

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLAN COMMISSION HELD ON WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2015, AT THE VILLAGE POLICE STATION BUILDING, 7760 QUINCY STREET, WILLOWBROOK, DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Kopp called the meeting to order at the hour of 7:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Those present at roll call were Commissioners Lacayo, Remkus, Soukup, Kaucky, Ruffolo, Vice-Chairman Wagner and Chairman Kopp. Also present were Village Planner Jo Ellen Charlton, Building Inspector Roy Giuntoli, Secretary Joanne Prible and Administrative Intern Tiffany Kolodziej.

3. OMNIBUS VOTE AGENDA

The items on the Omnibus Vote Agenda were as follows:

- A. Waive Reading of Minutes (APPROVE)
- B. Minutes – Regular Meeting November 4, 2015 (APPROVE)
- C. Minutes – Village Board Meeting October 12 and October 26, 2015

MOTION: Made by Commissioner Remkus seconded by Commissioner Lacayo, to approve the Omnibus Vote Agenda.

MOTION DECLARED CARRIED

Chairman Kopp stated that the next item on the agenda is a discussion and consideration of a motion on Public Hearing 15-06 and stated that Vice-Chairman Wagner will preside over the Public Hearing. Chairman Kopp recused himself.

4. PLAN COMMISSION OLD BUSINESS: Zoning Hearing Case 15-06: (ROC Willowbrook LLC – 7501-7601 Quincy) Consideration of a motion to approve a special use for a Planned Unit Development and approval of a Preliminary and Final Plat of Subdivision and Preliminary and Final Plat of PUD. (Remanded by Village Board on November 23, 2016)

A. DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION OF A MOTION

See Court Reporter Minutes

MOTION: Made by Commissioner Remkus, seconded by Commissioner Lacayo that based on the submitted petition and testimony presented, I move that the Plan

Commission forward its findings for special use and planned unit development referenced in the staff report for PC 15-06 prepared for the December 2, 2015 meeting and recommend to the Village Board approval of the relief associated with PC 15-06 including a preliminary and final plat of subdivision, approval of a special use for a preliminary and final planned unit development, including exceptions outlined in exhibit 2 of the December 2, 2015 staff report, and other relief as may be necessary to accommodate proposed project, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the approval be in substantial compliance with the list of documents approved for PC 15-06 on December 2, 2015 meeting for PC 15-06, except as modified or required by all required changes or proposed conditions of approval identified in sections 2 and 3 respectively of the staff report for PC 15-06 except that Required Change Number 1 in Section 2 will not require a shade tree in the one island that contains a light pole, and except as may be required for compliance with the requirements of the village engineer or the building inspector as part of the building permit review process.

2. Compliance at all times with the conditions of approval identified in Section 3 of the December 2, 2015 staff report for PC 15-06, except as discussed at the meeting, which is as follows:

a. Condition Number 5 shall be revised to identify 53 instead of 29 parking spaces in Lot 2, and eliminate the words “only as long as the use on Lot 1 is for self-storage”.

b. Condition Number 6 shall be revised to require the 10” pre-cast panels with painted reveal accent stripes only on the west elevation of Building A and only on the west and south elevations of Building B, which are the elevations visible to Quincy and Executive Drive.

c. Condition Number 18 is removed as it was a run-on error in the staff report.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Commissioners Lacayo, Remkus, Soukup, Kaucky, Ruffolo, and Vice-Chairman Wagner; RECUSED: Chairman Kopp. NAYS: None.

MOTION DECLARED CARRIED

Chairman Kopp continued the Plan Commission Meeting.

5. PLAN COMMISSION CONSIDERATION: Zoning Hearing Case 15-07: (David Froberg – Willowbrook Square Management Co. – 6262 S. Route 83) Amendment to PUD to reduce the “dwell time” on approved digital sign for each message from 20 seconds to 8 seconds.

A. PUBLIC HEARING

B. DISCUSSION

See Court Reporter Minutes

**MOTION:** Made by Vice-Chairman Wagner, seconded by Commissioner Remkus to continue discussion and deliberation of PC 15-07 to the January 13, 2016 meeting.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Commissioners Lacayo, Remkus, Soukup, Kaucky, Ruffolo, Vice-Chairman Wagner and Chairman Kopp. **NAYS:** None.

