

APPROVED

**VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING**

April 4, 2022, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Rickard called the April 4th, 2022 meeting of the Downers Grove Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and led the Plan Commissioners and public in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Chairman Rickard, Commissioners Rector, Dmytryszyn, Boyle, Maurer, Toth

ABSENT: Commissioners Roche, Johnson, and Patel

STAFF: Director of Community Development Stan Popovich, Planning Manager Jason Zawila, Senior Planner Flora Leon

OTHERS

PRESENT: Ron Olson, Matt McDonald, Muhammad Starks, Nancy Gazelle, Liz Chalberg, Bill Chalberg, Brian Meade, David Yandel, Michael Werthman, Andy Sikich, Police Chief Shanon Gillette, and Fire Chief Scott Spinazola.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Rickard entertained a motion to approve the minutes.

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 7, 2022 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING WERE APPROVED ON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER RECTOR, SECOND BY COMMISSIONER DMYTRYSZYN, MOTION PASSED BY VOICE VOTE OF 6-0.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Rickard explained the protocol for the public hearing process and swore in those individuals that would be speaking during the public hearing.

FILE 22-PLC-0007: A PETITION SEEKING APPROVAL FOR A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, A REZONING FROM DT TO DT/PUD, RIGHT-OF-WAY VACATION, FINAL PLAT OF SUBDIVISION AND A SPECIAL USE TO CONSTRUCT A WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY. THE PETITIONER IS PROPOSING TO CONSTRUCT THE DOWNERS GROVE CIVIC CENTER BUILDING THAT WILL HOUSE THE OFFICES OF VILLAGE HALL, POLICE STATION AND SCHOOL DISTRICT 58, IN ADDITION TO REMOVING THE EXISTING TELECOMMUNICATION TOWER AND CONSTRUCTING A NEW TELECOMMUNICATION TOWER.

THE PROPERTY IS CURRENTLY ZONED DT, DOWNTOWN TRANSITION. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED DIRECTLY EAST OF THE INTERSECTION OF

APPROVED

WASHINGTON STREET AND BURLINGTON AVENUE, COMMONLY KNOWN AS 700 BURLINGTON AVENUE, 801 BURLINGTON AVENUE, 825 BURLINGTON AVENUE, AND 842 CURTISS STREET (PINS 09-08-131-018, 09-08-813-019, 09-08-211-001, 09-08-211-002, 09-08-211-003, 09-08-211-014, 09-08-211-015, 09-08-211-016, 09-08-211-001, 09-08-304-008). VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE, OWNER AND PETITIONER.

Petitioner, Mike Baker Deputy Village Manager for the Village of Downers Grove introduced himself as the Project Manager for the new Civic Center Facility Design and Construction. He then introduced the team that would partake in the petitioner's presentation.

Mr. Baker then thanked the public and board for their consideration of the petition. He then explained that the request from the Plan Commission was for a positive recommendation on the items listed on the screen, including: (1) plat of vacation; (2) final plat of subdivision; (3) final planned unit development; (4) map amendment from Downtown Transition to Transition/Planned Unit Development and a (5) special use.

Mr. Baker explained that the approvals would permit the construction of the new Downers Grove Civic Center, a new facility that would provide space for the Police Department, Village Hall and District 58 administrative offices. This would allow combining facilities that are currently in three separate buildings, into one and providing substantially more modern and efficient features and spaces to serve public safety, administrative and educational needs of this community for decades to come. These approvals would also allow for the construction of a new telecommunications tower, along with the removal of the existing tower.

Mr. Baker then noted that the subject property was located at the southeast corner of Burlington Avenue and Washington Street, commonly known as 700 Burlington Avenue, 801 Burlington Avenue, 825 Burlington Avenue and 842 Curtiss Street. As an overview of this project, he shared a three-minute video produced by the Village's Communications Department. He added at the end of the video that the neighborhood meeting mentioned occurred on March 21, 2022 and included approximately 50 residents in attendance.

Mr. Baker explained that his presentation would focus on three elements, the petition's (1) compliance with the recently adopted Downtown Design Guidelines, (2) compliance with the Comprehensive Plan; and (3) compliance with the Zoning Ordinance and how it meets the review and approval criteria for the planned unit development, zoning map amendment, and special use.

