

MINUTES
PLAN COMMISSION
MAY 24, 2018

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Mary Loch at 7:00 p.m. Plan Commission Members Tracy Hemming-Littwin, Tim Loftus, John Mulherin and Jamie Vondruska were present. Plan Commission Members Angela Fanella, Phillip Hartweg, David Rodemann and Mohammed Saaed were excused. Also present were Village Planner John Sterrett, Plan Commission Liaison Trustee Craig Pryde and Recording Secretary Karin Kietzman.

A quorum was present.

Public Comment

No general comments on non-agenda items were made by the public at this Plan Commission meeting.

Approval of March 8, 2018 Plan Commission Minutes

Commissioner Hemming-Littman Moved, seconded by Commissioner Loftus to approve the March 8, 2018 Plan Commission Minutes. Commissioner Mulherin abstained because he had not attended the meeting.

Public Hearing - 840-944 Roosevelt Road - Pete's Market/Baker Hill Shopping Center - PUD Amendment and Sign Variations

PUBLIC HEARING WITH DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND RECOMMENDATION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE BAKER HILL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT TO AMEND ORDINANCE 4467 TO ACCOMMODATE THE EXPANSION OF AN EXISTING COMMERCIAL TENANT SPACE AND A REQUEST FOR VARIATIONS FROM THE SIGN CODE FOR A FUTURE PETE'S MARKET. THE SUBJECT PROPERTY IS LOCATED IN THE BAKER HILL SHOPPING ON THE NORTH SIDE OF ROOSEVELT ROAD EAST OF BAKER HILL DRIVE IN THE C6 COMMERCIAL/MULTI-USE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT.

Commissioner Mulherin Moved, seconded by Commissioner Hemming-Littwin to open the Public Hearing.

Staff Presentation

Village Planner John Sterrett was present to speak regarding the proposed PUD Amendment and Sign Variations. Village Planner Sterrett was sworn in and stated that the petitioners were

present. The petitioners are Phillips Edison and Company, owner of the Baker Hill shopping center, and JD Real Estate, Inc., developer for Pete's Market grocery store, shopping center.

Village Planner Sterrett stated:

The petitioner is requesting the following variations from the Sign Code:

- a. A variation from Section 4-5-10(B) of the Sign Code to allow 2 wall signs in lieu of the maximum 1 wall sign permitted; and
- b. A variation from Section 4-5-10(B) of the Sign Code to allow 1 wall sign to have a surface area of 300 square feet in lieu of the maximum 100 square feet permitted.
- c. A variation from Section 4-5-10(C)3 to allow a free-standing multi-tenant sign to have a surface area of 300 square feet in lieu of the maximum 100 square feet permitted.
- d. A variation from Section 4-5-(C)3 to allow a freestanding multi-tenant sign to have a height of 25 feet in lieu of the maximum 15 feet permitted.
- E. A variation from Section 4-5-15(B) to allow a message board to have an area of 96 square feet in lieu of the maximum 18 square feet permitted.

JD Real Estate is proposing to remodel an existing 75,100 square foot vacant commercial space in the shopping center, previously occupied by Dominick's until 2013, for a Pete's Market grocery store. In addition to the interior remodel, JD Real Estate is proposing to construct 3 additions, totaling 4,581 square feet, on the building to accommodate the new grocer including a 1,792 square foot addition to the mechanical room located on the back of the building, a 2,219 square foot addition under the existing canopy on the front of the building and a 570 square foot enclosed patio area east of the entrance to the building.

Pete's Market is proposing 2 wall signs on the front of the building including a 300 square foot "Pete's Market" sign and an 89 square foot "Lotus Café" sign with a lotus logo.

Village Planner Sterrett showed an overview picture of the property, and stated that the subject property is located in the C6 Commercial/Multi-Use Planned Development District, the former Dominick's location.

Village Planner Sterrett suggested that the Plan Commission should consider the petitioners' request for approval of an amendment to the Baker Hill shopping center PUD and variations from the Sign Code and make a recommendation to the Village Board for approval, approval with conditions, or denial. In reviewing the requests, the Plan Commission should consider the criteria of Section 10-7-7 of the Zoning Code and Section 4-5-17(G) of the Sign Code. The Plan Commission may wish to consider the following conditions as part of their recommendation:

1. That the existing 10 foot tall freestanding sign located immediately west of the Roosevelt Road entrance to the shopping center be removed within 10 days of completion of the proposed 25 foot tall freestanding sign. Village Planner Sterrett stated that the petitioners have proposed to remove the sign; and
2. That the two existing 67.5 square foot “Baker Hill” wall signs at the southeast portion of the building be removed within 14 days of completion of the proposed 25 foot tall freestanding sign; and
3. No outdoor sales or storage of merchandise shall be allowed.