MOTION DECLARED CARRIED

6. **PLAN COMMISSION CONSIDERATION:** Zoning Hearing Case 15-08: (The Willows PUD – Pete’s Fresh Market) Petition requesting a special use for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) that allows the reuse of part of the existing vacated K-Mart building as a multi-tenant building and construction of a new multi-tenant commercial building, including on-site improvements and offsite improvements to both Plainfield Road and Route 83.

- A. PUBLIC HEARING  
B. DISCUSSION

**MOTION:** Made by Commissioner Lacayo, seconded by Commissioner Soukup to continue discussion and deliberation of PC 15-08 to the January 13, 2016 meeting.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Commissioners Lacayo, Remkus, Soukup, Kaucky, Ruffolo, Vice-Chairman Wagner and Chairman Kopp. **NAYS:** None.

MOTION DECLARED CARRIED

7. VISITOR’S BUSINESS

None.

8. COMMUNICATIONS

None.

9. ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION:** Made by Commissioner Soukup, seconded by Commissioner Lacayo, to adjourn the regular meeting of the Plan Commission at the hour of 10:30 p.m.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE

MOTION DECLARED CARRIED

PRESENTED, READ AND APPROVED,

January 13, 2016

Minutes transcribed by Joanne Prible.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

# Transcript of the Testimony of

**Date:** December 2, 2015

**Case:** WILLOWBROOK PUBLIC HEARING 12/2/2015



**Certified Court Reporters**  
*For all your court reporting needs*  
Since 1968  
[www.metroreportingservice.com](http://www.metroreportingservice.com)

---

311 S. County Farm Rd., 2nd Floor, Suite E, Wheaton, IL. 60187

630.690.0050 FAX 630.588.9866

VILLAGE OF WILLOWBROOK

PUBLIC HEARING

ZONING HEARING CASE NOS. 15-06, 15-07, AND 15-08

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had at the  
Public Hearing of the above-entitled cases before  
The Planning Commission at the Village Hall of  
Willowbrook, 7760 Quincy Street, Willowbrook,  
Illinois, on the 2nd day of December, 2015, at the  
hour of 7:04 p.m.

PRESENT:

Daniel J. Kopp, Chairman  
John Wagner, Vice Chairman  
Leonard Kaucky  
Bernardo Lacayo  
William Remkus  
Gregory Ruffolo  
James Soukup  
Roy Giuntoli, Building Inspector  
Jo Ellen Charlton, Village Planner  
Joanne Prible, Recording Secretary  
Tiffany Kolodziej, Intern

1 MR. KOPP: Next item on the agenda is  
2 Zoning Hearing 15-06. Because I represent the  
3 applicant in legal matters, I'm going to recuse  
4 myself from this hearing and step off the dais  
5 until we get to the next item on the agenda.

6 MR. WAGNER: Thank you, Chairman.

7 The next item on the agenda is  
8 Item 4, which is Plan Commission -- at a hearing  
9 at our last meeting concerning the ROC  
10 development, and it has been remanded back to the  
11 Plan Commission, I think, because a few things  
12 weren't in order at the time.

13 Jo Ellen, do you have anything  
14 you would like to present first?

15 MS. CHARLTON: I can go first or I  
16 can go second in response to whatever he might  
17 present new.

18 MR. WAGNER: Why don't we start with  
19 the Petitioner. Good evening again. Is there  
20 anything new that you have this evening beyond  
21 what we discussed at the hearing in our last  
22 meeting?

23 MR. SIUREK: I don't think there is  
24 anything substantially new, but I thought I would

1 like to at least take the opportunity to kind of  
2 go through the staff report that Jo Ellen has  
3 provided you so that we can address some of the  
4 questions that may still be out lingering, and I'm  
5 happy to go through the presentation again, but  
6 you have most of that information in your packet.

7 But I guess I should start,  
8 for the record, my name is Mike Siurek,  
9 S-i-u-r-e-k. My company is ROC, Inc. We are the  
10 owners of the parcel at 7501 Quincy, and this  
11 piece is referred to as -- I think the address  
12 will be 7601 Quincy, and that is ROC Willowbrook  
13 LLC.

