

**VILLAGE OF WOODRIDGE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
Regular Meeting of August 19, 2013**

A regular meeting of the Plan Commission for the Village of Woodridge was held at 7:30 p.m. on August 19, 2013 in the Board Room of the Village Hall, Five Plaza Drive, Woodridge, Illinois.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Zawacki called the meeting to order at 7:36 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Upon roll call the following were:

Present: Balogh, Hendricks, Mast, Przepiorka, Krywaruczenko, Zawacki

Absent: Gaspar

Director of Community Development Michael Mays, Senior Planner Jenny Horn, Planner Jason Zawila, and Recording Secretary Peggy Halper were also present.

III. APPOINTMENT OF NEW SECRETARY

Chairman Zawacki stated there is a need for a new secretary since the previous secretary has resigned. He then called for a motion for a new secretary.

Commissioner Krywaruczenko made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Przepiorka to nominate Commissioner Hendricks for secretary.

Chairman Zawacki asked if there were any other nominees. None responded. He then called for a roll call vote.

Ayes: Krywaruczenko, Przepiorka, Mast, Balogh, Hendricks, Zawacki

Nays: None

Motion passed

Chairman Zawacki announced that he had recent throat surgery so he will be having Commissioner Krywaruczenko take over the meeting for tonight so he can limit his talking.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE JULY 15, 2013 MEETING

Commissioner Przepiorka made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Zawacki to approve the minutes of the July 15, 2013 meeting with no changes. A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: Przepiorka, Mast, Krywaruczenko, Balogh, Hendricks, Zawacki

Nays: None

Motion passed

V. CONSIDERATION OF A MAJOR AMENDMENT TO A PRELIMINARY AND FINAL RPUD PLAN AND PLAT AND AMENDMENT TO A RPUD ZONING LOT PLAN – 6500 ROUTE 53 CLARA’S AT SEVEN BRIDGES – GENCO HOLDINGS 2, LLC

A. Staff Presentation

Mr. Zawila stated the subject property is located at 6550 Route 53. The property is approximately 2.016 acres in size and contains a restaurant that is currently under construction. He said the development is located on Zoning Lot No. 2 of the Seven Bridges Regional Planned Unit Development (RPUD), which also includes the Edward Health Center and a two acre outlot intended for office use.

Mr. Zawila said Genco Holdings 2, LLC is the owner of Clara’s Restaurant and they purchased the former Krispy Kreme property in 2012. He stated they received approval earlier this year to construct an approximately 2,500 square foot addition to the building, an outdoor patio, a parking lot and other site improvements.

Mr. Zawila stated the applicant is proposing to construct an approximately 1,572 square foot addition to accommodate an additional restroom and restaurant “back-end” operations. He stated additionally, the outdoor patio has been expanded with the proposed addition. The applicant proposes to cover a portion of the patio with a retractable roof and windows that can be closed during winter months. He said the building addition will extend the façade, and will be consistent with the existing building that consists of a combination of EFIS, stone and face brick. He also stated the proposed increase in floor area triggers the need to amend the RPUD Zoning Lot Plan and major amendment to the Preliminary RPUD Plan and the Final RPUD Plan.

Mr. Zawila said regarding parking, access, and landscaping the proposed improvement to Clara’s meets the Village Code. He stated there are a few minor items that need to be addressed by the applicant prior to Village Board consideration of the project. He said the Plan Commission’s recommendation for this proposal shall be subject to these revisions being completed prior to Village Board consideration.

B. Applicant Presentation

Mr. Zawila stated the applicant will not be presenting but are available for any questions.

C. Public Comments

Acting Chairman Krywaruczenko asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments. None responded.

D. Plan Commission Discussion

Acting Chairman Krywaruczenko asked if the Commissioners had any questions or comments. None responded.

E. Staff Recommendation

Mr. Zawila stated staff recommends that the Plan Commission make the motions as noted in the staff report and recommend approval of the project.

F. Plan Commission Recommendation

Acting Chairman Krywaruczenko then called for a motion for the Findings of Fact.

Commissioner Zawacki made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Przepiorka to adopt the Findings of Fact for RPUD Zoning Lot Plan, as contained in Attachment 7 of staff's report dated August 19, 2013. A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: Zawacki, Przepiorka, Mast, Krywaruczenko, Balogh, Hendricks

Nays: None

Motion passed

Commissioner Przepiorka made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Zawacki to adopt the Findings of Fact for the Preliminary RPUD Plan and Plat, as contained in Attachment 7 of staff's report dated August 19, 2013. A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: Zawacki, Przepiorka, Mast, Krywaruczenko, Balogh, Hendricks

Nays: None

Motion passed

Commissioner Przepiorka made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Zawacki to adopt the Findings of Fact for the Final RPUD Plan and Plat, as contained in Attachment 7 of staff's report dated August 19, 2013. A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: Zawacki, Przepiorka, Mast, Krywaruczenko, Balogh, Hendricks

Nays: None

Motion passed

Acting Chairman Krywaruczenko then called for a recommendation to the Mayor and the Village Board of Trustees.

Commissioner Przepiorka made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mast to recommend to the Mayor and Village Board of Trustees approval of the proposed amendment to the Zoning Lot Plan and Major Amendment to the Preliminary RPUD Plan and the Final RPUD Plan based on the Findings of Fact in attachment 7, subject to the plans listed A through E on page 3 and 4, and subject to the conditions on page 4 which are all contained in staff's report dated August 19, 2013.

A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: Przepiorka, Mast, Krywaruczenko, Balogh, Zawacki, Hendricks
Nays: None
Motion passed

VI. CONSIDERATION OF AN AMENDMENT TO A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, AN AMENDMENT TO THE PRELIMINARY PUD PLAN AND PLAT AND FINAL PUD PLAN AND PLAT – ORCHARD HILL PARK – 8301 AND 8325 JANES AVENUE – WOODRIDGE PARK DISTRICT

A. Public Hearing

Acting Chairman Krywaruczenko called the Public Hearing to order at 7:45 p.m. He reviewed the application before the Plan Commission, verifying that all required public notices had been given. He then called for a motion to adopt the Rules of Procedure.

Commissioner Przepiorka made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Zawacki to adopt the Rules of Procedure. A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: Przepiorka, Zawacki, Mast, Krywaruczenko, Balogh, Hendricks
Nays: None
Motion passed

Acting Chairman Krywaruczenko asked if staff would like to make a presentation.