Mr. Baker then provided an overview on how the petition met the requirements of each entitlement request. As part of the presentation, Mr. Baker provided further explanation for the special use request related to the proposed telecommunications tower. He explained that after an evaluation of potential tower sites was conducted, this revealed that only a small area on the Civic Center site could serve as the future space for the telecommunications tower. Mr. Baker also provided photo renderings of the proposed new tower site compared to the existing tower site.

Mr. Baker then spoke about the improvements related to the Washington Crossing. He noted that the project would eliminate the eastern leg of Burlington Avenue and Washington Street intersection. Mr. Baker added that this option was reviewed thoroughly and that the Village Council considered and supported the configuration. He listed several benefits with the proposed

APPROVED

configuration and noted that the improvements at the crossing represented just one of the many community benefits offered by the project. He added that the project provided environmentally sustainable features, consolidates existing public facilities, provides spaces that support modern work environments and improved customer interactions, along with landscaped paths and public plazas. Mr. Baker concluded his presentation by thanking the Plan Commission for their time and consideration.

Chairman Rickard invited public comment.

Mr. Ron Olson, 704 Maple Avenue, explained that his home would be directly backing up to the proposed tower. He noted that when they purchased their home the antenna was not right behind their house. Mr. Olson expressed his concern over the potential decrease in property values due to this proposal. As such, he suggested that there might be consideration for a real estate credit for the homes that would now have to bear the cost of the proposed tower. Mr. Olson asked about the required fall radius and how his research led him to believe the fall zone had to equal 300% of the height. Additionally, he requested additional screening to be provided in the form of a 12-foot fence and more landscaping. Finally, he expressed concern over the increase in height of the tower and the increased proximity the new tower would have with adjacent residential properties. To conclude, Mr. Olson expressed that the proposal appeared to give future residents of Downers Grove preference over existing residents considering the TIF district would only work if the future multi-family development on Lot 2 was not close to the tower.

Mr. Matt McDonald, 710 Maple Avenue, agreed with Mr. Olson's previous comments. He added that their properties were within the required setback for a new telecommunication tower. Specifically he noted that the requested relief would allow the tower four times closer than what would typically be allowed. Mr. McDonald then noted that the plans did not include any proposed landscaping. He added that additional buffer would make sense between the Public Works property and their backyards. He concluded by stating that the proposal did not preserve their property values or the pleasantness of their backyards.

Mr. Muhammad Starks, 706 Maple Avenue, asked what the future of the third parcel would be. He noted that in the past, this area has been used for a number of different purposes and now it seemed that with the tower the parcel appeared more industrial. As such, Mr. Starks asked if the tower was placed back there what the future for that property would be. Mr. Starks, concluded by stating that he had previously attended a Village Council meeting when they were considering development options for that property. He then decided he would invest in his property and now he wanted to confirm what the future plans were for this parcel. Mr. Starks also noted that he agreed with Mr. Olson and Mr. McDonald's previous comments.

Ms. Nancy Gazelle, introduced herself and noted that she was not an adjacent neighbor to the proposed site. Instead, she explained that she lived on the other side of town but commuted through the area frequently. Specifically Ms. Gazelle explained that she used the designated bike path and believed that rerouting the Washington Street intersection did not adequately take into consideration southbound cyclist traffic. She concluded by stating that routing all of the traffic through the Burlington and Washington intersection was dangerous for cars, pedestrians, and cyclists.

APPROVED

Chairman Rickard invited for any additional public comment. No additional public comment was received. Staff was invited to present.

Mr. Jason Zawila, Planning Manager, showed the location of the site on a map and noted that the property was zoned Downtown Transition (DT) was currently improved with Village Hall, the Village's Police Station, and a converted single family house that sits on the southwest corner of the subject property. He explained that the site also included the Village's fleet management facility and a telecommunication tower located immediately east of Village Hall. Mr. Zawila also explained that notice was properly provided to all property owners 250 feet from the property in addition to publishing a legal notice and posting the public hearing signs as shown on the screen. Additionally, he noted that as required by the Zoning Ordinance and highlighted with the first presentation, the petitioner held a neighborhood meeting, which was summarized in the packet and earlier in the evening.