14 We were before you -- and I  
15 appreciate you coming back for a redo. We were  
16 before you on November the 4th, and we went  
17 through a presentation and had quite a bit of a  
18 discussion about many of the items of our proposed  
19 development. After your approval, I sent Jo Ellen  
20 kind of a recap and a summary letter kind of  
21 outlining what I felt the Commission had approved  
22 and what we had discussed.

23 We since, just to give you  
24 some more background, then we collectively got

1 together, I think it was, on November 16 and went  
2 through and compared the notes that we had and  
3 went ahead and made some additional document  
4 changes. It was recommended that we come back  
5 before you just to formalize that and then bring  
6 it back to city council. That's why we're here  
7 today, and I thought I would again just start by  
8 going through the staff report that Jo Ellen has  
9 put together, and we can do it as quickly or  
10 slowly as you would like. So getting to the  
11 exhibits, the documentation that was listed here,  
12 Jo Ellen had provided a handout now that is an  
13 updated list of documents that she would like to  
14 substitute and I have read those -- that list and  
15 I agree that that list is accurate.

16 On Page 2, there was a  
17 question where these five items are listed here  
18 regarding these revised plans, the revision date  
19 was not changed; and I think I need to state the  
20 revision date that will be on those drawings.  
21 That revision date will be 11/20/2015. So those  
22 drawings will have that as a revision date.  
23 Digital copies were also provided, and Jo Ellen  
24 will confirm that.

1 Moving down in the various  
2 sections, she broke this down into five sections;  
3 and I thought we can walk through those. The  
4 Commissioners can ask me questions, or I can  
5 discuss or explain certain items. First is  
6 parking. I didn't think that there was any issue  
7 on the parking, and so I want to just put it back  
8 out there to say that I don't believe that there  
9 is a parking issue with this development. In  
10 fact, the parking that would be available for Lot  
11 2, which is the existing building to the north  
12 after the development of the lots to the south,  
13 will actually add additional parking in total to  
14 that which is currently available to Lot 2. In  
15 essence, we're removing a lot, an ancillary lot,  
16 that is going to become part of Lot 1, which  
17 contains 29 spaces, and we will be replacing that  
18 with 53 parking spaces. So that net amount is the  
19 additional parking that will be available to the  
20 lot to the north. And that is going to be  
21 accomplished via an easement agreement which will  
22 also be recorded for this purpose. I don't know  
23 of any additional parking questions that anybody  
24 might have. The parking is controlled by an

1 ordinance, which we will conform to, the existing  
2 building. I think in our last meeting we talked  
3 about parking, and I don't believe there were any  
4 open issues, but I put that out there to ask if  
5 you have any questions. I will be happy to answer  
6 them.

7                   The only thing I would like to  
8 note is on the last sentence before you get to  
9 Item B, the sentence reads: "A condition is  
10 included that the existing building on Lot 2 can  
11 utilize the 29 parking spaces." That No. 29, Jo  
12 Ellen and I just spoke before the meeting, should  
13 be 53. That's the number. 29 is the old lot. So  
14 that number should read 53. And throughout the  
15 document, we should make that change that that  
16 number should be 53 not 29. Going further it  
17 says: "29 parking spaces on the north side of  
18 the northern building on Lot 1." I would like for  
19 that sentence to end with a period because "only  
20 as long as the use on Lot 1 is for self-storage."  
21 This Parking Easement Agreement that allows that  
22 north lot to use those spaces or that north  
23 building to use those space is not just contingent  
24 upon those buildings that I'm building to be

1 self-storage. I don't know what will happen. If  
2 somebody comes and buys these buildings from me in  
3 25 years from now and they want to change that,  
4 that easement agreement should still belong to the  
5 property to the north, which today is mine. But  
6 in 25 years from now, it may not be. So I don't  
7 think that that's appropriate to have that as a  
8 condition. I think anything that would have to be  
9 changed would require a PUD amendment anyway, and  
10 there would be an opportunity for parking to be  
11 reviewed in its entirety. So I want to bring that  
12 out because that ends up being in the conditions  
13 for the approval that I would like to make sure  
14 that we talk about further.