Mrs. Horn, Senior Planner, was sworn in. She stated she would like to enter staff's report into the record as exhibit "B". She said Orchard Hill Park is located at the southeast corner of Janes Avenue and 83rd Street. The park currently consists of Cypress Cove Aquatic Park, a maintenance building, three baseball fields, four soccer fields and associated parking lots.

Mrs. Horn said the Park was originally approved in 1996 when a special use permit for a PUD and preliminary and final PUD were granted for Phase 1, which consisted of the Cypress Cove Park and associated parking. She stated in 2001, the grading for the soccer and baseball fields was approved. Also in 2001, the installation of the fields, associated parking and maintenance building were approved. Mrs. Horn said various amendments have been approved over the years including the expansion of the water park in 2008, a field equipment storage building and baseball field shelter in 2012.

Mrs. Horn stated there are two requests being considered. Starting with Phase 3, she said the applicant is requesting to construct a 4,900 square foot cold storage maintenance building. The proposed building would be located just south of the existing 14,000 square foot maintenance building. She stated the area where it is proposed is an unpaved outdoor storage yard area. Mrs. Horn said the proposed building will provide an indoor storage option for the Park District's equipment. She stated additional paving is also proposed for the storage yard area to provide a cleaner and easier access throughout the storage area. She said the existing fence located

around the remainder of the storage yard area is to remain. Mrs. Horn stated the proposed building aesthetically will be consistent with the existing storage building; however it will be significantly smaller than the existing building. This proposed cold storage building and paving triggers an amendment to the preliminary and final PUD plans for Phase 3 of Orchard Hill Park.

Mrs. Horn said Phase 5, was previously granted preliminary PUD approval but not final PUD approval. She stated the preliminary PUD approval included both future parking lot as well as a future site for the Athletic Recreation Center. She said at this time the Park District is only requesting final PUD approval for the parking lot improvements. Therefore, they are seeking an amendment to the preliminary PUD plan for Phase 5, which will separate Phase 5 into two phases. Mrs. Horn stated Phase 5 would be the parking lot improvements and Phase 6 would be a potential future site for the Athletic Recreation Center. She said the Park District is still evaluating this site as well as the northeast corner of Janes and 83rd Street for the Athletic Recreation Center. She stated if they decide to move forward with the ARC at Orchard Hill Park, they would be required to obtain final PUD approval for Phase 6 from the Village which would be considered by both the Plan Commission and the Village Board.

Mrs. Horn stated the proposed 105 parking stalls would be located south of the existing entrance drive off of Janes Avenue. She said there are a total of 12 parking lot end islands that are being proposed. She stated six of the islands meet the Village Code in terms of landscaping. The other six islands serve two parking rows each. She stated since they serve two parking rows, it is required by the current code to have two trees and 18 low shrubs in each end island. She said to be consistent with the remaining park the applicant is seeking relief from this section of the code and only proposing one tree per island. To offset this relief, the applicant has agreed to install the six trees, which would otherwise be located in the end islands, within Phase 3, adjacent to the cold storage building to provide for additional screening. Mrs. Horn stated this would conclude staff's report.

Commissioner Przepiorka asked if the proposed parking lot for Phase 5 is identical to the original submission of the parking lot.

Mrs. Horn said it is substantially the same.

Acting Chairman Krywaruczenko asked if there were any other questions. None responded. He then asked if the applicant would like to present.

Jenny Knitter, Superintendent of Planning and Development for the Woodridge Park District, stated the proposal tonight is broken up into two parts. The first being the 105 stall parking lot addition. She said they feel this is a need based on the amount of people visiting the park during the summer months. She stated there are times when the parking lot is filled and people have to park outside of the park area.

Ms. Knitter said the second part of the project is the addition of the non-heated storage garage. She stated it would be located just south of the existing maintenance building. She said the use of the storage would be for mowers, tractors, hay wagons and plows. Ms. Knitter stated it is important to keep these items out of the weather conditions so they can extend the useful life of the equipment. She said the maintenance yard is currently not paved. She stated not having it paved causes a difficult time for staff to move around the yard especially during wet seasons. Ms. Knitter said the improvement of the yard would help improve the usability of that space. She stated that summarizes the project and she is available for any questions.

Commissioner Hendricks asked where the equipment was currently being stored.

Ms. Knitter said currently they squeeze everything into the existing building, but equipment like hay wagons are kept outdoors. She stated the life span on that equipment has been shortened due to the exposure of the weather.

Acting Chairman Krywaruczenko asked if anyone wanted to ask questions or provide testimony in support of the request by the applicant. None responded. He then asked if anyone wanted to provide testimony opposing the request of the applicant. None responded. He then called for a motion to close the public hearing.

Commissioner Zawacki made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Balogh to close the public hearing. A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: Zawacki, Mast, Przepiorka, Krywaruczenko, Balogh, Hendricks

Nays: None

Motion passed

B. Plan Commission Discussion

Acting Chairman Krywaruczenko asked if the Commission had any questions or comments. None responded.

C. Staff Recommendation

Mrs. Horn stated staff has prepared two draft Findings of Fact and the Plan Commission should modify these Findings as necessary. She said staff recommends that the Commission recommend approval of an amendment to the existing special use permit for a PUD, an amendment to the preliminary and final PUD plan and plat for Phase 3, an amendment to the preliminary PUD plan and plat for Phase 5, and final PUD plan and plat for Phase 5 based on the Findings of Fact, conditions and plans outlined in staff's report.

D. Plan Commission Recommendation

Acting Chairman Krywaruczenko then called for a motion.