Questions from Plan Commission

Commissioner Mulherin asked to see where the new freestanding sign would be located. Village Planner Sterrett showed pictures and the aerial photo to demonstrate the location. Commissioner Mulherin asked if the owner of the property owned the sign? Village Planner Sterrett stated that the owner of the property does own the sign. Commissioner Mulherin stated you indicated that the Pete’s sign, absent the maximum square footage, the sign would conform based upon the calculation of up front space. Village Planner Sterrett confirmed that it would comply with that maximum 100 square feet.

Commissioner Loftus asked if there were any existing codes/regulations on the video board that is being proposed underneath Pete’s? Village Planner Sterrett indicated yes, and they are asking for a variation from the maximum square footage which is currently 18 square feet. There are other regulations more attached to the operation of the electronic message board, dealing with how long they can be on, or if there were an emergency, the Village has the right to use the board, but that is more on the operation side.

Chairperson Loch asked if the name of the shopping center “Baker Hill” was going away. Village Planner Sterrett responded no, not that they were aware of. He explained that the owner of Baker Hill was present this evening so they could probably elaborate if needed.

Commissioner Loftus asked how they could guarantee the signs get removed. He stated that in almost ten years there have been two owners and they did not remove the sign, what type of requirements do they have, how do we protect ourselves from this in the future?

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin asked which sign and explained that the same thing had happened at the Chocolate shop. She stated that they could make it a condition of approval. She stated that there was a wall sign at the Chocolate shop and that sign is now down. Village Planner Sterrett also stated that a citation could be issued if necessary.

Village Planner Sterrett stated that staff is recommending to memorialize this to make sure the sign is taken down.

Petitioners' Presentation

Peter Dremonas, who resides at 4333 South Pulaski Road, Chicago, IL 60632 was sworn in. Mr. Dremonas stated that he works in project management and is the cousin of the owner. He stated the Pete's Market is family owned retail supermarket which was started in the late 1970's and serves a vast variety of ethnicities. They sell fresh produce, deli foods, and hot prepared foods. They started in the Hispanic markets but now cater to all ethnicities.

Chairperson Loch asked why they are asking to amend the PUD? Mr. Dremonas stated that the back of the store is mostly storage and they need more space in the front for more access.

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin asked if the sign will be further west than the existing sign? Village Planner Sterrett stated that it would be further west.

Commissioner Loftus asks if this will disrupt delivery? Mr. Dremonas stated that it would not, he stated that they need more receiving space because it is very tight in back and they need the room to move the pallets around.

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin stated that they have another store located in Oak Brook Terrace and asked if the sign proposed was the same size as that sign? Mr. Dremonas stated that the sign was a little bit smaller because of the name change of Pete's Market over time. This sign has the tenant slots.

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin asked who controls the advertising space. Mr. Dremonas stated that Pete's Market Corporate would control the space and that it will be used to advertise specials.

Commissioner Loftus asked if the existing sign holders have to change their sign size? Mr. Dremonas stated that their signs would stay the same size.

Commissioner Loftus asked about the possibility of a stop light at the entrance off of Roosevelt Road and if that is requested, will that come back in front of the commission? Village Planner Sterrett stated that this would be an IDOT project. He noted that a stop light was not proposed, just a left turning lane.

Chairperson Loch asked if there were any other questions for the Petitioner and there were not.

Commissioner Mulherin made a positive comment regarding Pete's and looking forward to Pete's Market coming to town. Mr. Dremonas thanked him and stated that they were looking forward to being in Glen Ellyn. Commissioner Mulherin asked when the store is expected to open? Mr. Dremonas stated that it will open in the first quarter of 2019.

Chairperson Loch asked if there was anyone from the public that would like to speak regarding this project and asked that comments be kept to about three minutes.