15 Anybody have a question about  
16 that item?

17 MR. WAGNER: Not as yet.

18 MR. SIUREK: Thank you. Moving on to  
19 elevations. This is a rendering of the two  
20 buildings as viewed from Quincy Avenue or Quincy  
21 Street. We discussed this quite thoroughly at our  
22 last meeting, and I put it back up here because  
23 there was some thoughts and suggestions or, you  
24 know, it was open for discussion still whether or

1 not these elevations and this design was adequate  
2 and suitable to meet the conditions of the  
3 comprehensive PUD plan that I put forward. So I'm  
4 proud of what we have designed. I'm very proud of  
5 what we're intending to build. I think it meets  
6 this criteria. I think it's very attractive.  
7 It's aesthetically pleasing and I would ask for  
8 your comment. Do you have any questions or  
9 thoughts or concerns? I would be happy to address  
10 them now.

11 MR. WAGNER: Why don't we go ahead  
12 and continue with your presentation, and we'll  
13 hold the questions until after your presentation  
14 and staff's.

15 MR. SIUREK: Okay. As we flip  
16 through to Page 5, at the bottom, I think this is  
17 another condition that is being asked. This is  
18 regarding the lighting that would be illuminated  
19 through those windows at night. There will be a  
20 hallway and through that window, the hallway will  
21 be lit, and you will see the storage unit doors.  
22 And as we talked about, they would be a single  
23 color, whatever that color may be. And the hall  
24 lighting would be simply hall lighting. It

1 wouldn't be any, you know, extra lighting or  
2 supplemental lighting or any other type of  
3 illumination. But, again, you would be able to  
4 see through those windows at night, and you would  
5 see the storage doors in the evening.

6 On Page 6, I think Jo Ellen is  
7 asking that we -- it would be helpful if the Plan  
8 Commission would address the following items: Is  
9 the building or are the building colors and the  
10 reveals appropriate? I think they are and I would  
11 like for you to agree with me.

12 2. Should additional building  
13 cornices/elevation heights be utilized? I say no.  
14 I would like for you to agree with me. I think I  
15 added some details to the corners, particularly  
16 where the office is. I've added a feature where  
17 there's an awning outside of that. I put glazing  
18 along that face to break up the expansive space of  
19 the precast. I've added different tones and  
20 colors. And, in fact, on the building to the  
21 south, which will house the luxury car storage, I  
22 wrapped that corner with an architectural metal  
23 which added another detail, architectural feature  
24 and texture to break up and give it some

1 dimension. So I would like for you to agree with  
2 what I'm asking.

3                   3. Is it okay to eliminate  
4 building details on the northeast corner of  
5 Building A given proximity to existing trees? I  
6 think that's referring to the backside where the  
7 striping continues around. I'm not sure there's  
8 an issue there. That's facing the pond and the  
9 backside of the industrial buildings across the  
10 pond. So I don't think that -- I think it's okay.  
11 I don't know whether there is any issues, but I  
12 would like to just say that I believe that the  
13 design is adequate for that.

14                   And then, finally, what  
15 details, if any, should be discussed for the two  
16 sides of both buildings not shown in the colored  
17 elevations? That would be, again, the backside  
18 that's facing the pond detention; and I don't  
19 think there's anything in addition that I would do  
20 unless you suggest something different or that you  
21 would require me to do something different.

22                   Okay. Further, Item C, the  
23 landscaping. There were several items that were  
24 discussed and recommended changes. As of today Jo

1 Ellen and our landscape design architect, Upland  
2 Design, have communicated the changes that were  
3 recommended, some of which were already  
4 incorporated on the drawing. Some are new as it  
5 relates to suggested changes by Jo Ellen, and  
6 we're in agreement with those.

7 The next is the monument sign.

8 The monument sign is out by the office component  
9 of our development. It's somewhere here. You  
10 don't see it on this plan. This is a rendering,  
11 but on the site plan, you'll see the monument  
12 sign. There was some discussion with Jo Ellen as  
13 to getting it out of the rain garden swale. And  
14 so we're just repositioning that a few feet in  
15 either direction so that we can put the adequate  
16 landscaping in and it's not down in the swale. So  
17 the position of that is something that we're  
18 finalizing. It's a couple feet in either  
19 direction. It's not a major issue at all.