Commissioner Przepiorka made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Zawacki to adopt the Findings of Fact for the Special Use Permit for a PUD, as contained in Attachment 8 of staff's report dated August 19, 2013. A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: Przepiorka, Zawacki, Mast, Krywaruczenko, Balogh, Hendricks

Nays: None

Motion passed

Commissioner Mast made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Przepiorka to adopt the Findings of Fact for the PUD, as contained in Attachment 9 of staff's report dated August 19, 2013. A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: Przepiorka, Zawacki, Mast, Krywaruczenko, Balogh, Hendricks

Nays: None

Motion passed

Commissioner Przepiorka made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Balogh to recommend to the Mayor and Board of Trustees approval of an amendment to the existing special use permit for a PUD, an amendment to the preliminary and final PUD plan and plat for Phase 3, an amendment to the preliminary PUD plan and plat for Phase 5, and final PUD plan and plat for Phase 5 based on the Findings of Fact listed in Attachments 8 and 9, and subject to plans 1 through 7, and subject to conditions 1 and 2, which are all listed in staff's report dated August 19, 2013. A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: Przepiorka, Zawacki, Mast, Krywaruczenko, Balogh, Hendricks

Nays: None

Motion passed

VII. CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN PROPOSED ZONING TEXT AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 9 AND 10 OF THE VILLAGE CODE, THE ZONING AND SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE OF THE VILLAGE OF WOODRIDGE

A. Public Hearing

Acting Chairman Krywaruczenko called the Public Hearing to order at 8:03 p.m. He reviewed the application before the Plan Commission, verifying that all required public notices had been given. He then called for a motion to adopt the Rules of Procedure.

Commissioner Zawacki made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Przepiorka to adopt the Rules of Procedure. A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: Przepiorka, Zawacki, Mast, Krywaruczenko, Balogh, Hendricks

Nays: None

Motion passed

Commissioner Krywaruczenko asked if staff was ready to make their presentation.

Mr. Zawila, Planner, was sworn in. He stated staff routinely examines the Zoning Ordinance to determine if textual modifications are necessary. He said modifications are often warranted in order to ensure that the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance serves as a proactive document. He stated a number of the proposed amendments are regarding items to improve businesses processes. Other proposed amendments are in response to resident and business requests. He said some of the proposed amendments are an attempt to clarify existing regulations or bring regulations into compliance with new state law.

Mr. Zawila stated staff is proposing several text amendments to the Municipal Code. In staff's report the amendments are organized by topic into six categories: village and zoning administration amendments; accessory structure amendments; lighting standard amendments; signage amendments; medical marijuana dispensary and cultivation centers; and wind energy system amendments. Tonight he will reference and provide an overview of the amendments and pause for questions and discussion with each topic.

Mr. Zawila said he will first reference Attachment A. The amendment covers minor changes to special uses, expiration of development applications, fee administration for engineering review and clarifying utility extension requirements for developments. He stated this encompasses four amendments to Titles 9 and 10. He then asked if the Commission had any questions. None responded.

Mr. Zawila stated he will now move on to Attachment B, regarding text amendment to the accessory structure section. He said these four amendments have been proposed to be more responsive to residential reinvestment in the community or the need to provide businesses greater clarity for installing code compliant accessory structures. He asked if there were any questions or comments for this section. None responded.

Commissioner Przepiorka asked if it was only applying to residential areas.

Mr. Zawila stated the amendment gives more clarity to commercial structures. Regarding commercial structures the additional accessory structures were listed, such as propane tanks or bulk storage.

Mr. Zawila stated he would also like to enter staff's report as exhibit "B".

Commissioner Przepiorka clarified that F, S, and R stand for front, side and rear.

Mr. Zawila said that was correct.

Commissioner Przepiorka clarified in the staff report, where a letter appears in the chart does that mean where it is permitted.

Mr. Zawila stated that is correct. It is permitted to encroach into that yard setback. He then asked if there were any more questions. None responded.

Mr. Zawila said he will now reference attachment C, which pertains to the lighting standards. He said the lighting ordinance was last updated in 2011. He stated with that update the code was revised to introduce new lighting terminology, address enforcement concerns, update illumination requirements, address under canopy lighting and sports field lighting, and add provisions related to energy efficient lighting.

Mr. Zawila stated when this was last reviewed there was concern about the effect of LED and the potential of “blue rich lighting” and its negative effects on the nighttime environment, glare and sky glow. He said blue rich lighting’s correlated color temperature (CCT), is measured in Kelvin’s. He stated with the 2011 updates, light sources other than high pressure sodium was not recommended as there was a lack of standards in place to measure the Kelvin’s or the CCT of LED lighting so as to ensure it wouldn’t emit blue rich lighting. Also, this type of restriction requires technical expertise to enforce. He said staff continues to receive frequent requests for the allowance of LED lights in the Village. He stated since that time, other communities, such as Homer Glen and Bolingbrook, have allowed LED lighting (with CCT maximums). He said speaking with industry representatives, the technology has also evolved so that the bulb can be modified more easily to adjust lighting to certain color temperatures.

Mr. Zawila said to address the negative effects of blue rich lighting without adding overly technical regulations to the Code, staff recommends that an exception be made to allow LED lights with Kelvin maximums that limit the output of blue rich lighting. He stated the maximum Kelvin level recommended in the text amendments would be 4300 Kelvin, which produces light in the yellow and orange spectrums, similar to high pressure sodium which are allowed by the code today.

Mr. Zawila stated if the amendment is put into place, businesses will need to produce a photometric plan that provides details on the Kelvin levels of the lighting, foot candles and lumens, which can be reviewed by staff. He then asked if there were any questions or comments.

Commissioner Przepiorka asked if this section applied just to commercial districts or does it apply to residential as well.

Mr. Zawila said it is intended for commercial but has also been applied to residential development, such as parking lots or in common areas.

Commissioner Przepiorka asked what the temperature was for the high pressure sodium.

Mr. Zawila stated it would be similar to what they are recommending in the yellow or orange spectrum.

Commissioner Przepiorka said the 4300 light would still appear bluish white. He asked are they going to get into too many different colors now where they are mixing and matching.

Mr. Zawila said with the LED's there is a range that they can go up, but what we are proposing is that the maximum is 4300 Kelvin. If the Kelvin is less than that measurement, you are going to see a different color to the spectrum.

Commissioner Zawacki said he would like to see what Downers Grove, Hinsdale and Naperville are doing.

Mr. Zawila stated Bolingbrook does not give a specific color temperature into the ordinance. He said other communities surveyed in DuPage County do not prohibit LED lighting, but lighting does have to meet standards such as maximum foot candles.

Commissioner Zawacki stated LED lighting only benefits the person who is putting it in by saving them money and energy. He said it doesn't benefit anybody who is looking up at the sky. He stated the blue light is offensive to certain people.