Mr. Zawila shared that the Village of Downers Grove, as the petitioner, was requesting approval for a planned unit development, a rezoning from DT to DT/PUD, right-of-way vacation, final plat of subdivision and a special use to construct a wireless telecommunications facility. He then noted that the approvals would permit the construction of a combined Village Hall and Police Station facility and relocation of a telecommunication tower.

Mr. Zawila provided a slide showing the proposed subdivision. He explained that the proposal included vacating part of the Burlington Avenue right-of-way. Additionally, he shared that on Lot 1 the Village was proposing the construction of the Downers Grove Civic Center, which would meet the Downtown Design Guidelines. Lot 2 would remain vacant and any future private development proposal would be required to go through the complete public process. Finally, Mr. Zawila noted that Lot 3 would be designated for the newly proposed monopole communications tower.

Mr. Zawila moved on to describe the two sets of requested relief associated with the petition. The first included the parking lot. To maximize the parking on site, the setback would be reduced along the northern property line. The other relief requested was associated with the relocation of the telecommunications tower. He highlighted that the existing tower was a critical part of the emergency services response network used by DU-COMM, the Village, and adjacent communities. Staff found that the petition met the goals of the Zoning Ordinance, Downtown Design Guidelines, and Comprehensive Plan. As such, he recommended that the commission formulate a motion to approve the petition based on the draft motion provided on page eleven of the staff report.

Chairman Rickard asked if staff could talk more about the telecommunications tower. Perhaps noting how far it is moving and what physically would be different from what is there now. Additionally he asked about any other immediate construction plans for Lot 3. Mr. Zawila stated the petitioner would respond to the operation functions of the tower when they came back up to respond. Commissioner Rector asked for clarification on the required 300% setback. Mr. Zawila explained that it is an additional buffer. The first requirement of 200 feet is to clear the fall zone. He added that in this case the petition was requesting relief from the setback because there was not one physical location that would meet that setback on the site without that relief.

Chairman Rickard asked if there was any current relief given for the tower. Mr. Zawila said that he did not believe so.

APPROVED

Commissioner Boyle asked if there was a surplus of commuter parking. Additionally, he asked if this became an issue later on if there was a plan to address this. Mr. Zawila noted that it appeared that there were other parking options in the current network that would make up for the loss of commuter parking. Commissioner Boyle asked if that ended up not being the case does the Comprehensive Plan have other options to explore if parking becomes an issue in the future. Mr. Zawila shared that there were a multitude of options available as it related to downtown parking. The Village has worked on reviewing this in the past and will continue to work on this as situations arise.

Commissioner Boyle asked for clarification on the proposed Washington intersection. Mr. Zawila indicated that it would be more appropriate for the petitioner to address this question in more detail when they came back up to the podium.

Commissioner Maurer asked why if there were only 164 spaces required a total 252 spaces proposed. He asked if a nice green space could have been proposed instead. Mr. Zawila explained that there were portions of the parking designated as secured and the provided spaces are required for Village Hall and the School District operations.

Commissioner Maurer asked about the available locations for the tower. He asked what made that area the available location. Mr. Zawila noted that the petitioner would speak in more detail on that.

Commissioner Maurer asked if Lot 2 were proposed as private development, if this would push vehicular Village traffic between Lot 1 and Lot 3 onto Curtis Street. Mr. Zawila confirmed that was correct.

Commissioner Maurer asked if Lot 2 was supposed to take advantage of transit-oriented development features why the building was oriented in the opposite direction. Additionally with the primary entrance, facing east and no sidewalk connection along the train tracks there is no access to easily get to the train station. Mr. Zawila stated that there was no final plan for Lot 2. The image for review is only a diagram. However, there was a potential entrance shown on the plans that could also lead to the existing sidewalk network.

Commissioner Maurer asked if the 4.4 feet would not be intended to include a sidewalk. Mr. Zawila said no a sidewalk along the northern lot line would not be included due to the location of the proposed secured parking area.

Commissioner Toth asked what the proposed square footage building as compared to the existing facilities. Mr. Zawila noted that the petitioner would speak to those square footage difference.

Chairman Rickard asked if the location of Lot 2 came about based on the phasing for the construction of this project. Mr. Zawila confirmed that was correct.

Chairman Rickard invited the petitioner to speak to some of the questions that came up.

