

**DOWNERS GROVE PUBLIC LIBRARY  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING  
WEDNESDAY DECEMBER 18, 2013, 7:30 P.M.  
LIBRARY MEETING ROOM**

**MINUTES**

1. **Call to Order.** President Kathleen DiCola called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.
2. **Roll Call.** Present: Trustee Susan Eblen, Trustee Wendee Greene, Trustee David Humphreys, Trustee Daniel Loftus, Trustee Thomas Read, President Kathleen DiCola.  
Absent: None.  
Also Present: Library Director Rick Ashton, Assistant Director for Public Services Bonnie Reid, Assistant Director for Support Services Sue O'Brien, Public Relations Manager Melissa Doornbos, Digital Librarian Mary Styrzcula, Information Technology Manager Dale Galiniak, Children's Services Manager Sara Pemberton, and Circulation Services Manager Melanie Mertz.  
  
Also Present: Tiffany Nash and Daniel Pohrte of Product Architecture + Design, Steven Hendrickson and John McNutt of Shales McNutt Construction, Dawn Rhodes of the Chicago Tribune Triblocal.
3. **Welcome to Visitors.** President DiCola welcomed visitors and staff and thanked them for their interest in the work of the Library Board.
4. **Approval of Minutes.**
  - a. November 20, 2013 Regular Monthly Meeting.  
Read requested an amendment to the Minutes to remove his name from roll call votes on page 4, sections a and b, since he was absent from the meeting. The Board agreed to the amendment. It was moved by Read and seconded by Humphreys THAT the Minutes of the November 20, 2013 Regular Monthly Meeting, as amended, be approved. Roll Call: Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Abstentions: None. Nays: None.
  - b. December 11, 2013 Special Meeting.  
It was moved by Read and seconded by Humphreys THAT the Minutes of the December 11, 2013 Special Meeting be approved. Roll Call: Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Abstentions: None. Nays: None.
5. **Approval of Payment of Invoices and Other Financial Reports.** Ashton reviewed the invoices distributed in advance. He presented the credit card invoices totaling \$4,458.14 and pointed out a few items of note. It was moved by Read and seconded by Greene

THAT December 18 invoices totaling \$130,985.79 be approved, credit memos totaling \$579.06 be approved, and November payrolls totaling \$185,155.69 be recognized. Roll call: Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Abstentions: None. Nays: None.

**6. Opportunity for Public Comment on Agenda Items.**

There was no public comment.

**7. Opportunity for Public Comment on Other Library Business.**

There was no public comment.

**8. Unfinished Business.**

- a. Library Building Renovation Project. Report and Recommendations by Shales McNutt Construction and Product Architecture + Design regarding Awarding of Contracts. Requested Action: Awarding of Contracts.

Shales McNutt and Product Architecture personnel presented extensive design changes and cost modifications intended to bring the renovation project scope within the amount of funds allocated for the project. The proposed changes exceeded the targeted reduction of \$433,000 in total. The consultants made these presentations with the intent of recommending to the Board that the low bidders in the various trades be awarded contracts for the low bid amounts, accompanied by change orders that would reduce the scope and cost of each contract to bring the project within budget. (Documents attached).

Ashton advised the Board that the Library's attorney, Kathleen Henn of Klein Thorpe Jenkins, had indicated that the awarding of low bid contracts and simultaneous modification of those contracts via change orders would violate various provisions of Illinois law. He recommended that the Board take formal action to reject all bids received on November 22 and direct Product Architecture + Design and Shales McNutt Construction and Library staff to proceed with project modifications and action plans that would result in a re-bidding of the project, at a date to be determined. It was moved by Humphreys and seconded by Eblen THAT the Board reject all bids received November 22, 2013 and direct Shales McNutt Construction, Product Architecture + Design, and Library staff to undertake the necessary work to prepare for re-bidding of the project. Roll Call: Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Abstentions: None. Nays: None.

The Board discussed the tasks, timetable, and communication activities necessary to proceed with the re-bidding of the project.

Discussion centered initially on details of the proposed project cost reductions. Staff review of the proposals has been completed, with requests for a few clarifications and changes. These included changes to the Administration area, the north corridor walls, finish materials, and package pricing of project elements for possible add-back in the event of special funding. Staff also requested further time for review and discussion of the revised phasing plan. In general, the Board agreed

that the proposed cost reductions did not compromise the overall intent of the renovation.

Discussion also focused on the tasks and timetable of re-bidding. Construction will begin approximately three months after the Board gives the architects and construction managers direction to proceed. Although the project will have a later start date, a shorter project duration will also affect the schedule. The Board understood that no price guarantees apply to the current bid estimates, as all second-round bidders are free to offer new pricing for a project of reduced scope and duration. Architects agreed that the inclusion of some deduct alternates in the bid package would be a method for protecting the project budget, and Board members inquired about the possibility of revisiting some of the add-alternates from the original bid package.

The Board agreed to hold a Special meeting on Wednesday January 8, 2014 at 7:30 p.m. to review activities in preparation for re-bidding, agree on project scope, and authorize the Construction Management firm and Architects to proceed with Construction Documents and a formal bid process.

**9. New Business.**

a. New Library Web Site.

Public Relations Manager Melissa Doornbos and Digital Librarian Mary Styrzcula informed the Board about the planning and development work on a new web site. They demonstrated several features. The development is nearing a stage where active user testing will be needed. Doornbos invited members of the Board to participate in this user testing and explained the mechanisms for this. Board members expressed appreciation for the work that has been accomplished and looked forward to participation in the testing.

**10. Report of the Director.**

Ashton briefly summarized his report (attached).

**11. Board Member Comments and Requests for Information.**

None.

**12. Adjournment.** President DiCola adjourned the meeting at 8:47 p.m.

**DOWNERS GROVE PUBLIC LIBRARY  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
SPECIAL MEETING  
WEDNESDAY JANUARY 8, 2014, 7:30 P.M.  
LIBRARY MEETING ROOM**

**MINUTES**

1. **Call to Order.** President Kathleen DiCola called the meeting to order at 7:34 p.m.
2. **Roll Call.** Present: Trustee Susan Eblen, Trustee Wendee Greene, Trustee Daniel Loftus, Trustee Thomas Read, President Kathleen DiCola.  
Absent: Trustee David Humphreys.  
Also Present: Library Director Rick Ashton, Assistant Director for Support Services Sue O'Brien, Children's Services Manager Sara Pemberton, Adult and Teen Services Manager Nicole Wilhelms, Public Relations Manager Melissa Doornbos, Circulation Manager Melanie Mertz.  
  