Commissioner Przepiorka asked if he felt the allowable recommended maximum is too high.

Commissioner Zawacki stated the blue light gives off a different feel when looking at the sky which is different from the typical street light we have now.

Commissioner Przepiorka asked in the commercial fixtures that are available now, what type of color temperatures do they have.

Mr. Zawila stated he cannot answer for most, but what he can say is with the way technology is advancing you are able to adjust lighting to the color spectrum we would require. He said staff would have to see a photometric plan that would have to be submitted with any development review to make sure it meets the code requirements.

Chairman Zawacki stated the last time this was brought up there was a big uproar in the community about how it was going to effect what they see at night. He said the blue light is something that he does not see that they need. He stated if someone wants it then they should have to go thru a public hearing to give the residents the opportunity to come in and speak in regards to it.

Michael Mays, Director of Community Development, was sworn in. He said a couple of years ago the Plan Commission and Village Board evaluated in great detail the lighting ordinance trying to find a good balance. He said they looked at the impacts of negative lighting while providing different options that would meet the Village's code with the products that are out there. Mr. Mays stated that night skies is still a continued concern, and all other provisions in the code remain in place including the shielding requirements. He said this helps direct the light down instead of up which might help with the concern of LED lighting.

Commissioner Zawacki stated that one should put the two lights next to each other and see which one offends you more.

Commissioner Mast stated she shares her concerns with Chairman Zawacki. She said the equipment for LED lights allows for deviations from lighting when they are replaced. She stated she knows they have a long life span; however it puts the Village in a difficult position when it comes to monitoring. Commissioner Mast said you can have replacement bulbs that are not in compliance. She stated she is not in favor of allowing them for that reason.

Commissioner Przepiorka asked if staff knew how much energy an LED light saves.

Mr. Zawila stated staff tried to evaluate this; however it would be too site specific to offer a general energy savings amount.

Commissioner Przepiorka asked what some of the requests were from developers for the types of locations.

Mr. Zawila said they have received lighting requests from gas stations, for new industrial buildings and from the School District.

Commissioner Przepiorka clarified that it is mostly outdoor lighting.

Acting Chairman Krywaruczenko asked if LED lighting was approved, would there not be a reason for the applicant to come before staff or the Commission to decide what type of lighting gets put in.

Mr. Zawila stated if LED lighting was approved then they would have two options. He said if they choose high pressure sodium lighting then staff would have to review a photometric plan. He stated if they choose LED lighting then they would have to also review a photometric plan to make sure the color temperature meets what is provided in the ordinance.

Commissioner Hendricks asked in regards to what Commissioner Mast was talking about, is there any equipment that would read the output to the spectrum.

Mr. Zawila stated there should be but the main tool would be the photometric plan. He said for those situations where there is a dispute they might have to hire an outside consultant to assess the lighting.

No other questions followed.

Mr. Zawila stated he would now continue with Attachment D and would start with an overview of Electronic Message Board (EMB signs) amendments, followed by the amendments for monuments and wall signage. He said he will pause in between for questions and comments.

Mr. Zawila said the majority of the sign amendments are being proposed in response to concerns raised by local businesses or past relief granted for developments. He stated the amendments are also being proposed because of the direction of the Plan Commission to reevaluate the sign ordinance in light of frequent requests for relief from the Code. He said currently, EMB signs are permitted as a special use for shopping centers; and permitted with staff approval for gasoline service station signs (to display gas prices), golf courses, and movie theater buildings. He stated additionally, EMB signs are permitted as a special use for nonresidential uses in residential districts. To date there are five EMB signs and nine gasoline service station signs in the Village. He said the Village continues to receive additional requests for EMB signs for standalone businesses.

Mr. Zawila stated the proposed amendment is a direct result of Village businesses community request to review the allowance of EMB signs in the Village. He said staff met with the Chamber and area business representatives to understand their perspective regarding the current sign code. Mr. Zawila stated at that meeting the group pointed out that the current sign code limits opportunities for businesses to provide temporary messages to their customers with the existing limitations on EMB signage for standalone businesses. He said staff reviewed the concerns, surveyed surrounding communities, and reviewed best practices. He stated staff, with support from the representatives of the business community, recommends expansion of the EMB ordinance for standalone businesses.

Mr. Zawila said staff feels that the requests for this signage will become more prevalent as the technology becomes less expensive. As these signs become more accessible to the business and institution community, the amendment proposes to allow these signs in specific corridors in the Village including 75th Street, 63rd Street and Woodward Avenue. Mr. Zawila said EMB signs for nonresidential signs in residential districts will continue to be a special use, largely because of their close proximity to residential uses. The provisions for specific requirements, display time--a minimum time period of five seconds before changing--and distance requirement from residential properties will remain unchanged. He then asked if there were any questions or comments.

Commissioner Przepiorka asked if all the businesses up on 75th Street that are a standalone business would be able to request to have this sign.

Mr. Zawila said the way the ordinance is proposed now, yes.

Commissioner Przepiorka asked how the proposed compares to neighboring communities.

Mr. Zawila said Bolingbrook and Lemont allow for standalone businesses with certain street restrictions. He said the only neighboring community that does not is Downers Grove. He said all communities have similar requirements regarding size and time allowed for message.

Commissioner Zawacki said there was a comment made at one time that we don't want another Ogden Avenue. He stated he feels after awhile these signs are going to be bothersome and every business does not need one. He said just because the business feels they are not doing well does not justify them getting an EMB sign. He further stated there are other ways to generate business. He said he has looked at the proposed locations for these signs and every time you turn around there is another sign. He stated you will spend more time reading signs instead of watching the road. He said some businesses already have two, are they are going to ask for four. He stated there has to be a better way to issue out EMB signs because not everyone needs one, just like everyone doesn't need a 1,000 foot sign. Commissioner Zawacki stated every business feels they need a bigger sign, but he feels they should not give them out.

Mr. Mays said staff also does not want another Ogden Avenue. He said with this amendment relating to EMB signs, it is not an addition to, but would be incorporated in to their existing permitted signs within a typical business. He stated a business gets one monument sign and this EMB would have to be incorporated within it within the current requirements for the size of the sign. Mr. Mays said the EMB would only be 50% of the total sign area.

Commissioner Zawacki said he does not like them and feels they will be a distraction which can cause more accidents.

