Planner Damir Latinovic; Consultant Mr. Devin Lavigne, Houseal Lavigne Associates;

VISITORS: John Wendt, 1701 Concord Avenue, Downers Grove; Ms. Marge Earl, 4720 Florence, Downers Grove; Mr. Mark Thoman, 1109 61st Street, Downers Grove

Chairman Pro tem Webster led the Plan Commissioners in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

File PC-17-10 (continued from January 24, 2011) The purpose of the request is to consider the draft Downers Grove Comprehensive Plan, which, if adopted will become the official plan for the Village as required by Section 1.12 of the Municipal Code. The proposed comprehensive plan will replace the 1965 Comprehensive Plan; Village of Downers Grove, Petitioner.

Chairman Pro tem Webster reconvened the public hearing for File PC-17-10 and reminded the commissioners that the public was allowed to speak first, followed by deliberation of the commissioners, if necessary.

Chairman Pro tem Webster opened the meeting to public comment and swore in those individuals who would be providing public comment.

Director of Community Development Tom Dabareiner provided a brief update as to where the comprehensive plan was in the planning process, noting that three key issues would be discussed tonight: 1) Key Issue No. 3 - Recommendations regarding code enforcement and property maintenance; 2) Key Issue No. 4 - Recommendations regarding construction and development permitting; and 3) Key Issue No. 5 - Recommendations regarding the Community Facilities chapter, specifically facilities, government service, operational policies, etc. He believed Key Issue Nos. 3 and 4 were similarly related.

Provided the hearing is continued tonight, Mr. Dabareiner stated that next meeting's focus would be on recommendations for land use, transportation, and subarea plans.

Focusing on Key Issue Nos. 3 and 4, Mr. Dabareiner summarized that during Total Community Development 3 ("TCD3") some of the issues raised about code enforcement were based, he

believed, on peoples' negative experiences from previous years. However, over the past five years, he stated that code enforcement improved tremendously due to the review of performance standards within the Code Enforcement Department, staff retirement, and staff becoming more aware of its community. Mr. Dabareiner pointed out some of the text recommendations that should be considered struck from the plan due to better efficiency within the department and since the discussions from TCD3 did not accurately reflect what had occurred in more recent years.

Continuing, Mr. Dabareiner explained a success story with the building permit process, noting the initial permitting process five years ago averaged 63 days of review. Currently, that review process takes nine days on average due to better efficiencies. Nationwide, the standard is 10 days.

Commissioner comments/questions followed:

Mr. Matejczyk asked Mr. Dabareiner if he would propose any metrics moving forward to ensure the Village maintains its quality and have a continual review process, wherein Mr. Dabareiner suggested that it may benefit the Village to monitor national and regional code metrics and strive to match or improve them. Asked if the information should remain in the text, Mr. Dabareiner stated he would like to accurately reflect what has occurred. However, Mr. Beggs felt the comments (pg. 56) should remain in the plan since he felt they were a standard and should be strived for. Mr. Webster also agreed Item 3 accurately reflected how issues were being dealt with currently.

Turning to page 53, regarding the permitting process for residential areas, Mr. Webster, pointed out the language that needed to be clarified along the lines of what Mr. Dabareiner was conveying.

Mr. John Wendt, 1701 Concord Drive, suggested (on pg. 53, under Permitting Process) deleting the second sentence and change the third sentence to read as follow: "The village should monitor and maintain standards that meet national averages while continuing to expand on user-friendly compliance with standards."

Mr. Waechtler voiced concern about using the term "national averages" or whether another term could be used, wherein Mr. Devin Lavigne, with Houseal Lavigne Associates, clarified it was incorporating what Mr. Dabareiner had previous said about "national and regional" averages for the review process. Mr. Lavigne suggested not to revise the paragraph just yet but validate the TCD3 comments, noting that they were in the past, but that the Village responded by making changes to the permitting process, where they exceeded national and regional state averages, and it continues to look for ways to improve the permitting process, make it user-friendly, and make it easier for property owners to invest in their homes."

As to the "national average" term, Mr. Dabareiner stated staff based its target on what other communities were doing in the area and used information from the DuPage Council of Mayors and Managers on neighboring communities.