Also Present: Tiffany Nash and Daniel Pohrte of Product Architecture + Design, John Shales of Shales McNutt Construction, Dawn Rhodes of the Chicago Tribune Triblocal.
3. **Welcome to Visitors.** President DiCola welcomed visitors and staff and thanked them for their interest in the work of the Library Board.
4. **Opportunity for Public Comment on Agenda Items.**  
None.
5. **Opportunity for Public Comment on Other Library Business.**  
None.
6. **Unfinished Business.**
  - a. Library Building Renovation Project. Report by Product Architecture and Shales McNutt Construction regarding Project Design, Scope, and Budget Changes.  
Requested Action: Approval to Proceed to Re-Bid the Project.

Members of the design and construction team reviewed revisions to the project design, scope, budget, and schedule in detail. These included Cost Saving Items, Cost Comparisons, Alternate Suggestions for Review, and Re-Bid Proposed Schedule (attached). Key events would include issuance of revised bid documents on February 3, bid opening on February 22, Recommendation of contract awards on March 3, beginning of construction April 14, and project completion September 14.

Following discussion, it was moved by Eblen and seconded by Read THAT the Library Board approve the request to proceed to re-bid the project, subject to Library staff confirmation of remaining design details and additional clarification of construction phasing plans. Roll call: Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Nays: None. Abstentions: None.

7. **New Business.**

None.

8. **Board Member Comments and Requests for Information.**

9. **Adjournment.** President DiCola adjourned the meeting at 8:03 p.m.

Approved 1/27/14

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE  
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING  
PUBLIC HEARING

OCTOBER 28, 2013, 7:00 P.M.

Chairperson Urban called the October 28, 2013 meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and led the Plan Commissioners and the public in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

**ROLL CALL:**

**PRESENT:** Chairperson Urban, Mr. Beggs, Mr. Cozzo, Mr. Matejczyk, Mr. Quirk, Mrs. Rabatah, Mr. Rickard, Mr. Waechtler, Mr. Webster

**STAFF PRESENT:** Senior Planner Stan Popovich and Planner Damir Latinovic

**VISITORS:** Michi Mao, Neri Architects, 444 N. Northwest Highway, Park Ridge, IL; Ben Pecoraro, BP Homes, 10 Cliff, Highland Park, IL; Anthony Pecoraro, P.O. Box 331, Highland Park, IL; John R. Gilley, 1170 Stanford; Neil O'Rourke, 7117 Mathias Rd.; Tina Marie Mateja, 241 Indianapolis; Stephen Bubulka, 1170 Valley View Dr.; Tom Hickey, 6830 Saratoga; Elizabeth DeLeon, 1140 Crystal Ave.; Joseph Verzon, 7109 Dunham Rd.; Debra Walker, 701 Hobart Ave.; Susan Walker, 7071 Hobart Ave.; Chester and Jennifer Tom, 7205 Mathias Ave.; Rick and Cathy Schumann, 1190 Crystal; Kevin Lewis, 300 Marquardt, Wheeling, IL; Gloriane Heine, 7209 Mathias; Lisa and Steve Auernhamer, 1160 Crystal Ave.; Hsien Hu Wang, 1170 Crystal; Carol Wang, 1170 Crystal; Don and Lorelai Harkins, 1130 Crystal; David M. Haner, 1425 Richards; Karin Reeve, 1150 Stanford Ave.; Steve and Nancee Margison, 7113 Dunham; Sonjo Kasche, 1011 Pinewood Dr.; Atef and Sonya Mackar, 1180 Crystal; and Winnie DeLeone, 1140 Crystal

APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 7, 2013 MINUTES

**THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 7, 2013 WERE APPROVED ON MOTION BY MR. WAECHTLER, SECONDED BY MRS. RABATAH. MOTION PASSED BY VOICE VOTE OF 8-0-1. (ABSTAIN: MR. MATEJCZYK)**

A brief review of the meeting's protocol followed.

**PC 31-13** A petition seeking a Zoning Ordinance Map Amendment to rezone the property from R-2, Single Family Residential to B-3, General Services and Highway Business district. The property is located on the east side of Belle Aire Lane approximately 150 feet north of Ogden Avenue and is commonly known as 4245 Belle Aire Lane, Downers Grove, IL (PIN 09-06-402-001). Village of Downers Grove, Petitioner; Greg Nosich, Owner.

Chairperson Urban swore in those individuals that would be speaking on the above petition.

Approved 1/27/14

Village Planner, Damir Latinovic, located the 100' x 300' foot property on the overhead projector and noted the one-story commercial building on the site (4,500 sq. feet in size) with a parking lot located on the east side of the property. The Village was requesting to rezone the property from R-2 Single-Family Residential to B-3 General Services and Highway Business District to make the zoning classification consistent with the use, the on-site building, and to make it consistent with the surrounding uses and with the Village's Comprehensive Plan. A history of the building followed with Mr. Latinovic pointing out that the building is currently being renovated to house a tool and die/pattern-making shop that is permitted as a legal, non-conforming use in the residential district. However, when the use came forward, the village decided it was the appropriate time to request the rezoning of the property because tool and die shops were allowed as a permitted use in the B-3 District.

Mr. Latinovic discussed the benefits of rezoning the property to the B-3 General Services and Highway Business District. He pointed out the same surrounding zoning of properties to the south, east, and west, noting that R-2 residential zoning was located north of the subject property. The existing Future Land Use Map, within the Comprehensive Plan, was reviewed, reflecting the subject property designated as Residential use. However, staff felt the proposed rezoning was consistent with the rest of the Comprehensive Plan because the Plan's goal was to increase the depth of commercial properties along Ogden Avenue; it also called for a blend of commercial uses along the Ogden Avenue Corridor; and by making the change, an oversight would be corrected on the map.

A review of the bulk standards for the property followed. Mr. Latinovic stated that the owner was not making any exterior changes to the building or the parking lot. The existing nonconforming condition of the building not meeting the required north side yard setback (building located 4.25 feet where 10 feet is required in R-2 and B-3) will remain.