Comments from the Public:

Jeff Tiemen, who resides at 52 Grove Avenue, Glen Ellyn was sworn in and stated he lived near the proposed sign. Mr. Tiemen stated that he and his wife have concerns regarding the sign and flashing lights due to a genetic illness that his daughter has which includes a sleeping disorder. He stated that the flashing lights are worrisome. He stated they are worried about what the sign would look like and how large the sign may be. He stated that the location of the sign will be on a hill which will also make a difference.

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin asked for the sign to be shown. Mr. Tiemen stated that he has a picture of the sign, but it is hard to say what it will actually look like installed.

Commissioner Mulherin asked what is on the right side of the sign - the vertical piece? Someone from the audience responded that the vertical piece is a metal panel. Commissioner Mulherin stated that the light is oriented east/west.

Commissioner Loch asked what the hours were to operate the sign? Village Planner Sterrett stated the hours of operation for an electronic sign, which are 6:00 a.m. until 10:00 p.m. and he stated that the Village prohibits flashing signs. He added, a message has to be static for a minimum of 15 seconds.

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin asked if anyone knows how large the Health Trak sign across the street is? Village Planner Sterrett did not know how large this sign is.

Commissioner Vondruska asks Mr. Tiemen if the existing situation with the lights are a problem? Mr. Tiemen stated that the existing situation is not a problem but that they are just concerned about what the mechanical part will look like and the added height of the sign.

Chairperson Loch stated that the mechanical part of the sign was more to the north, not to the east.

Commissioner Littwin stated that it was further west right? Village Planner Sterrett stated that it was further west.

Commissioner Mulherin stated lighting engineers can control the amount of drift/spread of light. Someone from the audience responded that this was called scrolling.

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin stated that she did not disagree that it might be higher but asked if his daughter could not see the existing sign? Mr. Tiemen responded he was more worried about the ambient light that will be coming off of the sign.

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin asked if they had the information on how tall the pole light (foot candles) could be. Village Planner Sterrett stated that an electronic message board cannot exceed .05 foot candles. He stated that having a tall pole light, the foot candles will travel further because it is higher up. Mr. Tiemen stated not if they are designed properly. Commissioner Hemming-Littwin stated that they do design them in a way not to have the foot candles on and that this design has to be designed the same way. Village Planner Sterrett stated that she was correct, and that was for every illuminated sign.

Commissioner Loftus stated that the Starbucks and Lucky Motors have a white background and the flash from it is distracting and that it hurts the eyes at times.

Mr. Tiemen stated that they are scrolling and have pictures, but that it is an LCD monitor.

Commissioner Vondruska asked if the light will dim at night? Village Planner Sterrett stated that all electronic message boards have to be equipped with a photosensitive light and that they would dim at night.

Commissioner Loftus stated that the plan says 28' building. How will the change in the topography effect the location of the top of the message board?

Eugene Gincovich, 4333 South Pulaski, Chicago, Illinois was sworn in and used the pointer of the mouse on the overhead drawing and stated that the message center is at about 15 feet and the top of the message center is 19 to 20 feet. He stated that the steeple should help with shadowing and any flashing.

Mr. Tiemen stated that he understood what Mr. Gincovich was saying, but stated that other parts of the building are not as high and that there was a significant change in elevation up a hill to where the sign is located, which makes it a 30 foot sign not 25 feet. He stated that the higher the sign the greater chance the light will travel further.

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin stated that the one gabled roof is actually 45' tall.

Mr. Tiemen stated he understood that.

Chairperson Loch asked for a motion to close the Public Hearing and Commissioner Hemming-Littwin moved, seconded by Commissioner Mulherin.

Commissioner Loftus stated that all other signs are facing out away from any residential areas. He stated even though the sign is higher than what is allowed, when I look at the location of where the sign is going to be, I could go along with the proposed location. He stated the location of the addition is not any closer to any house near it.

Commissioner Mulherin stated that he did not have any issues with the sign's size, but he suggested the Village could look at the dimming of the signs and frequency of the animations and he is sure it could be worked out to minimize impact on the neighbors. He stated the property has been sitting vacant for a while and that he is fine with approving this project.

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin stated that she felt that the freestanding sign was appropriate especially because the site is a multi-tenant site and that the main tenant was further away. She went on to state that she wanted to go on record saying that she thinks that the way the Village regulates the signage on buildings today should be changed. There is no reason that someone should have to get a variance for signage on a building of this size. She stated that the sign code should be changed and that a 100 square foot sign is too small. She went on to state that she hoped that John (Village Planner) could give more specific information regarding what the foot candles are, and what they would be with dimming. She stated that she was fine with adding the conditions to remove the existing signage within a specific timeframe, the special use and limiting sales of merchandise outside.