Mr. Baker acknowledged that the comments that were expressed by the residents were very understandable, given the proximity of their homes to the construction of the new tower. He noted that there were some suggestions that were made and the Village would be open to enhancing buffering between the Village property and rear yard of residential properties. With the proposed

APPROVED

use of Lot 3, Village staff and customers would be using the space to park during the construction. Mr. Baker noted that the comments received presented an opportunity to explore how the space could be used in the future.

Chairman Rickard asked if in general the property moving forward would function as it has in the past. Mr. Baker confirmed that was correct. He did add that the existing garage, currently used for salt storage would be demolished to accommodate space for the proposed telecommunications tower.

Commissioner Maurer asked what made the designated area as the only available location for the telecommunications tower. Mr. Baker explained that the area designated was deemed available space based on the 200-foot setback required from any residential structure or public safety facility.

Commissioner Maurer asked if in that case the proposal considered the future private development on Lot 2. Mr. Baker confirmed that was correct.

Commissioner Maurer asked if there were any ideas of what the private development would be. He added if it were multi-family, residential could there not be an easement that stated the telecommunications tower must go on their roof. Mr. Baker stated that Lot 2 was anticipated to be an apartment building. As such, that would not accommodate the needs of the telecommunications tower.

Brian Meade, FGM Architects, explained that the phasing would be challenging because the tower would need to be in operations sooner than the private development is constructed. Commissioner Maurer noted that the existing tower is not on Lot 2. So he asked if the phasing could not proceed simply by keeping the exiting tower in operation. Mr. Meade explained that the existing tower was on Lot 2. He added that with demolition the issue of adjacency would come up.

Commissioner Maurer asked if Mr. Baker could address the traffic moving onto Curtiss Street and why the proposal included 30% more than what the required parking was. Mr. Baker explained that the main factors driving the additional parking included: public parking for police services, Village Hall, and District 58 services. Additionally, he added that with the council chambers being designed as more of an accessible and multifunctional space this would allow for more programming of this space during the day.

Commissioner Maurer asked if there was a continuous fence along the eastern lot line. Mr. Baker noted that as the plans were further refined and there was a better understanding for could be constructed on Lot 2, there could be an opportunity for sort of pedestrian access from the building, through and around the Village Hall site. Commissioner Maurer further stated that the suggested design would be an improvement. However, he noted the future development of Lot 2 would have a building giving its back to the civic center, the downtown, and the train station instead of embracing the civic center. Mr. Baker agreed and noted that staff could look at the eastern portion of the lot to encourage and promote more of a connection between the private development lot and civic center property.

Commissioner Maurer added that if more could be done for Lot 2 to embrace the civic center lot this could make lot 2 a more desirable development site for the developer, tenants, and Village. Mr. Baker offered to address a comment regarding cyclist safety. He noted that the width of the

APPROVED

pathway on the west side of the building was such that it could be very multimodal in nature, and accommodate not just pedestrian traffic, but also bicycles as well. Mr. Baker added that as the design was further developed; they would make sure that the signage properly indicated and maintained safe bicycle access onto the site. He stated that this was just one opportunity to make sure that cyclists had the opportunity to navigate the site in ways that did not force them along the curve on Washington Street.

Commissioner Dmytryszyn thanked the petitioner for the detailed Telecommunication Tower FAQ that was provided. He asked if more detail could be provided on the proposed increased height of the new tower. Mr. Baker referred back to the proposed tower elevation. He explained that the proposed tower was a monopole design, thus making it more narrow vertically. Mr. Baker shared that the existing tower was a lattice design. He stated that the monopole tower required more height to accommodate the equipment necessary to support the use of the tower. Mr. Baker added that the priority was to accommodate the public safety communications required equipment to allow police fire and EMS to continue to interact and communicate with dispatch and Downers Grove and neighboring communities. Additionally, Mr. Baker explained that the Village wanted to accommodate existing private telecommunications providers. He said that the thought process behind doing this was that if they were not afforded opportunities here, it is likely that they would pursue other tower construction in the immediate vicinity to make sure that their coverage could be provided.