Per staff, proper public notification and signage was posted on the site, and, to date, no comments were received from the neighbors. Staff reviewed each of the Standards for Rezoning in more detail and, in conclusion, noted all standards were met. Mr. Latinovic recommended that the Plan Commission forward a positive recommendation to the Village Council.

Asked if the property was sold and the petition was denied, would the property return to residential, Mr. Latinovic stated that most likely it would not because the property had always been commercial with a permitted commercial use on the property, as a legal non-conforming use. A legal non-conforming commercial use could remain for a long time. Asked what the zoning was at the time of annexation in 1972, Mr. Latinovic stated that based on his conversation with county zoning staff they indicated it was commercial. Upon a question, Mr. Latinovic explained that all properties, when annexed into the Village, are automatically zoned R-1 (unless the owner at that time submits a request for a different zoning classification) due to the greatest restrictions. Additional clarification followed from Mr. Latinovic regarding the Village's zoning map and land use map and the restrictions for B-3 zoning. Responding to a commissioner's question, Mr. Latinovic mentioned that should any changes be made to the building's exterior in the future, specifically on the north side, any new addition would have to meet the current setback requirements. Interior changes did not affect the setbacks.

Asked if a change in business owners or practices required the new owner to appear before the Plan Commission, Mr. Latinovic reported only if the new owner was proposing a special use; any other uses permitted by right were allowed.

Approved 1/27/14

Chairperson Urban opened up the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Ken Rathje, of Rathje Planning Services, conveyed that Greg Nosich, owner of the property, asked him to speak on behalf of the owner and to the proposed rezoning. Mr. Rathje summarized the steps he took with Mr. Nosich in speaking with the Village about the existing zoning on the site and also discovered in the Village's land use plan, and the past land use plan, an inadvertent modification that had changed the property from a commercial classification to a residential classification. He stated staff agreed an oversight existed and offered the applicant to pursue a petition for rezoning or stated the Village could pursue the rezoning to remedy the oversight. As to the prior zoning, Mr. Rathje researched records at the county and summarized that the property shown on the county map in April, 1972, prior to the annexation was County B-4-2 which translated to Business Service District with services that were comparable to the Village's current B-3 zoning. Further details followed. Mr. Rathje believed the rezoning was appropriate.

Hearing no further comments, Chairperson Urban closed public comment.

Mrs. Rabatah commented that the proposal was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan as well as the use. The Standards for Approval were met, and the fact that there was an oversight made, she saw no reason why the parcel could not be rezoned to the B-3 District. Mr. Cozzo concurred. Per another question, staff responded to date they received no comments from the neighbors.

**WITH RESPECT TO FILE PC 31-13, MR. WAECHTLER MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL TO APPROVE A ZONING ORDINANCE MAP AMENDMENT TO REZONE THE PROPERTY FROM R-2, SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL TO B-3, GENERAL SERVICES AND HIGHWAY BUSINESS DISTRICT.**

**SECONDED BY MR. QUIRK. ROLL CALL:**

**AYE: MR. WAECHTLER, MR. QUIRK, MR. BEGGS, MR. COZZO, MR. MATEJCZYK, MRS. RABATAH, MR. RICKARD, MR. WEBSTER, CHAIRPERSON URBAN**

**NAY: NONE**

**MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 9-0**

**PC 30-13** A petition seeking Preliminary Plat of Subdivision approval to subdivide the existing property into three lots. The property is zoned R5A, Townhouse Residence District. The property is located at the southeast corner of Dunham Road and Crystal Avenue, and is commonly known as 7143 Dunham Road, Downers Grove, IL (PIN 09-29-100-038). Dunham Street Development, LLC., Petitioner/Owner.

Chairperson Urban swore in those individuals that would be speaking on the above petition.

Mr. Latinovic summarized the location of the site while reviewing an aerial photo on the overhead, noting the surrounding, single-family residences around the site, except for a B-2 zoning designation and the shopping center to the south. The approximately 2.2 acre site was currently



Approved 1/27/14

zoned R5A, Townhouse Residence District, with one existing vacant single-family home. On the west side of the property exists a small wetlands area. Mr. Latinovic explained that due to the current zoning the owner could construct one large multi-unit townhouse building (14 to 16 units), provided all bulk standards, parking, lot coverage etc. were met. However, he explained the petitioner was seeking a preliminary plat of subdivision to divide the lot into three lots for three multi-unit townhouse buildings and was only asking for a preliminary plat approval to determine the appropriateness of the proposed subdivision without having to prepare final engineering documents. Per staff, the petitioner would have one year to request the approval of the final plat of subdivision if the Village Council approves the preliminary plat. At that time, full final engineering documents would have to be prepared. All units would have driveway access off of Crystal Avenue. A review of the dedicated right-of-ways for Crystal and Dunham Roads followed along with the proposed new improvements.

Staff believed the proposal was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the use served as a transitional use between the commercial use to the south and the single family residential use to the north. The proposal was consistent with the lot sizes and the six-unit townhomes in the adjacent single-family attached residential development to the northeast. The proposal was consistent with the Village's Subdivision Ordinance except for Lot 2 due to the required the dedication of right-of-way for Crystal Avenue. Details of the roadway width followed, noting that Lot 2 had a current depth of 155 feet minus the 35 feet for right-of-way, and totaled 120 feet in depth, which was why there was an exception request. All requirements for public utilities and drainage easements are met, along with providing park and school donations, based on the number of units being provided. Further requirements for the proposal followed.

Continuing, Mr. Latinovic reported that a homeowners' association would be created to maintain the property and the stormwater detention. The Village would create a Special Service Area in case the homeowner's association defaulted. Signage and proper public notification went out to those residing within 250 feet of the subject site. Per staff's request, the petitioner held a neighborhood meeting on September 28, 2013 at the library and a summary of that meeting was included in staff's report. Several phone calls were received by staff from area residents, who filed a separate petition, and have provided a handout for their presentation after the petitioner's presentation tonight.

Mr. Latinovic summarized the neighbor concerns included: safety concerns regarding the current width of Crystal Avenue; stormwater drainage, economic concerns, construction traffic, funding of the development, additional traffic, etc. Following the concerns, Mr. Latinovic reviewed the building timeline for the proposal and discussed the steps that would have to be taken before construction begins, i.e., comply with the Village's site management ordinance; proper fencing off of the site, work hours, access, clean-up, etc.