Commissioner Mulherin stated that Baker Hill is a challenging with regard to traffic especially with limited access for east bound traffic. He stated that he hoped that the Village will continue to pursue the turning lane project through the Department of Transportation to secure a left hand turn. He agreed that the Village should update the current code limitations on sign size. He stated that he did not have a strong feeling on whether the Baker Hill sign should stay or be removed.

Chairperson Loch said that she had nothing else to add but thanked the petitioners and stated that she hoped for success for Pete's Market.

Motion

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin moved, seconded by Mulherin to recommend the following:

Having considered the applications of Phillips Edison and Company and JD Real Estate, Inc. for approval of an amendment to the Planned Unit Development of the Baker Hill development to allow the proposed expansion of an existing vacant commercial tenant space and variations from the Sign Code located at 840 - 944 Roosevelt Road in the C6 Commercial/Multi-Use Planned Development District, the Plan Commission hereby adopts the findings of fact contained in the petitioners' application packet and presented by the petitioners at the public hearing, as well as the findings included in the deliberations of the Plan Commission, and recommends approval of the requests, subject to the following conditions:

1. The existing 10 foot tall freestanding sign located immediately west of the Roosevelt Road entrance to the shopping center be removed within 10 days of completion of the proposed 25 foot tall freestanding sign.

2. The two existing 67.5 square foot “Baker Hill” wall signs at the southeast portion of the building be removed within 14 days of completion of the proposed 25 foot tall freestanding sign.
3. No outdoor sales or storage of merchandise shall occur at Pete’s Market until such time a Special Use Permit is approved.

The motion carried unanimously with a voice vote.

Chairperson Loch explained that this project would go before the Village Board for approval and that the attendees were welcome to attend the Village Board meeting. Commissioner Hemming-Littwin asked when this would go before the Village Board? Village Planner Sterrett stated that it would go before the Board on June 4, 2018.

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin moved, seconded by Commissioner Mulherin to close the Public Hearing.

Public Hearing - Zoning Code and Subdivision Regulations Code Text Amendments

PUBLIC HEARING WITH DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND RECOMMENDATION REGARDING PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENTS TO THE GLEN ELLYN ZONING CODE AND THE GLEN ELLYN SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS CODE. AMENDMENTS TO THE ZONING CODE INCLUDE CHANGES TO CHAPTERS 2, 4, AND 5 THAT WILL AFFECT THE REGULATIONS FOR RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE VILLAGE.

Village Planner Sterrett was sworn in and stated that there are six proposed zoning and subdivision text amendments to review. He stated the amendments have to do with clarifying some of the regulations in the code to coincide with how staff interprets the code operationally. He stated that in the last round of zoning text amendments the Commission reviewed many of uses that were permitted in the C5A district. He stated staff is recommending that banking and financial institutions be removed from the list of permitted uses in C5A. He stated that the C5B district allows service uses as permitted uses and staff is suggesting this would remain unchanged. He stated that C5A should be more geared toward retail and restaurant uses on the ground floor.

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin asked why this is the only type of use being reviewed - for instance why are nail salons not being limited? Village Planner Sterrett stated that nail salons and pet stores, were removed from the list of permitted uses in the C5A district with the last round of text amendments.

Chairperson Lock asked how many banks exist in the C5A district now. Village Planner Sterrett stated that there were two banks in C5A, Citibank and Inland Bank. Commissioner Hemming-Littwin asked which district the US Bank was in and how many banks they have.

Commissioner Mulherin stated that bank branches are shrinking or closing because of mergers and that he is fine with the proposed revision. Commissioner Hemming-Littwin stated that she would also support the revision, but that it seemed that they were always behind the issue, discussing changes after the spaces are gone or used for special use.

Chairperson Loch asked if there is that much demand for the retail space that there is a need to limit banks? Village Planner Sterrett stated that when projects come forward for retail and restaurant uses they want to be located in C5A. He stated C5A is the prime location for retail or restaurant uses.

Commissioner Mulherin stated that Trustee Pryde may be able to go into this with more detail, but that he recalled that years ago banks had to be designed to be built in such a way that the building could be converted for retail space if the bank closed.