20 The wall signs. We've  
21 eliminated them from our renderings on our  
22 elevations and our architectural drawings because  
23 we're simply going to conform to the ordinance.  
24 We're not asking for any variance, so there was a

1 lot of discussion about that, so we simply just  
2 are just going to say we're going to conform to  
3 the ordinance and that puts that issue to rest.

4           There is a lot of discussion  
5 next about the garbage. I don't know if there is  
6 continuing to be an issue, but I will reiterate to  
7 you that the container will be kept inside. The  
8 container will be rolled out on garbage day, and  
9 the container will be put back for the evening.  
10 That's the way we put the garbage out and take  
11 care of the garbage in our storage facilities. If  
12 there's something more that needs to be discussed,  
13 I'm happy to do that. There was a question about  
14 the height of the roll-up door. It's 14 foot. I  
15 did -- my partner talked to Flood Brothers  
16 Disposal who handles a lot of our disposal. The  
17 height of their trucks are 11 and a half feet, so  
18 they will traverse through the facility without a  
19 problem. I don't know if there are any other  
20 questions there; but, again, our containers will  
21 be brought out on garbage day, and they will be  
22 brought back in that evening. So I don't know if  
23 there is more to be talked about there.

24           Mechanical equipment. That

1 was something on the roof we are going to have  
2 mechanical equipment. It wasn't something that  
3 was discussed during the staff meeting last  
4 time -- or, I'm sorry, during the Plan Commission  
5 meeting last time. And so Jo Ellen and I went  
6 through this to make sure it conforms and meets  
7 the expectation of the Village and the ordinance.  
8 So we added some language that said we will not  
9 place any mechanical equipment closer than 30 feet  
10 from any edge of the building, so it will be in  
11 the center of the building designed so you won't  
12 see it from the street, and the air conditioning  
13 unit that will be in the office area to cool the  
14 office, there is a parapet around that office that  
15 will shield that mechanical equipment. So that  
16 recommendation and that language is acceptable.  
17 So I know that that was a question that came up in  
18 our November 16 discussion, and it wasn't really  
19 discussed here. I don't think there is any issues  
20 regarding our plat of subdivision.

21                   So moving down to the required  
22 changes, we did speak about these landscape  
23 changes, and we are in agreement with those. Jo  
24 Ellen, there is Item 1 that I would like to bring

1 up regarding the shade tree and Upland. There was  
2 some discussion about putting up a shade tree  
3 where the light post will be in the island, and it  
4 was recommended that that be changed to a shrub or  
5 some other type of plant material. That would be  
6 the only suggested change on that.

7 Okay. Moving forward, which  
8 is a very important section, Section 3, which is  
9 Page 8 and going on to Page 9. 1, 2, and 3 I  
10 think are fine. Item 4, the Parking Easement  
11 Agreement. I would like to discuss whether we  
12 should add language that the easement may not be  
13 modified without the written consent of the  
14 Village. I think the parking ordinance is the  
15 controlling governance of the issue. If I have a  
16 Parking Easement Agreement in place, that's  
17 between the ownership. I don't understand or I  
18 don't agree that I need to go to the Village to  
19 amend that. If I'm conforming to the ordinance or  
20 if I do something that is not in conformance, the  
21 ordinance is what controls it. So that would be  
22 the item that I would like to have stricken from  
23 Item 4.

24 No. 5. The two items there is

1 that the 29 should read 53, and then the last  
2 sentence, "As long as the use of Lot 1 is for  
3 self-storage." As I explained before, if that Lot  
4 1 is changed from storage to something else beyond  
5 my ownership, this parking easement should not be  
6 effective. That would be something that would be  
7 addressed when a change to that use would come  
8 before you and you would have to approve it.

9 6, 7, are fine.

10 8. I would like to remove "to  
11 be approved by the Village Administrator," as it  
12 relates to the color of the doors that you would  
13 see through my windows. I think we agree that  
14 there will be one solid color. I don't think I  
15 need to go to the Village Administrator to get  
16 approval for that.

17 9, 10, 11, and 12, I agree  
18 with. 13 I agree with.