Commissioner Dmytryszyn asked if there were any requirements to upgrade the current tower. Mr. Baker stated that he did not believe any upgrades were required. Commissioner Dmytryszyn asked if the existing tower facilitated the current needs. Mr. Baker explained that the tower does meet the current needs but he noted that it was also forty years old. Commissioner Dmytryszyn asked if the Village was going to continue to lease the space and make revenue off that. Mr. Baker confirmed that was correct.

Commissioner Toth asked if the tower had to remain on this site. Mr. Baker confirmed that yes the tower had to remain on this site. David Yandel, FGM Architects, confirmed that the tower had to remain in close proximity to the police station. If the tower located further away additional fiber lines would have to be installed.

Chairman Rickard invited the petitioner to provide a closing statement.

Mr. Baker thanked the residents and the Plan Commission for the comments and questions and noted that this would help improve the project moving forward.

Chairman Rickard requested that the Plan Commission move on to deliberation. After receiving a request from the public, he instead allowed for additional public comment.

Mr. Ron Olson, 704 Maple Avenue, asked for clarification on three items. The first was regarding the setback requirement of 300%. He asked why an exception was being made to reduce from 600 feet to 145 feet. Next, he asked about the placement of the tower. He noted that if the only barrier to relocate the tower was running fiber, he was certain that with today's technology running fiber would be possible. Lastly, Mr. Olson asked about the height of the tower and if the maximum permitted is 140 feet, why this tower was allowed to exceed that.

APPROVED

Mr. Muhammad Starks, 706 Maple Avenue, noted that if the city was willing to work with residents if there was another process to continue this dialogue. Chairman Rickard explained that the Plan Commission was a recommending body and that there would be additional meetings at the Village Council level where a final decision would be made. He noted that there are an addition two opportunities to participate and ask question. Mr. Starks asked if there would be an additional opportunity for the public to review design changes and offer their opinions. Chairman Rickard noted that the Village staff is available via email. He added that if residents wanted to reach out to share their concerns or participate at the Village Council hearing those were options to ask for consideration.

Chairman Rickard invited the petitioner to provide any closing statements.

Mr. Baker expressed his willingness to continue a dialogue with residents to understand and see what could be done to accommodate some of their concerns. He added that from the Village standpoint, the tower location as proposed was viewed as critical, because it supports public safety communications. Mr. Baker further noted that with the proposed development the existing tower would need to come down. As such, he explained that having the existing services on the tower accommodated somewhere else needed to be considered. For this reason, the location proposed, after evaluation, was determined to be the most desirable site for the proposed tower to accommodate the requirements of public safety, telecommunications, and for the private telecommunications providers as well. Mr. Baker concluded his statement by thanking the board for their time and consideration.

Commissioner Toth asked if a study had been prepared considering a relocation of the tower with added fiber optic cables to connect it back to the police station. Mr. Baker stated that a study did not exist looking at those types of alternatives. He added that the basis of the proposed location had to do with a number of factors that are not just limited to the public safety requirements. He added that the tower location was also based on the colocation capabilities of the tower.

Chairman Rickard moved to Plan Commission deliberation.

Commissioner Rector shared that she liked the proposal and the idea of having a building for multiple uses. She added that the design appears have been well thought out as it met the goals of the Village. Additionally, she noted that she was not thrilled with the tower option; however, she understood why the tower had to be replaced in the proposed location. Commissioner Rector noted that she was in favor of the proposal and felt that the standards were met.

Commissioner Dmytryszyn stated that it was a great proposal and believed a lot of care was put into the plans. He added that as he read through the standards of approval he could not argue that they had not been met. Commissioner Dmytryszyn noted that he would like to see more detail around the tower and why it needed to be placed where it is proposed. He stated that the petitioner should be prepared to answer more questions about additional options such as running fiber as Commissioner Toth proposed. Commissioner Dmytryszyn concluded by agreeing that the standards had been met.

Commissioner Boyle shared that he would like more detail on how to create buffering between the tower area and residential properties. Additionally, he added that there should be more details focused on how Lot 2 can be designed to be more in line with transit-oriented development. He stated that the plan met all of the criteria and supported the police, school, and Village staff.