A review of the expected traffic trips, including AM and PM peak hours followed. The standards for the exceptions followed next, noting the exception for the depth of Lot 2, from 140 feet required to 120 feet proposed. Each standard was reviewed in greater detail by Mr. Latinovic. Staff found the standards for granting the exception were met and recommended that the Plan Commission forward a positive recommendation to the Village Council subject to the four conditions in staff's report.

Per Mr. Matejczyk's question, staff clarified that the petition was before the commission because the petitioner was seeking a subdivision but he could have constructed one building on the lot

Approved 1/27/14

without the subdivision and without coming before the Plan Commission. Per question, Mr. Latinovic said he could only assume the petitioner was subdividing for marketability but deferred to the petitioner. Chairperson Urban added that under the current proposal the petitioner was required to widen the road, but asked if the same would occur under a larger building proposal, Mr. Latinovic responded that the Village would request the same improvements. Asked if the petition for the three-lot subdivision was denied, could the petitioner turn around and construct one large building, Mr. Latinovic confirmed the petitioner could.

Per commissioner questions, Mr. Latinovic reported that the fire protection district did review the plans and required that all townhome units include sprinklers and fire alarms. The proposed access would also allow for emergency vehicle accessibility.

As to what thought process was generated for having the lots as single-family, Mr. Latinovic explained the residents brought the issue forward and believed the lots were better suited for single-family residential lots. Staff did review the idea, noting that the R5A zoning did allow for single-family lots, but a different subdivision would have to be brought before the commissioners and Village Council. Additionally, Mr. Latinovic stated the market also dictates if a property is developed single-family or townhouse if the zoning allows for both. Per another question, the R5A classification, from the research done by Mr. Latinovic, indicated that the rezoning of the site occurred in approximately 1983 and had not changed since. Asked when the residences on the north side of Crystal Avenue were constructed, Mr. Latinovic reported the residences in the Rainbow Estates Subdivision were approved in 1995 and he surmised single-family homes were constructed there between 1996 and 1997. Lastly, staff reported the Downers Park Plaza shopping center was developed in 1979.

Mr. Waechtler asked Mr. Latinovic to clarify the zoning around the subject site, which included R5A, R3 (along Hobart Ave.), and R1. Mr. Waechtler voiced concern about emergency vehicles having a turn-around on Mathias Road, north of Crystal Avenue, wherein Mr. Latinovic reminded the commissioners that the fire department reviewed the plans and indicated they would likely back up on Mathias Road, as was their current practice.

Mr. Latinovic then explained that proposed improvements for the small wetlands would include widening and improving the functioning of the wetland, which included improved vegetation, improved inlets and outlets while the homeowners association would maintain it. The Stormwater Ordinance also required the petitioner to provide a maintenance plan for the wetlands. Staff stated that according to the preliminary design engineering, all impervious areas that were developed would drain to the stormwater detention.

On behalf of the applicant, Mr. Anthony Pecoraro, for Dunham Street Development, P.O. Box 331, Highwood, IL thanked staff for their assistance on this project. He reported that Dunham Street Development hired a general contractor, BP Homes, to construct the homes for the development. A brief history of BP Homes followed. Mr. Pecoraro added that the final objective was to construct 12 townhomes in three separate buildings (1 two-unit building, 1 four-unit building and 1 six-unit building) versus one large 16 unit building, per the residents' concerns. He reported the proposal met the Village's Comprehensive Plan by providing a separation barrier from the commercial area to the south and from the single-family homes to the north. Details of the luxury townhomes followed. Mr. Pecoraro confirmed that the petitioner would comply with the following: the widening of Crystal Avenue and right-of-way with a five-foot wide sidewalk; a 10-foot parkway on

Approved 1/27/14

Dunham Street; the “hammer-head” between Mathias and Crystal Avenue; the fee-in-lieu for 16 parkway trees; a stormwater detention facility that meets the Village and County’s requirements; and providing just over \$34,000 in school and park donations.

Exterior elevations were then provided by Mr. Pecoraro, who confirmed the residents did see the elevations at their meeting. The buildings would be constructed of stone skirts, brick masonry, and siding. Approximate unit sizes would range from 2,700 to just over 3,000 square feet.

Chairperson Urban opened up the meeting to public comment and entered into the public record the following three documents: 1) an email dated 10/21/13 from Jennifer H. Tom, 7205 Mathias, that was transmitted and included in commissioners’ packets; 2) an email dated 10/24/13 from Jennifer H. Tom, 7502 Mathias, with a listing of the signed petition (on dais); and 3) a cover letter, [Change.org](#), that was delivered tonight and on the dais.

(The Plan Commission took a 5 minute break at 8:11 p.m. and reconvened at 8:16 p.m.)

Mr. Chester Tom, 7205 Mathias Road, reviewed his presentation, summarizing the concerns of the residents, which pertained to the following: adhering to proper Village planning, safety and drainage concerns, economic concerns, and finding alternatives. Mr. Tom conveyed that the issues to be addressed included widening the road to a full 30 feet; ensure proper stormwater drainage; add additional stormwater detention; include an area for a properly designed cul-de-sac; and to properly size the entrance of Crystal Avenue to reduce the traffic flow issue. Alternatives included: developing the site into single-family homes since drainage and stormwater detention would be handled better; reduce the number of townhomes proposed with better aesthetics; add access from Lemont Road; and utilize rear-facing garages. He pointed out the existing R5A single-family zoning around the site, emphasizing that it could be used as a precedent for the area. He also pointed out another nearby 2.2 acre site zoned R5A and questioned what would stop a developer from developing that site with townhomes. He believed that townhomes being constructed in an established single-family area, even if it was the petitioner’s right, should not be built because he did not believe it met the Village’s Comprehensive Plan.

Chairperson Urban clarified to Mr. Tom that as to road widening, radius and such, that would fall under the purview of the Village Community Development staff, Public Works and the Village engineer, and not the Plan Commission. The stormwater/wetlands, however, would fall under both the Village as well as DuPage County.