Trustee Craig Pryde was sworn in and stated that speaking as an architect and Village resident, not as a Trustee; there was talk about this years ago but it was never made into an ordinance as a zoning requirement.

Chairperson Loch stated that if there were no further questions regarding this issue they would move on to the next item and that the Commission would vote on all of the proposed amendments at one time.

Village Planner Sterrett stated that the next amendment will clarify what a reverse frontage lot is. He stated that this is to clean up the definition of a reverse corner lot.

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin asked if there was any public comment.

A member of the audience asked if it is different than a two frontage lot. Village Planner Sterrett stated that is a through frontage lot.

There were no further comments or questions on this text amendment. Village Planner Sterrett stated that the next text amendment is in regards to a lot with two front yards. Currently, if a resident would like to have a 6 foot fence in the rear of their home they would have to move the fence in 4 feet from the rear property line and maintain landscaping around the fence. The Village has seen an increase in variation requests to allow 6 foot fences to be replaced at the property line.

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin asked if in the subdivision north of Geneva Road do the property lines go to the public sidewalk? Village Planner Sterrett responded that the sidewalk is where the property line ends.

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin stated that the fence would go into the parkway and the parkway is supposed to be taken care of by the resident. She asked if you have a through lot like that, are you still responsible for mowing the parkway. Village Planner Sterrett stated that

he was not sure. Commissioner Hemming-Littwin stated that they need to be careful with this because if a fence goes close to or right up to the sidewalk that there would be potential that the landscaping would not be taken care of. Village Planner Sterrett agreed but said that a lot of residence will put in an access gate to take care of those areas. Commissioner Hemming-Littwin stated that they need to make sure the residents take care of maintaining the yard. Village Planner Sterrett stated that the proposed amendment would not change requirement to maintain those areas. Chairperson Loch asked how many people don't take care of the landscaping. Village Planner Sterrett stated that the Village has had a handful of complaints.

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin asked why this was coming up and if there a new subdivision. Village Planner Sterrett stated that he did not believe that this was for a new subdivision but rather to address the number of variations being granted for these types of lots, where the property owners have constraints on where the fence can be placed.

Commissioner Mulherin stated we are trying to legislate responsibility. Chairperson Loch stated that she was not comfortable with this text amendment change. But that they will see what happens.

Kevin Moran 374 Amy Court, Glen Ellyn was sworn in. Mr. Moran stated that this was his first time at one of these meetings. He stated that he is the owner of a through lot along Geneva Road and he would like to put a fence up in the rear of his home. He said that there is an ordinance tied to his property from 1996. He stated that he wanted to put up a fence as security for his kids and his pets from Geneva Road. He stated that he wasn't aware that he was supposed to take care of mowing the parkway it was just something that he always did. Commissioner Hemming-Littwin asked if he was told that he could not put up a fence. Mr. Moran stated that he was told he would have to move it in 4 feet from the property line.

Village Planner Sterrett stated that the Village Board has reviewed a number of variances like this and that is part of the reason for this proposed text amendment - to eliminate the need for property owners in this area to request variances.

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin asked if these variations were going through the ZBA for approval. Village Planner Sterrett stated yes.

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin stated that she understands Mr. Moran's situation and that residents were told to keep up on the landscaping along the road. Village Planner Sterrett stated that would be something tied to the developer. But that some of the properties do not have that specific requirement. He suggested that if it is a planned unit development you can put in these types of requirements, or have dedicated landscaping buffers. He stated that developments that don't have specific requirements is where we are seeing these variations. He suggested it could be written into new planned unit development.

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin asked if Amy Court is not part of a PUD or planned subdivision? Village Planner Sterrett was not sure.

Mr. Moran stated that in Stacy's Woods Subdivision there were not a lot of two frontage lots that don't have a fence. Commissioner Mulherin suggested that if the recommendation was to keep the landscaping inside of the fence that he is willing to trade off leaning more toward helping homeowners.

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin stated that maybe a service gate attached to the fence is an idea. She told Mr. Moran that she appreciated that he took care of the parkway. Mr. Moran stated that was part of his plan, maybe the service access door would make a difference. He asked what happened if people did not take care of the landscaping. Village Planner Sterrett stated that citations are given if the parkway is not maintained by the resident.