Mr. Mays stated they did check with the Police Department and since the EMB signs were constructed for Hollywood Boulevard the accident rates have gone down for that intersection. He said staff wanted to look at that research to see if there was increase in accidents due to these types of signs.

Mr. Zawila said there is no mechanism right now to allow standalone businesses to have EMB signs. He stated staff is trying to respond to the business community to get that type of signage at specific locations throughout town.

Acting Chairman Krywaruczenko said he feels all signs are just clutter. However, after looking through this he said he is impressed with Naperville. He stated they base their sign square footage in conjunction with the speed limit of the road. He asked why they chose not to go with that direction.

Mr. Zawila stated that is one approach. He said they are doing something similar with the increase in the monument sign which will be discussed next. He stated they are increasing sign size for major shopping areas which are on higher speed limit roads and based on the same thought process. Mr. Zawila asked if there were any more questions. None responded.

Mr. Zawila said over the years the Village has granted wall sign relief for several retail establishments. He stated staff conducted a survey of neighboring communities to review wall signage requirements for businesses. He said a common finding identified

that other communities do not have a maximum square footage requirement for wall signage or if there is a maximum it is larger than the Village's requirements. He stated because of this and the frequent requests and granted relief for signage; it is recommended that the maximum area be increased as noted in Attachment "D".

Mr. Zawila stated the Village has also consistently received requests to place wall signage on facades that do not face a roadway, especially for businesses that have facades that face private internal drive aisles and parking lots of larger shopping centers. He said staff supports allowing signage on additional facades facing private drive aisles in order to better direct customers that may not be familiar with business locations. He stated this is particularly true for customers driving around a shopping center site. So that the signage does not adversely affect residential properties, businesses will not be allowed to place signage on facades fronting private roads that face residential uses.

Mr. Zawila said similar to wall signage, the Village of Woodridge has also seen an upward trend in signage relief for monument signage for larger shopping centers. He stated similar to the research conducted for wall signage, the typical area and height for monument signage is significantly higher in other communities than what the Village allows. He said because of this and the frequent requests and granted relief for signage, it is recommended that the maximum area be increased as provided in Attachment "D". He then asked if there were any questions.

There were no questions.

Mr. Zawila stated before he moves on there were some amendments to regulations for development entrance signs, menu boards, and temporary signage. He asked if there were any questions on those.

Commissioner Przepiorka said he does not have a questions but a correction of Page 13. He stated the last line should say 25 feet.

Mr. Zawila stated he will now move on to Attachment "G" which covers medical marijuana. He said the government passed the Medical Cannabis Act (MCA) on August 1, 2013 and the Act will go into effect on January 1, 2014. He stated legislation addresses everything from how to legally cultivate, sell, possess, and consume medical marijuana, to how cannabis cultivation centers and dispensaries will be taxed, licensed and regulated by various state agencies.

Mr. Zawila said in regards to zoning, the act requires that municipalities "may not unreasonably prohibit the cultivation, dispensing, and use of medical cannabis" as provided by the act. He stated medical marijuana would be highly regulated under the state and compared to other states' equivalent legislation. He said all cannabis dispensed to patients would be grown by one of up to 22 strictly regulated cultivation centers. He stated prospective license holders would have to submit detailed plans to the Department of Agriculture, which would select a facility in each of the 22 State Police districts. He said centers would have to comply with local zoning laws and must

be located at least 2,500 feet from daycare centers, schools, and areas zoned for residential use.

Mr. Zawila then showed Attachment “H” on the overhead projection. He stated because of the distance requirements for cultivation centers and their proximity to residential districts, there are no locations in Woodridge that can meet the state requirements. Therefore, staff is not recommending zoning changes at this time.

Mr. Zawila said regarding dispensaries, there would be no more than 60 dispensaries in the state, and dispensaries would have to abide by the acts rules and rigorous registration requirements as well as any local zoning. He stated they could not be located within 1,000 feet of a school or daycare location, nor could they be sited in residential neighborhoods. He then showed on the map where the buffer zones are located. Mr. Zawila said regarding dispensing locations, staff reviewed Village zoning districts to identify a district that would meet the state requirements. He stated the Regional Business Center District was identified as the best area in the Village to locate this use. He asked if there were any questions related to this topic.

Commissioner Zawacki asked why we have to have this.

Mr. Zawila said State Legislation is very specific that we can't go out of our way to prohibit this type of use in the Village.

Commissioner Zawacki said we are not going out of our way we just don't have the type of zoning they need.

Mr. Zawila said regarding the cultivation center that is true.

Commissioner Zawacki asked if we should do everything the State said. He said cannabis is a drug and there are a lot of people who use it that are not sick. He stated why are we encouraging it. He said just say we do not have any spots. Commissioner Zawacki asked what will they do.

Mr. Zawila stated they have to review the ordinance based off of the State legislature and their rules. He said there is a potential zoning district and we would have to abide by the rule. He stated the State legislature is very specific stating that we can't unreasonably have zoning regulations related to this to disallow.

Commissioner Zawacki said sometimes he feels the State and Federal government is wrong. He stated just because they came up with this, maybe we need to put our foot down and say we don't have a spot. He said how many ordinances have they passed that cost us money. He stated they come up with this good idea, but then we have to enforce it at our cost. He further said they can go next door to Downers Grove or Bolingbrook. He stated he feels they should not encourage it and just say we don't have a spot.

Mr. Mays stated it is a lot like how the Village had to address adult uses. He said they needed to provide a location for these uses within the community. He stated the RBC zoning district is the only zoning district that permits that type of use. Mr. Mays said it is a similar approach so the Village can be proactive to regulate as opposed to having the regulation forced on us.

Commissioner Zawacki said he is not in favor.

Commissioner Przepiorka asked what if they don't put it as a permitted use.

Mr. Mays stated someone can challenge the Village in that case. He said they can sue stating Woodridge has to provide a location within the community as long as it adheres to all the state regulations.

Commissioner Przepiorka said there is a limited amount of these facilities allowed in the State. He asked who decides that.

Mr. Mays said it is determined by the State and the State Police will be regulating them.

Mr. Zawila explained who determines and regulates the cultivation centers and the dispensaries.

Commissioner Mast said she has more of a problem with the cultivation centers. She asked how the State is defining a cultivation center. She also asked if this would be outside or inside buildings.