19 14. We are back to the  
20 garbage again, the dumpsters. There's a question  
21 there as to where. If specifically, we need to  
22 note where it is, it will be on the northeast  
23 quadrant of Building A so that the truck can drive  
24 through. There was discussion about an alternate

1 spot which, you know, is feasible; but if we need  
2 to designate an area for this purpose, I will  
3 designate the northeast quadrant so that the  
4 garbage can be picked up and the truck can  
5 traverse through the facility. In the middle of  
6 this sentence or this item, it says "and rolled  
7 back inside immediately after being serviced." It  
8 goes on to say, "Failure to successfully perform  
9 this requirement on three separate occasions will  
10 require the construction of a code-compliant  
11 masonry dumpster enclosure with locking gates in a  
12 location approved by the Village Administrator."  
13 I think that's overstepping in my opinion. I  
14 don't know who is going to monitor that, if Roy or  
15 somebody is going to be going around. There are  
16 dumpsters in this park that are not within  
17 enclosures. And immediately, if I put the  
18 dumpster out and it sits out there for a couple of  
19 hours until the manager brings it in, and I just  
20 don't want to be held to some standard that is not  
21 reasonable. Again, our dumpster will get rolled  
22 out, a two-yard dumpster. It will get rolled back  
23 in. That will be a requirement of the management  
24 company. I don't want to -- my request is we

1 don't put an overburdensome language in my  
2 conditions that are perhaps not necessary. I  
3 think we can say that it won't be left overnight.  
4 I think that was the concern in the request, and I  
5 made sure that that happened.

6 I'm fine with 15.

7 16. I think the first  
8 sentence where it says, "As far as possible,"  
9 after Jo Ellen and I were just speaking, I think  
10 the idea here is that it's going to be moved north  
11 several feet to stay out of that rain garden  
12 swale. So that's just a minor issue that we can  
13 include, and it will be reflected on any  
14 engineering drawings and our site plan as we  
15 submit for permit.

16 17 we discussed and I will  
17 conform to the ordinance. So that is good.

18 18. I'm not sure what that  
19 said, Jo Ellen.

20 MS. CHARLTON: It's a run-on.

21 MR. SIUREK: It's a run-on and repeat  
22 of something else. 18 should come out.

23 Going forward. Section 4,  
24 where she outlines the special use and planned

1 development standards. I'm good with that.  
2 Again, except for the error with the 29 parking  
3 spaces should be 53 in a number of places as you  
4 go through these.

5                   And then as we move finally to  
6 Section 5, Page 13, the recommendation and the  
7 sample motion. It is my hope that you approve  
8 this today and you take into account the revisions  
9 to the changes and the conditions which would be  
10 put forth in your motion as I discussed.

11                   So with that, I'm finished  
12 unless you would like to see some more of my  
13 presentation, and I'm open for some questions and  
14 answers.

15                   MR. WAGNER: Thank you very much.  
16 And I think we'll hear from staff. Jo Ellen would  
17 like to present what she has to say, and then  
18 we'll see what questions arise out of all of this.

19                   MS. CHARLTON: Okay. Thank you,  
20 Mr. Vice Chairman. As Mike indicated, you did  
21 receive a list of revised documents that are to be  
22 considered as the documents for approval of PC  
23 15-06. Because they're referenced in the final  
24 revised motion that I'm going to provide you a

1 copy with, and it also talks about how many sheets  
2 are there, and we have revision dates that needs  
3 to be addressed, I wanted to make sure everybody  
4 understood the difference between the documents  
5 you got with your report and the documents, I  
6 believe, that, Joanne, you provided to everybody  
7 tonight that were emailed to you on Monday. We  
8 had a little issue with -- I didn't realize the  
9 digital files had been emailed to me on the day  
10 that I received the actual full-size copies. So  
11 when I prepared the report, I didn't have the  
12 ability to print those for you. Additionally, I  
13 want to point out, again, because I didn't have  
14 the digital files at the time I was preparing the  
15 report, H, I, and J at the bottom of those are  
16 additional documents that were part of the digital  
17 files, so I've called that out. You actually did  
18 receive the ROC Industrial PUD sheet notice as 3i  
19 in your report, although it wasn't referenced in  
20 the original list. And I also didn't provide,  
21 although I referenced it in the report, the  
22 Parking Easement Agreement, which I'll provide you  
23 guys a copy with tonight. I referenced that in  
24 here as well as an additional document that should

1 be referenced and the list of documents approved.