Ray Whalen 177 Sunset Avenue, Glen Ellyn was sworn in. Mr. Whalen stated that perhaps on collector or arterial streets additional consideration should be given. He stated that someone that backs up to the lake could put up a fence which would be undesirable. He suggested that maybe the code could be written to consider the classification of the road and that the taller fences could only be built along major streets.

Mr. Whalen asked if an alley is considered an improved street. Village Planner Sterrett responded that an alley is considered a public way.

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin stated she would be willing to support this revision if there were some consideration given for the type of roads. Village Planner Sterrett stated that staff could revise the regulation to limit 6 foot fences at the property line to through lots on any roadway under County or State jurisdiction.

Chairperson Loch stated she was more comfortable with that language.

Village Planner Sterrett stated that the next three text amendments are from the Subdivision Code. The first amendment up for discussion is that private streets be prohibited.

Village Planner Sterrett stated that the following two amendments have to do primarily with two-lot splits, land transfers and lot consolidations which are considered subdivisions. He stated that in the past staff has not required property owners that wish to transfer land on such a small scale to underground utility lines. He stated staff believes that it should be made clearer in the code that unless there are new utility lines being proposed, the undergrounding of utilities is not required when requesting a two-lot split, land transfer or consolidation.

Commissioner Loftus asked what the requirement would be if a new house were being constructed.

Village Planner Sterrett responded anything in the right of way could stay above ground. But new construction requires burying.

Village Planner Sterrett stated staff is really starting to evaluate how we do these administrative approvals. He stated if someone were to do a two-lot split they could do it administratively, but if they were to try and do something like a land transfer or lot consolidation within five years of that original two-lot split they would be required to come to the Plan Commission for a minor subdivision.

Chairperson Loch asked if this was happening regularly. Village Planner Sterrett stated they have seen a few of these recently and people decide not to pursue it because it is not worth their time or effort.

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin asked if they could do a partial land transfer. Village Planner Sterrett stated they could but they would have to put together a new plat of subdivision. The only difference would be it would be able to be reviewed and approved administratively instead of them having to do a public hearing.

Commissioner Mulherin asked if there was anything stopping anyone from doing it every five years. Village Planner stated that they were not proposing to change the time frame for it. It is to discourage people from doing a two-lot split and then another two-lot split five years later, creating a subdivision.

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin stated that they could put a requirement on how big a lot could be. She then asked Village Planner Sterrett how many lots in the Village are 200 – 300 feet wide? To which Village Planner Sterrett responded he was not sure.

Village Planner Sterrett pointed out one example that the Plan Commission reviewed a few months prior on Harding Avenue and stated that if the Village didn't have this provision in place the property could have been split administratively and then those two lots could have later been split.

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin stated that her only recommendation for a change would be to the wording about the fencing. Village Planner Sterrett stated they could modify the language.

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin motioned to approve the text amendments as presented but removing the 4' buffer along roads that are owned by either DuPage County, Illinois Department of Transportation or alleys. Commissioner Mulherin seconded the motion.

Motion carried by voice vote.

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin asked when this would go before the Village Board. Village Planner Sterrett stated that it would go before the Village Board on Monday, June 4, 2018.

A member of the audience asked if the Public Hearing had been closed.

Commissioner Hemming-Littwin moved to close the Public Hearing seconded by Commissioner Mulherin.

Trustee's Report

Trustee Craig Pryde reported that the Village Board approved the last round of text amendments. Trustee Pryde stated that they approved two contracts for road paving on Main Street and Park Blvd. He stated that the Main Street project would be completed first and should be completed by July 1 and then construction will begin on Park Blvd. Trustee Pryde stated that they approved the contract for the underpass on Taylor Street and that this project will start this summer as well.

Chairperson's Report

Chairperson Loch wanted to state that this was Tim's last day on the Planning Commission. She thanked him for all of his service and wished him Good Luck.

Staff Report

Village Planner Sterrett stated that at the next meeting on June 14, 2018 a proposal for Buena Beef on lot 3 of the old Enterprise site will be discussed. He stated that sign code text amendments will be coming to the Plan Commission for review this summer.

Other Business

No other business was discussed.

Adjournment

At 8:40 p.m. a motion was made by Commissioner Hemming-Littwin and seconded by Plan Commissioner Loftus to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karin Kietzman
Recording Secretary

Reviewed by,

Kelly Purvis
Planner