Mr. Waechtler suggested using the term "national average of similarly populated communities", wherein Mr. Dabareiner concurred it could be revised. Commissioners also agreed that Mr. Lavigne revise the language accordingly. (See page 63 to assist with page 65 for language to be used)

APPROVED 2/28/11

Mr. Dabareiner emphasized that on page 53, under Property Maintenance, he would like to incorporate language that explains the strides code enforcement staff has made and the fact that “more tools” were being utilized in the process.

Per a question by Mr. Cozzo, Mr. Dabareiner discussed the code enforcement process as compared to other, similar villages, and as it relates to staffing, consistent area coverage, and tools used.

The dialog then moved toward staff providing the new business owners of convenience stores a copy of the Village’s window sign ordinance, as raised by Mr. Waechtler. Mr. Dabareiner agreed and stated his first approach with the owners is to facilitate and explain the ordinance process.

Page 63, under the Commercial Design and Development Guidelines paragraph, Mr. Webster asked staff to clarify the words “should establish commercial design guidelines” since he said it appeared as if the Village did not have any guidelines, wherein Mr. Dabareiner stated those were specific tools being recommended. He explained that the Village currently had design guidelines for the downtown district only but that the Ogden Avenue Site Improvement Strategy (“OASIS”) program was recently initiated to address such items as those being raised by Commissioner Waechtler, i.e., property issues, sign clutter, etc .

Mr. Lavigne interjected and recalled for commissioners that he discussed Naperville’s Community First booklet that addresses such matters and that it was for developers and business owners to use best management practices. The booklet would be illustrative and pointed to the various codes to be followed.

Mr. Waechtler, as a recommendation, suggested that the words “should establish design guidelines” be deleted and replace it with the words “should establish and continue to implement commercial design and development guidelines and address commercial issues...” Staff concurred with the wording.

Page 56, Item 3 - language to be added to page 66, per Mr. Lavigne.

Pages 118-119 - Mr. Beggs recommended that the illustration be turned so that the North directional is at the top of the page.

Mr. Waechtler then raised dialog about an article in the *Wall Street Journal* discussing special service agencies and TIFs (tax incremental financing districts) and asked Mr. Lavigne to expand upon the difference between them and a redevelopment agency. Mr. Lavigne described those details for the commissioners, noting there is a duplication of services with a redevelopment agency, much overhead involved, and yet another layer of government managing a TIF. Mr. Waechtler offered to the commissioners of whether this idea about redevelopment agencies should even be mentioned in the comprehensive plan, as he did not support it and said it could leave the Village open to something it does not want.

Mr. Lavigne stated a number of villages/communities do have examples of agreements between them on this topic which results in creating a Special Service Area Agency, wherein Mr. Matejczyk believed it could be helpful to know this information if the issues does become a boundary crossing.

Pages 40-41 - Addressing Key Issue No. 5, Recommendations regarding the the Community Facilities chapter, Item No. 4, Mr. Webster asked what developing a long-range financial plan, etc. had to do with land use decisions typically found in a Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Lavigne explained it had to do with some of the projects that the Village has identified but currently has no funding to start them any time soon, i.e., an interchange at Highland/I-88. He explained many of the recommendations within the chapter were administrative actions but some were large-scale capital improvements which would affect long-range financial planning.

Page 40, Objective No. 1, as it relates to Substation Locations, Mr. Matejczyk suggested that due to the utility companies laying out their long-range plans early on, he recommending that the Village begin coordinating with the utility companies simultaneously before such request comes before the Village for approval. Mr. Lavigne appreciated the comment and would work it into the text.

Discussing Key Issue No. 5 again, the Community Facilities Plan chapter, Mr. Dabareiner pointed out that the first paragraph of the chapter summarizes the Village's future needs and long-range recommendations for each community service provider, i.e. an approach to work with other governmental entities, which he believed raised some concerns by individuals. However, he noted that there was potential re-write to address those concerns within this chapter, if necessary. He reiterated that the Plan Commission was only "advising" the Village in its comprehensive plan and not other government entities, such as the school district, the library district, etc. A better clarification for the term "support" followed, which resulted in a suggestion to replace it with a word "promote."