Mr. Steve Auernhamer, 1160 Crystal Ave., lives adjacent to an existing detention basin and emphasized that the widening of the street would not increase housing value, as mentioned earlier. He stated that half of the traffic that travels on Crystal Ave. is already inadvertent traffic. Large trucks, plows, etc, that already back into Crystal Ave. will not benefit anymore by the increased roadway. He strongly recommended reviewing the street layout, particularly if the driveways for the townhome development remained as planned. He agreed transition was in order but did not believe it incorporated single-family homes and townhomes, except if it were a similar arrangement such as the townhomes to the east, where the transition was “distinctly separate.” He reminded the commissioners that a statement in the Comprehensive Plan stated that “development should be sensitive and consistent with existing neighborhood character.” He found it discouraging that the anticipated sales prices for the similar Burr Ridge townhomes constructed by the same developer

Approved 1/27/14

were much higher than what they actually sold for, and he was concerned the same thing would occur with the subject proposal.

Mr. Beggs asked what the difference was, if any, of the number of cars coming from the subject 12-townhome site or coming from five or six single-family homes, Mr. Auernhamer estimated the difference would roughly be half of the estimated 24 cars coming out of the townhome development. Per a question, Mr. Auernhamer also confirmed there was a “No Outlet” sign at the entrance of Crystal Avenue. Lastly, he voiced concern about the adjacent detention basin spilling onto Crystal Avenue in heavy storm events, suggesting that it may be too small.

Mr. Don Harkins, 1130 Crystal Avenue, was glad to see the elevations but noted that the view of the single-family homes looking onto the townhomes will see garage doors and roofs.

Ms. Tina Maria Mateja, 241 Indianapolis Ave., mentioned that she knew the developer and Village staff were in constant communication on the best way to address water retention, provide a cul-de-sac at the end of the street, and to make the proposal the best development it could be. She clarified the history of the Burr Ridge complex the residents were referring to, noting that one developer started the project but after foreclosure, the developer completed it in a down-trend real estate market. Ms. Mateja stated that the applicant’s desire to subdivide was to add more green space between the buildings and to provide new construction for down-sizing individuals. Such housing was scarce within the village. She summarized how the developer was basing the pricing of his proposed maintenance-free, luxury units. Per a question, she noted she was a realtor who sold the developers six units in Burr Ridge.

Ms. Lorelai Harkins, 1130 Crystal Ave., voiced concern that the developer pointed the residents to the homes he built but he did not tell them at the time he completed the interiors of the buildings. She questioned whether the developer would stand by his developments and did not understand how the realtor speaking prior could justify a 2,700 to 3000 sq. foot home as “downsizing.”

Mr. Rick Schumann, 1190 Crystal Ave., commented that he built his home in 1997 because it was a single-family home area. If townhomes existed there, he would not have built there. He did not believe the development belonged in the area. He found it difficult that the fire department was fine with the “set-up” and brought up the fact that the prices of the townhomes were already reduced since the last meeting with the contractor.

Mr. David Hanek, 1425 Richards, as committee member for Precinct 13, mentioned the concerns of his precinct residents, namely the access for emergency vehicles in the area and the routes they take.

Mr. Steve Auerhamer, 1160 Crystal Avenue, returned and clarified that the Burr Ridge complex he referred to in his earlier statements about the pricing was one of two complexes the developer completed in Burr Ridge. The pricing he referred to was the development that was not shown in the earlier photographs.

Ms. Jennifer Tom, 7205 Mathias Road, referenced her petition on [www.Change.org](http://www.Change.org) explaining that over 70 signatures were received, some from the same household. She believed at least over 50 or 60 households agreed that the site was not the right location for townhomes. While she did not disagree there was a need for such housing, she said it was a question of whether it was right among existing single-family homes. She questioned who signed-off on the fire safety access. She

Approved 1/27/14

reviewed the same issues raised prior but questioned whether the townhomes would be a transient neighborhood or bring in individuals who want to support and be involved in the community. She invited the commissioners to drive the area.

Mr. Waechtler indicated he drove and walked the area but noted there were no addresses on the petitions, the zip code differed, and someone from New York and from Wyoming signed the petition, wherein Ms. Tom indicated she has no ability to prevent who signed the petition on-line. However, she stated a vast majority of the petitions were from the 60516 zip code. She proceeded to explain the process an individual followed to sign the petition and offered to contact the individual to provide their exact address, if necessary. Additionally, she added that those petitions that were not in the 60516 zip code were residents probably concerned about the road intersection, congestion, property values, etc. Mr. Waechtler suggested she obtain the addresses and clean up her document before presenting it to the Village Council.

Mr. Karin Reeve, 1150 Stanford Avenue, resides a block north of Crystal Avenue and did not believe the project affected her; however, she did believe it concerned the Village and the housing trend. She supported the above statements being made by the residents but the one standard that struck her was the comment made about Standard No. 2, where it was stated that the proposal was consistent with the trend. She disagreed, as pointed out several times by the residents' statements. She also noted the proposal was not consistent with Standard No. 5 -- the character of the area -- even though someone said it was. Single-family homes surrounded the site.

Mr. Steve Margison, 7113 Dunham Road, opposed the townhomes as being not consistent with the rest of the neighborhood. He was surprised to find out that the area was zoned R5A which meant the residents could not stop townhomes without asking for a rezoning. He suggested rezoning the area for R-1 or set aside a combination of nature/wetlands preserve for the area. He stated that if the reality was going to be townhomes coming in, he asked that the developments be the "best possible" (or least offensive) townhomes. Should the proposal be denied, he stated nothing would stop the petitioner from constructing a 16-unit building and the residents would have nothing to say about it. He believed it was a "decent" plan and liked the suggestion of having access off of Lemont Road which would solve traffic and emergency access problems.

As an observation, Chairperson Urban pointed out that county jurisdiction for large roads, such as Lemont Road, required certain spacing distances for driveways. She suggested that a right-in only access may be added but there would have to be an exit somewhere on Dunham Avenue, which could become a larger issue with cut-through traffic.

Mr. Beggs questioned Mr. Margison if he was referring to a large triangular parcel south of the subject parcel for an access point, wherein Mr. Margison said he was not but found it to be an interesting observation and worth looking at. He emphasized that his early comment about creating a wetlands/nature preserve as a natural buffer was serious.