Mr. Zawila stated they do not have a location because of the distance requirements that were specified.

Commissioner Mast asked if he was looking at farming or building.

Mr. Zawila said the code was not specific to building or farm.

Commissioner Mast asked what about the areas by Internationale Parkway.

Mr. Zawila said there is a distance requirement—they cannot be located within 2500 feet of residential areas.

Mr. Zawila stated the last topic is on small wind systems. He said currently, there are no regulations in the Village Code which addresses small wind energy systems. In 2011, the Village Code was amended to include regulations for solar energy systems. He stated since that time, model ordinances, such one for Naperville, have been developed regarding small wind energy systems. Like solar energy systems, staff recognizes the interest by property owners and benefits of wind energy systems.

Mr. Zawila said the proposed regulations are intended to provide guidance that will appropriately direct the installation of small wind technology within the community, including roof-mounted and ground mounted small wind energy systems in certain zoning districts. He stated those are mostly in commercial and industrial districts. He said staff is requesting guidance from the Plan Commission on whether they support this amendment.

Commissioner Zawacki stated he recommends that everyone goes and visits one of these windmills. He said to stand underneath then come back and tell him if they want it. He stated they are too noisy and he would rather see solar panels.

Commissioner Hendricks said he is in favor of sustainable practices; however, wind energy would not be one of them. He stated he would rather see solar panels and sustainable practices with construction and materials. He said wind energy might create secondary problems.

Commissioner Przepiorka asked if they had anyone recently requesting this.

Mr. Zawila stated not recently. He said Naperville has only received two requests since their ordinance went into place which was about 2011.

Commissioner Przepiorka said he would like to go back and touch on some notes he made. He stated on page 7 there is a section that talks about utility service extensions. He stated he wanted to clarify that if a development is occurs, that water, sewer and storm sewer is extended to the property lines for the next development to come in and tap into. He said on page 7 in the new proposed language the very last sentence says “such utility system shall be extended to the far side of the property owner and be available for future extensions by subsequent property owners”. Commissioner Przepiorka asked if this was adjacent property owners or subsequent owners of that property.

Mr. Zawila stated what it is intended to say is future adjacent owners. He said staff can edit the language.

Acting Chairman Krywaruczenko said they will now take testimony from anyone in support of the applicants.

Dan Coil, Chairman for the Woodridge Chamber of Commerce was sworn in. He thanked staff for taking the time to meet with him. He stated in regards to signage they had sat down with owners from various local businesses. Mr. Coil said the changes that are proposed make the sign code more appealing to businesses so they have a better chance to promote their business. He stated he believes that the Village was more than fair in all the proposed sign code amendments. He said all of the business owners that he met with were extremely happy with what the Village brought forth. Mr. Coil stated he hopes they will consider everything that staff has put together and know the Chamber and business owners do support this proposed amendments.

Rick Filipis, representative for Nonnie's Pizza in Woodridge, said it was mentioned that some of things that we could do to advertise were coupons and so forth. He stated they are already doing that and it only helps to a certain degree. He said it is proven that places that have digital signs their business does increase. Mr. Filipis said Hollywood Boulevard and on Route 53 there are digital signs that are advertising for food and beverages.

Commissioner Zawacki stated there is a difference in size when looking at the Route 53 plaza compared to Nonnie's. He said they have a large area with several businesses that you have to take into consideration.

Mr. Filipis said with Hollywood Boulevard he is not sure what they are allowed to display on their sign. However, they are displaying margarita specials which are the same that Nonnie's offers and they are right down the block.

Commissioner Zawacki asked staff if they were allowed to advertise food and beverage. He said he thought it was just movies and times.

Mr. Zawila stated they can advertise products that are part of their business.

Mr. Mays said the way they had structured the code was very specific for gas stations. For them it can only be gas prices. He then asked if Mr. Zawila could recite the code. He stated for other businesses over the years it has been approved for movie theatres, shopping centers and most recently with golf courses. Mr. Mays said shopping centers today with EMB signs can promote all the businesses within that shopping center and whatever types of business related products.

Mr. Zawila recited the text reference. He said it is specific to goods, services, promotions and events to the theater.

Mr. Mays stated since the theater offers food it would be considered inclusive.

Mr. Filipis said he feels it would give them an edge being that they're a family owned business. He stated especially with the economy and the road construction that happened on 75th Street last year. He said they have been in business with Woodridge for 28 years and it is not because they do bad business or don't advertise. He stated to be able to showcase some of their specials digitally on the street would help draw more people in.

Mr. Zawacki stated after being in business for 28 years, he knows where they are and he does not need a sign.

Mr. Filipis asked if he knew their specials. He thanked the Commission for their time.

Kandy Sladek stated she was the immediate past Chair for the Woodridge Chamber of Commerce and a business owner in Woodridge. She said she choose Woodridge for her business because she felt it was business friendly. She stated after starting her business here and looking at the current code it wasn't as friendly as she had hoped it would be. Ms. Sladek said as a business owner it was a struggle trying to get her name out there. She stated she is not on 75th Street, so there is not a high traffic visible area. She stated she was active with the Chamber before she even opened her business doors. She said she has done coupons and advertising, but it has been a struggle.

Ms. Sladek stated she does not want an EMB sign and is not in a position for one. She said the businesses that they are targeting are these free standing businesses. She stated they do not want it to be Ogden Avenue either, however; they do want their businesses to be strong. Ms. Sladek said if you look down the corridor of 75th Street there are not that many freestanding businesses. She stated a lot of it is strip malls and they are already allowed one per strip mall. She said the one on Route 53 is very large and it is a very large shopping center. She stated many of the landlords with the smaller strip malls are not going to pay to have an EMB put out there.

Ms. Sladek said she is an innocent bystander when it comes to the EMB signs. She stated it is something that would never go by her business. She said she is working for the other local businesses and what would help them be prosperous within the community.

Ms. Sladek stated for the smaller businesses it was the temporary signs regulations that hit her the hardest. She said this is because the code allows a very small square footage for a short period of time. She stated she follows the rules but it has been very difficult. Ms. Sladek said there were people out there measuring her signs. She said she did not have 50 foot banners but instead very reasonable banners that are kept in good condition. She stated their whole goal is to find a happy medium and not punish the people that follow the code. Ms. Sladek said a lot of businesses are struggling even though the economy is on an upswing, but it will still be slow going. She stated she was very pleased that staff was willing to speak with owners throughout the Village and she feels it went very well. She said as owners their whole goal is to increase business visibility but still keep the community looking the way it is because they have a vested interest also. She thanked the Commission for their time.