Dialog was raised regarding the recommendation of conducting a traffic study for the post office and the comments coming from the post office on this topic. Mr. Dabareiner felt discussions on this matter were addressed at a previous TCD-3 meeting and the Village was not in the business of providing a traffic study for the post office. Mr. Lavigne offered some better language to address the topic, but not to remove it entirely from the comprehensive plan, such as again to use the word "promote" rather than "support."

Page 100, No. 14 - It was noted that the recommendation for the relocation of the post office was to move the truck traffic further west but keep the distribution activities within the downtown area.

Mr. John Wendt, 1701 Concord Drive, recommended using language from the first sentence on page 100, Item No. 1, "the village should actively promote cooperation..." and insert that verbiage into the sentence regarding support for the school district. Mr. Webster liked the suggestion.

Returning to the post office study (No. 14), Mr. Webster asked whether the traffic study needed to be stated so specifically in the plan. Mr. Lavigne noted that on Page 114, the topic was addressed better and he could paraphrase it on Page 100. Mr. Dabareiner concurred.

Page 100, No. 15 -- Stormwater Management recommendation. Mr. Dabareiner stated the Village has, for the past few years, had a long-term strategy to reduce runoff in the Village and certain areas of the village were seeing those benefits. He believed the tense in the last sentence would need to be better clarified. Of further importance, he pointed out that some of the operational comments made in this chapter were not reflective of the character of the community and would have to be revised.

APPROVED 2/28/11

Returning to stormwater management paragraph, Mr. Waechtler proceeded to share his concerns about the Village supporting (financially) underwater detention for the park district in the future, calling attention to the fact that the park district needs to know the village is not setting a precedent in this Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Lavigne responded that the Village was built out and it will have to be creative in how it addresses future stormwater issues. Mr. Dabareiner agreed. Mr. Lavigne would rework the paragraph.

Page 97, right-hand column, as it relates to the Village conducting a life-cycle assessment, Mr. Dabareiner believed certain text should not be included and the focus should be on land use, location, building-type topics related to a comprehensive plan.

Mr. Waechtler asked for direction regarding permeable pavers and believed that if developers could get on board with such best management practices, it would be ideal.

Chairman Pro tem Webster opened up the meeting to additional public comment.

Mr. Mark Thoman, 1109 61st Street, reminded the commissioners that the comprehensive plan was supposed to address everything that has to do with the future of the Village. He stressed the importance of reading the background information of the goals and objectives which lead to the conclusions of the document. Lastly, he reminded the commissioners that the plan was a living document that needs to be revisited on a regular basis.

As a last comment, Mr. Beggs stated he agreed with Mr. Thoman regarding the comments about the police and fire departments.

In response, Mr. Thoman suggested that public safety, public service, and public works should be included in the future planning of the community because they are part of the community.

Mr. Waechtler stated he hoped Mr. Thoman did not disagree with him that the Village had to be careful it did not commit village funds to certain projects. As a member of the Comprehensive Plan Committee, and speaking personally, Mr. Thoman said he looked at the stormwater topic as a way to partner with other government entities to lower costs overall. He commented on the various ways his committee looked at addressing stormwater mitigation within the village. He suggested exploring the partnering option.

In closing, Mr. Waechtler appreciated the above information provided by staff. No further comments followed by the commissioners, nor the public.

MR. COZZO MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING TO A DATE CERTAIN, THAT DATE BEING MARCH 7, 2011, SECONDED BY MR. WAECHTLER.

ROLL CALL:

**AYE: MR. COZZO, MR. WAECHTLER, MR. BEGGS, MR. MATEJCZYK, MR. QUIRK,
CHAIRMAN PRO TEM WEBSTER**

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 6-0

APPROVED 2/28/11

Mr. Damir Latinovic announced that the next scheduled meeting was February 28, 2011 with three petitions on the agenda. Minor details followed on what those petitions included.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:30 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. COZZO, SECONDED BY MR. QUIRK. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 6-0.

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