Hearing no further comments, Chairperson Urban invited the petitioner to speak.

Petitioner, Anthony Pecoraro, 10 Cliff Road, Highland Park, IL offered to answer questions and to have his architect, engineer and contractor answer any specific questions. He reiterated that they had the ability to construct up to a 16-unit townhome complex but was constructing 12 units and

Approved 1/27/14

was trying to create a buffer zone. As to the Village's greenscape requirements, Mr. Pecoraro stated they are working with staff to meet all of those requirements.

Mr. Kevin Lewis, 300 Marquardt Drive, Wheeling, IL, engineer for the development, proceeded to explain how the hammerhead was designed as an interim and how a vehicle would turn around using a three-point turn. The new right-of-way was pointed out on the plans. Mr. Lewis stated that the road would be widened to the required minimum road width of 29 feet. Regarding the existing wetland, Mr. Lewis proceeded to explain the current drainage of the existing detention basins and explained how the subject site drained in a westerly direction, heading towards other depressional areas. He pointed out where all of the stormwater from the site would be contained and released towards the south. Clarified was the fact that the water was not going to run towards the homes but, instead, travel south, which was an improvement. He emphasized that he was required to follow the Village and county's stormwater ordinances and the petitioner was before the commissioners to receive input and guidance as to an alternative to one large unit townhome building.

Mr. Lewis walked through the plans discussing the various locations of the front yard setbacks, the parkways, green space, the existing edge of pavement, driveways, etc. to better clarify the plans for the residents. He stated the petitioner was contemplating a wetlands-style detention basin to improve water quality from the basin. Backyard green space and a triangular wooded buffer area (from Lemont Road) were pointed out on the plans. Per a question about the distance from the townhomes to the single family homes, Mr. Latinovic stated it was about 25-30 feet from the front property line on single family lots to the actual single family homes, then a 70-foot right-of-way for Crystal Avenue, followed by a 25-foot setback for the townhomes. Further clarification followed.

Chairperson Urban closed public comment.

Mr. Pecoraro thanked staff for their assistance and had no further statements.

Chairperson Urban appreciated the residents' preparation for the meeting and summarized the concerns raised and how they were addressed by either staff or the petitioner's team.

Mr. Waechtler inquired about people not located within the 60516 zip code signing the petition. Mr. Beggs noted nothing should be changed on the petitions, noting the those signing the petition from far away reflect the credibility of the petition not the validity of the petition. Mr. Popovich indicated that staff would forward the petitions, the documents on the dais, and all public comment to Village Council but the validity of someone from out of state signing a petition was not staff's purview. He noted those people may own property in the Village and be concerned.

As to the resident bringing up Standard No. 2, Mr. Webster stated that staff was taking the position that the geometric configuration of the lots was consistent with the surrounding area yet he could understand the resident's logic, i.e., what was there currently as compared to what was to be built, and whether it was consistent with what was surrounding the area. Mr. Webster clarified that from a planning perspective, the standard for approving the proposed lot depth exception on Lot Two was met.

Chairperson Urban explained the challenge was that the proposed townhome project was not a zoning request, but a question of whether the commission agreed with the subdivision with the one variance for lot depth. She clarified the standards were responding to the exception being

Approved 1/27/14

requested and not necessarily the single-family detached versus attached single-family zoning. Mr. Latinovic clarified that the standards for approval were related to the exception from the minimum lot dimension requirement and not a variance. He explained that while the petition was for the approval of the subdivision, the petitioner had to satisfy the minimum lot dimension requirements for each lot and, if not satisfied, the petitioner has to ask for an exception and meet the standards under the Subdivision Ordinance for approval of those exceptions. Details followed on how the lot depths were measured with Mr. Latinovic pointing out that the depth of a lot that was 120 feet deep was relatively common in the area, including the single-family lots across the street which are all 120 feet deep.

Mr. Webster then pointed out that the same resident brought up Standard No. 5, wherein staff, in its report, stated that the buildings were three smaller, multi-unit buildings instead of one large building, which would have been allowed had there been no request for the three lots. He believed the standard could be interpreted as addressing the size of the buildings as they related to the surrounding buildings but in staff's report the standard was being met. Lastly, Mr. Webster summarized that it appeared the residents wanted the development configuration to "turn its back" on the residents who reside on Crystal Avenue so that the road that would service the townhomes would be located on the south side of the property and not on Crystal Avenue in order to avoid seeing the row of garages. He believed this was good planning.

In general, Mr. Webster stated the use of the subject land was always to be a buffer from the heavy commercial zoning to the south and it was unfortunate that Crystal Avenue was not properly installed years ago and it was very narrow for a two-lane road. While he believed Crystal Avenue would get improved, he said it would be, unfortunately, with a row of garages, but that was not a reason to redesign the petitioner's proposal or to deny it all together.

Mrs. Rabatah also cautioned the residents on whether they wanted Crystal Avenue going through to Lemont Road since it was mentioned that it may not be desirable, i.e., what type of traffic would come from Lemont Road.

Chairperson Urban reiterated to the public the challenges that were before the commissioners and entertained a motion.

**WITH REGARD TO PC 30-13, MR. BEGGS MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE THE PRELIMINARY PLAT OF SUBDIVISION TO SUBDIVIDE THE EXISTING PROPERTY INTO THREE LOTS, WITH THE FOUR CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN STAFF'S REPORT:**

- 1. The Final Plat of Subdivision shall substantially conform to the Preliminary Plat of Subdivision for Dunham Subdivision prepared by IG Consulting, Inc., dated July 3, 2013, last updated September 12, 2013, and Preliminary Engineering Plans prepared by IG Consulting Inc., dated May 8, 2013, last revised September 18, 2013, except as such plans may be modified to conform to the Village Codes and Ordinances.**
- 2. The petitioner shall pay \$34,111.24 (\$22,532.71 for the Park District, \$8,068.37 for School District 58 and \$3,510.16 for School District 99) prior to Village executing the final plat of subdivision.**

Approved 1/27/14

3. A landscape plan must be submitted indicating all proposed parkway trees (min. of 1 tree per 40 feet of frontage is required). A fee in-lieu of tree installation within the parkway (\$500 for each tree) must be submitted prior to issuance of the construction permit.
4. Crystal Avenue shall be widened per Village Standard PVT-13 (minimum width of 29 feet back of curb to back of curb).