Acting Chairman Krywaruczenko asked if anyone else wanted to speak in favor of the applicant. None responded. He said at this time they would allow anyone who wanted to cross examine the applicant or anyone who testified in favor of the applicant.

Commissioner Mast said she appreciates hearing the testimony from the business owners. She asked if there is any way to define the type of signage in a digital format. She said she is thinking about the difference in style. She stated the sign the Park District has is very tasteful but there are some that can look like a casino sign with lots of color and movement.

Mr. Zawila said the way the ordinance is written the message has to be static and moving images are not allowed.

Acting Chairman Krywaruczenko stated they will now take testimony from anyone opposing the applicant. None responded. He then asked if the applicant would like to make any further statements.

Mr. Zawila stated staff recommends approval of the amendments that they have presented tonight.

Acting Chairman Krywaruczenko then asked for a motion to close the public hearing.

Commissioner Przepiorka made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mast to close the public hearing. A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: Przepiorka, Mast, Krywaruczenko, Balogh, Zawacki, Hendricks

Nays: None

Motion passed

B. Plan Commission Discussion

Mr. Zawila stated the best way to review this is to go through each individual amendment and attachment. He said if there is a consensus regarding these amendments then they can make a recommendation, or the Commission can request staff conduct additional research and it can be tabled to another meeting if wanted.

Mr. Mays said if there is an additional analysis that the Commission would like staff to explore they can direct staff to do that analysis and continue this for another meeting. He stated this is a lot of information to take in.

Mr. Zawila stated they would start with Attachment A which is Village and Zoning Administration. He asked if there were any comments. None responded.

Mr. Zawila said Attachment B is for Accessory Structures. He asked if there were any comments. None responded.

Mr. Zawila stated Attachment C is for Performance Standards. He asked if there were any comments.

Commissioner Hendricks said he would like to wait and explore other options or avenues for lighting.

Mr. Zawila asked what other information the Commission would like for staff to review.

Commissioner Hendricks stated he would like to get more information on the different effects of the lighting.

Mr. Mays asked if it would be helpful to look at the other communities that have established and allowed the LED lighting to see if there have been any complaints from the residential community. He said another thing they can look at is if there are any videos or demonstrations that could do a direct comparison so the Commission can see what they look like side by side.

Commissioner Hendricks stated it would be helpful.

Commissioner Mast said they should look at other states not just nearby communities, and replacement bulbs.

Commissioner Przepiora stated he would like to see the difference in power consumption with the different types of lighting. He said he would like to know if there is significant savings to power consumption that would benefit the community.

Mr. Zawila said he can look at other case studies that have been completed.

Commissioner Balogh said what she wants to know how this will affect residential areas. She asked if this would apply to certain zones more so than others. She said personally she would not want this in her neighborhood.

Commissioner Przepiora asked if this would affect Village street lights requirements.

Mr. Mays said they would provide that information for them.

Discussion continued on whether residential properties would be affected.

Acting Chairman Krywaruczenko asked if Bolingbrook had them in their shopping malls.

Mr. Zawila stated they allowed LED lighting.

Mr. Mays said they can provide the Commission with a list of areas so that they can visit those areas to see the difference. He then went through the list of what information the Commission wanted staff to provide. He asked if there was anything else.

Commissioner Mast said if staff can look at the technology and how replacement bulbs are handled.

Mr. Mays said they would talk to other communities to see if they had any replacement problems.

Mr. Zawila moved on to Attachment D, related to signage and asked if there are any questions and comments.

Commissioner Przepiorka asked if there are six proposed changes. He said most of the comment he heard was regarding EMB signs.

Acting Chairman Krywaruczenko suggested that they look at Naperville. He said he does not believe in signs, however if you want to get their attention it should be based on speed limit code.

Mr. Zawila said it would be based on the faster the speed limit then the bigger the sign. He said the proposed amendment is based on scale and the size of the shopping center.

Acting Chairman Krywaruczenko said he understands but if you're going to insist on a sign then you should make sure people are going to see it. He stated he feels Naperville has it set up so you can see the sign.

Mr. Mays said part of the reason for the sign provisions recommended was because of direction by the Plan Commission. He stated there was concern that they have granted so much relief with the sign code over the years that they should re-evaluate the sign code. He said since this is the standard that the Village has been approving over the years then the code should be more inline with that standard.

Commissioner Przepiorka asked what is the proposed square footage for monument signs.

Mr. Zawila stated the only change is for shopping centers that are more than 20 acres and the proposed square footage is 640 square feet.

Commissioner Mast said based on the testimony heard tonight, we would want to make sure that they are not discriminating against smaller business owners. She stated if you based it on speed limit most of the smaller businesses are located on slower streets.

Commissioner Przepiorka asked based on the six sections, are there any sections that the Commissioners would not feel comfortable recommending as is.

Commissioner Zawacki stated when he had brought up the topic he wanted to have a discussion to go over the whole thing. He said things that make sense are the size of sign based on how many square feet of store front certainly within a shopping center. He stated he feels it needs more discussion.

Mr. Mays said if there is additional information or options that they could bring back, staff is willing to do that.

Commissioner Hendricks stated he recommends the proposed signage needs more time to be dissected and reviewed. He said he cannot get specific but feels it should be put to the side for next meeting.

Mr. Mays said what he is hearing is it relates to monument and EMB signs. He said what might be helpful is to provide information on the actual size of shopping center signs and the relief that has been granted so you can apply size to a visual. He asked with EMB signs is there any additional information that staff can provide to help with evaluation.

Commissioner Przepiorka asked based on the map of 75th Street where staff showed all the potential businesses that could apply, can staff show a mock of what that would look like.

Mr. Zawila stated the green squares on the map are all standalone businesses that would be able to potentially request one.

Mr. Mays said he feels that there is a concern as to how these EMBs will look. He said they don't have that many within the Village, but if they were able to identify in another Village what they were proposing would that help as a visual.

Commissioner Przepiorka stated what ever they can provide would be helpful.