APPROVED

Commissioner Maurer agreed with the previous Commissioners. He noted that the new proposal would create better working conditions and increase efficiency. Commissioner Maurer added that the proposal did not contribute to the nature of the downtown. While he agreed with the intersection improvements, he did not believe the proposed arrival point of two blank facades was appropriate. Commissioner Maurer stated that even flipping the plan 180 degrees in either direction would be an improvement and would make the proposed park more accessible to the downtown.

Commissioner Toth stated that it was a great plan and an improvement to the current facilities. He noted that he believed the tower setback was still an issue. Commissioner Toth concluded by stating that a better explanation for the tower location should be prepared for the Council.

Chairman Rickard stated that he believed the standards had been met. He added that he agreed with Commissioner Maurer in the orientation of the building so that the park is more accessible. With regards to the tower he added that it appeared that the most appropriate location would be to place it near the police and Village facilities. Chairman Rickard stated that the reality was that there has been a tower there for forty years. Residents who live around that area purchased their homes understanding that there was a tower there. Chairman Rickard noted that the tower was getting slightly taller but he added that it is also getting more slender.

Chairman Rickard addressed a comment from the audience and stated that the public comment period had concluded and that the Plan Commission was now deliberating. He then suggested if the public had any additional comments they would have an opportunity at the Village Council meeting. Chairman Rickard concluded his statement by noting that he supported the project, that the standards had been met, and that this would be a huge improvement.

Chairman Rickard entertained a motion

WITH RESPECT TO FILE 22-PLC-0007 AND BASED ON THE PETITIONER'S SUBMITTAL, THE STAFF REPORT, AND THE TESTIMONY PRESENTED, I FIND THAT THE PETITIONER HAS MET THE STANDARDS OF APPROVAL FOR A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, ACCOMPANYING REZONING, AND SPECIAL USE, PLAT OF VACATION AND PLAT OF SUBDIVISION AS REQUIRED BY THE VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE ZONING ORDINANCE AND IS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST. COMMISSIONER RECTOR MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL APPROVAL OF 22-PLC-0007, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. THE SPECIAL USE, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT AND MAP AMENDMENT SHALL SUBSTANTIALLY CONFORM TO THE STAFF REPORT, RENDERINGS, ARCHITECTURE PLANS, LANDSCAPING PLANS AND ENGINEERING PLANS PREPARED BY FGM ARCHITECTS, DATED THROUGH MARCH 25, 2022, AND TRAFFIC PLANS PREPARED BY KLOA DATED MARCH 25, 2022 EXCEPT AS SUCH PLANS MAY BE MODIFIED TO CONFORM TO THE VILLAGE CODES AND ORDINANCES.**
- 2. THE PETITIONER SHALL SUBDIVIDE THE LOT INTO THE THREE LOTS OF RECORD PURSUANT TO SECTION 20.5 OF THE SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE**

APPROVED

PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF ANY SITE DEVELOPMENT OR BUILDING PERMITS.

- 3. A DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION FOR LOT 2 SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO THE PLAN COMMISSION AS A PUD AMENDMENT, AND ALONG WITH ANY OTHER REQUIRED ENTITLEMENTS, WITH FINAL APPROVAL BY THE DOWNERS GROVE VILLAGE COUNCIL.**
- 4. A PLAT OF EASEMENT IS PROVIDED FOR PUBLIC UTILITY PURPOSES AND RECORDED WITH DUPAGE COUNTY ONCE INFRASTRUCTURE IS CONSTRUCTED.**
- 5. A PLAT OF EASEMENT IS PROVIDED FOR TELECOMMUNICATION PURPOSES AND RECORDED WITH DUPAGE COUNTY ONCE TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT IS CONSTRUCTED.**
- 6. A PLAT OF EASEMENT IS PROVIDED FOR STORMWATER PURPOSES AND MUST BE RECORDED WITH DUPAGE COUNTY ONCE INFRASTRUCTURE IS CONSTRUCTED.**

SECOND BY COMMISSIONER RECTOR. ROLL CALL:

AYE: COMMISSIONERS RECTOR, DMYTRYSZYN, BOYLE, MAURER, TOTH, CHAIRMAN RICKARD

NAY: NONE

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 6-0

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:28 P.M. UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER PATEL. SECOND BY COMMISSIONER TOTH. A VOICE VOTE FOLLOWED AND THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

**/s/ Village Staff
Recording Secretary
(As transcribed by MP-3 audio)**