**SECONDED BY MR. MATEJCZYK. ROLL CALL:**

**AYE: MR. BEGGS, MR. MATEJCZYK, MR. COZZO, MR. QUIRK, MRS. RABATAH, MR. RICKARD, MR. WAECHTLER, MR. WEBSTER, CHAIRPERSON URBAN**

**NAY: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 9-0**

Senior Planner Stan Popovich explained how the residents could follow this petition through the Village process. He announced to the commissioners that there will be another meeting next Monday, November 4<sup>th</sup>, to review the zoning ordinance. Lastly, he stated the look of future agendas will be slightly revised to be more in line with the other boards and commissions.

**THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 10:05 P.M. ON MOTION BY MRS. RABATAH, SECONDED BY MR. MATEJCZYK. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 9-0.**

/s/ Celeste K. Weilandt

Celeste K. Weilandt

(As transcribed by MP-3 audio)



Approved 1/27/14

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE  
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING  
PUBLIC HEARING

NOVEMBER 4, 2013, 7:00 P.M.

Chairwoman Urban called the November 4, 2013 meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and led the Plan Commissioners and the public in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

**ROLL CALL:**

**PRESENT:** Chairwoman Urban, Mr. Beggs, Mr. Cozzo, Mr. Matejczyk, Mr. Rickard, Mr. Waechtler, Mr. Webster

**ABSENT:** Mr. Quirk, Mrs. Rabatah

**STAFF PRESENT:** Community Development Planning Director Tom Dabareiner, Senior Planner Stan Popovich, Planner Kelley Chrise and Planner Damir Latinovic

**VISITORS:** Ms. Marge Earl, 4720 Florence Ave., Downers Grove; Mr. Tom Le Cren, 545 Chicago Avenue, Downers Grove

A brief review of the meeting's protocol followed.

**PC 18-13** The purpose of the request is to consider updates to Chapter 20 (Subdivision Code) and Chapter 28 (Zoning Ordinance) of the Municipal Code; Village of Downers Grove, Petitioner. *(Continued from October 7, 2013 meeting.)*

Chairwoman Urban reported that the commissioners will be considering the packet, as presented by staff, and will be discussing any proposed revisions. Staff will also be looking for a recommendation tonight to forward the updates to the Village Council.

Chairwoman Urban swore in those individuals that would be speaking on this petition.

Director Dabareiner opened up the discussion by briefly reviewing the timeline process for the zoning ordinance draft, asking that the commissioners vote and forward a recommendation tonight to the Village Council. Specifically, he would be highlighting the changes made since the commissioners last saw the modules and stated that any changes made tonight would be written down and incorporated into the recommendation. Director Dabareiner, in Mr. Bishop's absence, shared a PowerPoint presentation highlighting the various changes made to the zoning ordinance in a page by page format, some of which were minor in detail, while others had specific comments:

Page 2-1: Per staff, the title of R5 classification will be reworded to blend in with attached housing.

Approved 1/27/14

Page 3-4: The term “Outdoor Display” was accidentally left out. Director Dabareiner stated there should be a hot link reference to “Temporary Uses.”

Page 5-2: “Table of Uses” -- Staff reviewed those uses that were added, deleted, or combined.

Page 5-9: (Handout distributed to the commissioners). Included were the latest definitions for “Library”, “Museum” or “Cultural Facilities”, with Director Dabareiner explaining how the page numbers for this section will eventually work out. The term “Hookah Lounges” was omitted.

Page 5-13: Per Director Dabareiner, “Title Secured Loan Establishments” will not be allowed. Mr. Webster said he did not recall discussing the prohibition of fortune-telling, psychics and tattoo shops, and asked how such establishments get treated, i.e., they are non-conforming uses.

Page 6-5: Physical separation for primary and accessory living areas -- Director Dabareiner clarified that an external door will have to be placed on the side or rear yards, i.e., no two front doors on the front elevation since the point is to avoid creating an apartment in a single-family residence. Asked if there could be considerations for safety, Director Dabareiner indicated there always could be, especially if going through the ZBA process. Chairwoman Urban reiterated the new language was more flexible.

Page 6-9: The new requirement that retail kiosks be under a weather-protected canopy -- Mr. Webster did not recall this topic coming up for discussion and asked the reason for it, wherein Director Dabareiner explained it was good practice in general. He pointed out, however, that existing kiosks were “grandfathered” in but if a business did request a change, staff would ask them to provide a cover. An explanation followed on how these types of requests can be approached. Asked if there are any restrictions on the number of kiosks a business could have, Director Dabareiner stated there was no restriction number currently and to date, there were no issues. However, if it did become an issue, he stated it could be addressed as an amendment and brought to this commission for consideration.

Page 8-5: Landscape Islands -- changing from 1 island per 20 parking spaces to 1 island for every 10 parking spaces -- Chairwoman Urban shared that while she appreciated the goal of more greenscape, she pointed out that landscape islands were not the best maintained green spaces within a property. She supported the island increasing from 120 sq. feet to 150 sq. feet but was not comfortable with going from the 20 to 10 requirement, due to the net gain that was lost. Director Dabareiner clarified that the smallest lots were excluded from the requirement. Chairwoman Urban reiterated that while she was seeing office spaces that were constructed per code, more parking spaces were being added because the spaces were being leased at higher rates. Mr. Webster agreed with Chairman Urban’s comments, pointing out that office parking spaces nowadays were being utilized by telecommuters and not everyone parked their car every day. Director Dabareiner opened up matter for dialog.

Other commissioner comments included that the one island for every 20 spaces appeared to be typical and the fact that the island square footage was being increased, also helped. Other comments included that this issue arose out of the Comprehensive Plan recommendations for landscaping and parking lots, specifically for the Ogden Avenue Corridor. Some commissioners recalled this issue also, citing some of the Ogden Avenue businesses that recently appeared before the commission and the commission asking them to provide more green space. Chairwoman Urban

Approved 1/27/14

add that this requirement becomes a hardship for some of the smaller businesses along Ogden Avenue.

Ms. Marge Earl, 4720 Florence Avenue, understood the chairwoman's comments but suggested that it may be more practical for the commission to go with the larger islands -- making them slightly larger -- than having more islands for every 10 spaces. Per Ms. Earl, many little islands become a landscaper's nightmare and the plantings rarely survive.