Discussion continued on what type of businesses would be allowed to have an EMB sign.

Commissioner Przepiorka said it seems like the Commission would like to table this whole section.

Mr. Zawila clarified what information the Commission wanted him to obtain for the next meeting.

Mr. Zawila moved on to Attachment G, regarding medical marijuana dispensary and cultivation centers.

Mr. Mays said that based on Plan Commission concerns related to this section, it would be helpful to have an opinion from the Village Attorney. He stated the opinion can directly respond to Commissioner Zawacki's question about what if we do nothing.

Commissioner Zawacki stated wait until they came asking and tell them we do not have room for it.

Mr. Mays stated what we need to ask is what happens if we just tell them no and they are not allowed or if we wait until they submit a text amendment. He said if they wait the Village would not be able to dictate a zoning district and the applicant could propose another zoning district that still meets the requirement of the state statute.

Commissioner Zawacki said it was a scare tactic that they use.

Commissioner Przepiorka asked if there was anything in the State ordinance that states if it has to be accepted in the community.

Mr. Mays stated what the concern is if we don't regulate it then it will be regulated for us. That is why many communities are being proactive to look at appropriate zoning regulations to predetermine where it might fit within the community.

Mr. Zawila said the statute states you may not prohibit the cultivation, dispensing, and use of medical cannabis.

Commissioner Mast stated she thinks the Village Attorney should comment on this.

Mr. Zawila moved on to the last Attachment which covers small wind energy systems and clarified that it appeared tonight there was not consensus to move forward with an amendment.

Commissioner Przepiorka said it looks like the only Attachments that they would recommend would be "A" and "B".

Mr. Mays said he would prefer to wait for Plan Commission recommendations until they come back so a recommendation can be made on all of them at once. He stated they can continue it until the next meeting.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT (ITEMS NOT RELATED TO THE AGENDA)

None

IX. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. TREE PRESERVATION DISCUSSION

Mrs. Horn stated in light of the questions raised at the last meeting, staff wanted to take the time to talk about tree preservation regulations in the Village Code. In 2004, the ordinance was approved and the intent is to encourage developers to preserve the high quality, old growth trees within the community. Also to provide replacement trees for those high quality trees that have to be removed to allow for development. She said since each development is different there is significant flexibility within the code that provides the Director of Community Development authority to increase the removal allowance.

Mrs. Horn said the code as it is written requires a tree survey be submitted with every new development. She stated based on the type, quality, and condition of the tree, there is a total replacement value that is calculated for each project. She said there is an automatic 25% reduction of the tree replacement value applied to each development.

Mrs. Horn stated it is important to understand that these tree replacements are in addition to the other required landscaping per the zoning ordinance. This would include perimeter landscaping, foundation landscaping, and parking lot landscaping. She said in the past the Village has evaluated each project on a case by case basis because each development is unique. When there are high quality trees, staff has worked with the developer to try to preserve these trees as much as possible without hindering development. Mrs. Horn said a good example of this is with the Smoter single-family subdivision that was approved in 2006 but not yet developed. There were a large number of large, old growth trees at the west border of the property. Staff worked with the developers to locate their required detention and park land in these areas so the high quality trees could be preserved.

Mrs. Horn said there are times where there are low quality trees or there are other site constraints that prohibit the developer from being able to include all the required replacement points onsite. She stated with these cases they have looked at them on a case by case basis and identified other site improvements that could be incorporated within the project to make it a better development in lieu of providing the onsite tree replacements.

Mrs. Horn said she provide a summary of business parks that were approved since the tree preservation went into effect. She stated the document outlines the replacement that would be required for each project per the ordinance, the trees provided, the relief that was granted from the ordinance and also the trees that were provided outside of the tree preservation ordinance to meet the other landscaping requirements. She said it also notes other considerations that were considered with each project.

Mrs. Horn stated in the case of Union Pointe Phase 2 from last month, the trees that were slated for removal were low quality trees. She said staff looked for other ways to improve the development like the sidewalk extension, trees in the median north of the development, and with Phase 1 the internal roadway. She then opened it up for questions or discussion.

Commissioner Hendricks asked who determines the quality.

Mrs. Horn said it is determined on the survey. She stated the code outlines specifically the quality and it is a generally accepted standard throughout the industry. She said on page 6 of the tree preservation regulations that were provided to the Commission, there is condition rating scale. Mrs. Horn stated it would be the developer's landscape architect who would prepare the tree survey.

Commissioner Balogh asked if this applied to any new developments.

Mrs. Horn said yes any new development.

Mr. Mays stated it does not apply to single-family residential homes.

Commissioner Przepiorka asked if there is any consideration to invasive species or native species.

Mrs. Horn said there are some specifically with the subdivision ordinance but not specifically in zoning ordinance. She stated with street trees there is a list the public works approved trees that must be planted.

Discussion continued on high and low quality trees and Ash trees.

Mrs. Horn asked if there were any questions or if staff could provide any other information to the Commission. None responded.

B. Training Session – APA – IL/Chaddick Institute

Mrs. Horn said she would like to schedule, at one of the regular Commission meetings, a planning official's development training. She stated it is put on by the Illinois American Planning Association and the DePaul University Chaddick Institute. She said they send out trained faculty to lead the Commission through an in-depth training on planning history, planning documents, open meetings act, ethics, regional planning and other various topics. She stated she is looking for some dates from the Commission and would like to get a date where everyone can attend. She asked that the Commissioners provide their availability to Lisa as soon as possible.

C. Open Meetings Act Training

Mrs. Horn stated she had provided a memo to all the Commissioners regarding the Open Meetings Act Training. She asked if they could please scan and email that Certificate to her or provide her with the hard copy. Mrs. Horn said it needs to be done before October 15th of this year.

X. UPDATE OF PREVIOUS PLAN COMMISSION CASES

Mrs. Horn said the Village Board had approved the Union Pointe Phase 2 at their August 8th meeting.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Acting Chairman Krywaruczenko called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Commissioner Przepiorka made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mast to adjourn the meeting. A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: Przepiorka, Mast, Krywaruczenko, Balogh, Zawacki, Hendricks

Nays: None

Motion passed

The Meeting was adjourned at 10:15 PM.

Peter Krywaruczenko, Acting Chairman

Peggy Halper, Recording Secretary