Chairwoman Urban asked for a voice vote to recommend modifying to the parking requirement to keep it at one (1) island for 20 every parking spaces. Consensus carried with a voice vote of 6-1. (Nay: Mr. Waechtler)

Page 11-3: This section discussed contiguous, non-conforming lots under single ownership. Director Dabareiner explained the lots needed to be consolidated if construction across the lots was to occur. Some slides were referenced and Director Dabareiner explained how the change impacted the allowances in the zoning code which would affect several lots. Examples of three scenarios were reviewed on the overhead. After searching the R4 district, staff found six examples of remnant parcels (25 to 30 ft. wide) with structures on them which lots would fall under scenario No. 1. Per Mr. Webster's question, Director Dabareiner explained that if all bulk requirements are being met, a property owner could build by right without coming before the Plan Commission. Where there is common ownership, the property needs to consolidate. Without common ownership, each property owner can build on his or her lot.

Page 12-2: Per staff, "Neighbor Communications" was a new section which basically required a petitioner to hold a neighborhood meeting prior to a public hearing and that he/she provide a written result of that meeting as it relates to telecommunications towers and for rezonings. Under the rezoning section on Page 12-7, Director Dabareiner stated the description was different in that it applied to rezonings that were not single-family. Examples followed. Staff felt this was a good addition to the ordinance.

Page 12-4: "Notice Requirements" were revised to not only include the 250 feet requirement but to be flexible and include a graph. Specifically, the 250 feet would not count the street rights-of-way under the proposed revisions. It would provide notice to additional property owners who would not otherwise be noticed under the strict 250 feet requirement. Examples followed.

Pages 12-20 & 12-21: Per staff, this new section entitled "Exceptions" was an additional opportunity to take cases before the ZBA. It provides a different set of standards the ZBA can use for those cases that make sense to grant a variation but cannot establish a hardship. An example followed, noting the new language includes "working to minimize the impact where there is one." Because the Village is built out, Director Dabareiner pointed out that more of these types of cases (usually expansions) will be coming to the Village and the Village does not want to hinder residents from investing in their homes.

Page 14-5: "Electric Vehicle Charging Stations" is new and will be allowed as a new setback encroachment. Conversation followed regarding the two charging stations near Kohl's and what their setback requirements were currently, if any. Asked how this issue was being addressed currently, Mr. Popovich explained that for the time being, staff has used the accessory structure setback requirements for such requests. Questions followed as to who pays for the use of the

Approved 1/27/14

charging station. Per Director Dabareiner, this change came out of the Comprehensive Plan to offer more “green” alternatives.

Ms. Marge Earl, 4720 Florence Avenue, responding to a question as to who pays for the charging station, explained that from her husband’s experience with the stations, it requires a charge card swipe to get a certain amount of electricity for so many hours.

Page 14-11: Definitions section: a suggestion was made to add “snakes” to the list. In general, Director Dabareiner explained that this issue arises when people make claims of a companion animal relationship with their animals, i.e., a goat, donkey, or some kind of exotic fowl. The issue also becomes the relationship between that property and the surrounding properties which is why the zoning is in place. Per a question, Director Dabareiner stated that dangerous animals are addressed in another part of the village’s municipal ordinance.

Chairwoman Urban noted that medical marijuana was not mentioned in the permitted use chart, where Director Dabareiner explained that the village manager had asked to not include it until it was actually enacted. The other change pertained to Page 6-7, Habitable Space above Garages -- the revised text did not align with Figure 6-2. Other comments included something being wrong with the artwork on Page 15-15 (drawing of a portable storage container); Page 11-5, paragraph (e), Moving -- a question about moving a non-conformance; Page 6-5, new wording: “provided that the door does not face a street.” Staff also explained the definition of a hookah lounge.

To Mr. Waechtler’s question about hookah lounges, Ms. Marge Earl, 4720 Florence, explained that the hookah lounge was a very popular tobacco smoking activity among college students where the lounges really become a hang-out for students. It was also a Middle Eastern cultural activity.

Turning to Page 6-7: Mr. Rickard asked whether habitable space was allowed above a detached garage currently, wherein Director Dabareiner explained that the village does not allow the space to be livable-type space and looks for such items as showers, kitchen facilities, etc. so that the space does not become an apartment.

**WITH REGARD TO PC 18-13 (DRAFT ZONING ORDINANCE ONLY), MR. WEBSTER MADE A MOTION TO FORWARD THE DRAFT ZONING ORDINANCE TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL, AS PRESENTED, WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES PERTAINING TO: 1) SECTION 8.030, AS IT RELATES TO THE NUMBER OF LANDSCAPE ISLANDS; AND 2) THE TEXT REVISION ON PAGE 6-5, AS IT RELATES TO THE EXTENDED FAMILY ACCESSORY HOUSING.**

**SECONDED BY MR. BEGGS. ROLL CALL:**

**AYE: MR. WEBSTER, MR. BEGGS, MR. COZZO, MR. MATEJCZYK, MR. RICKARD, MR. WAECHTLER, CHAIRWOMAN URBAN**

**NAY: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 7-0.**

Approved 1/27/14

Staff was commended for their work on the draft. Director Dabareiner reported that the Subdivision Ordinance will be coming forward at some point. He thanked commissioners for their input also.

**WITH RESPECT TO PC-18-13 (SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE PORTION) A MOTION WAS MADE TO CONTINUE THE HEARING TO A DATE CERTAIN, THAT DATE BEING JANUARY 6, 2014.**

**SECONDED BY MR. COZZO. ROLL CALL:**

**AYE: MR. WEBSTER, MR. COZZO, MR. BEGGS, MR. MATEJCZYK, MR. RICKARD, MR. WAECHTLER, CHAIRWOMAN URBAN**

**NAY: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 7-0**

Per a question on the Flowering Hearts zoning text request and whether it was addressed in the draft zoning ordinance, Director Dabareiner stated it was not because there was not a consensus to make the changes.

Mr. Popovich stated there will be a December 2, 2013 meeting and commissioners should have also received a copy of the meeting dates for 2014.

**THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:40 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. COZZO. SECONDED BY MR. WAECHTLER. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 7-0.**

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