2 I think I'll follow kind of  
3 the same order and procedure that Mike chose.

4 With regard to parking, Mike is right. When we  
5 look at parking for a facility that has multiple  
6 uses in it, we have this thing in our ordinance  
7 called collective provisions. And in that case,  
8 each business use has its own parking requirement,  
9 and the parking requirement for the whole use is  
10 the sum of all of those individual uses. It's a  
11 very tedious way that our ordinance deals with  
12 buildings like this that have a lot of different  
13 tenants. Another factor that makes it very  
14 difficult, and if you recall in the last report,  
15 during the public hearing, the ordinance talks  
16 about one use. So if it's a warehouse use, it  
17 gives you one parking requirement. Or if it's an  
18 office use -- so the information that Mike had  
19 provided didn't really give me any breakdowns of  
20 there is this business in 20,000 square feet, but  
21 10,000 of it is warehouse and the other 10,000 of  
22 it is office. So I didn't have the benefit of  
23 that information when I calculated parking.  
24 Because of that, the calculation that I came up

1 with for that north lot showed parking to be short  
2 so that they didn't have enough parking. So if I  
3 were to go through an analysis on a new tenant  
4 that he brought in today and went through that  
5 exercise, unless he provided that to me, he would  
6 be short. I believe he's since gone through and  
7 provided some additional calculations to show that  
8 he is compliant, but that's not been submitted. I  
9 don't have that. I'm fairly comfortable with the  
10 fact that the site itself for the reasons I stated  
11 in the last report is adequately parked,  
12 especially given that we have the additional 53  
13 parking spaces that are to the south. It was 29,  
14 as he stated. That parking lot has been revised  
15 and expanded, and it is the intent that those  
16 parking spaces will be available to accommodate  
17 any additional parking needs that that north  
18 building might have, which is important because  
19 the storage facility buildings themselves are  
20 light parking generators, so I don't think there  
21 is going to be really any need for most of those  
22 parking spaces on the north. Again, as long as  
23 it's a storage type of a use. So I think, you  
24 know, without getting into all of the

1 calculations, I think we're good because he's  
2 agreeing to the fact that we're going to continue  
3 to calculate parking to include the sum of the  
4 parking that's already on the lot to the north  
5 plus those 53 spaces, and that should be more than  
6 adequate to accommodate his needs for both  
7 buildings.

8                   He did make mention that he  
9 wanted to take away the language "only as long as  
10 the use on Lot 1 is for self-storage." And I'll  
11 get to that a little bit later when we're looking  
12 at the specific conditions of approval, but I  
13 think we'll be okay with that because one of the  
14 other conditions was that any change to the use  
15 would require a major change to the PUD. So at  
16 that time we could evaluate parking and loading  
17 and anything else that might come up as a result  
18 of another user in that location.

19                   Moving on to the elevation  
20 discussion. We did talk quite a bit at the last  
21 meeting about colors, and I think we were all  
22 pretty comfortable with the fact that the colors  
23 presented in the exhibits are what he intends to  
24 do and what the expectation can be, and even

1 though those aren't represented in the documents,  
2 we can use that as a guide. So when he submits  
3 his permit plans, he'll need to show what those  
4 colors are, and we'll have an opportunity at that  
5 point to determine whether we believe they're in  
6 compliance with the colors shown in the colored  
7 elevations, and that's been added as a condition  
8 of approval proposed.

9           Some of the other items with  
10 regard to how the building appears, I'll get kind  
11 of subjective. Your code for M-1 District does  
12 list what kind of things need to be looked at when  
13 you're using these types of panels. Specifically,  
14 the code talks about painted reveals as one of the  
15 items; and instead of a painted reveal, I think  
16 the plans currently show painted stripes on these  
17 panels. So that is a condition that I expected  
18 that we would support because we want to actually  
19 have the relief shown in those panels. With  
20 regard to what we do on the backsides of both  
21 buildings, the east -- and well, I guess pretty  
22 much the east and south sides of the north  
23 building, we don't really have a lot of  
24 information about what's proposed on that. We can

1 see in the elevations those that are visible from  
2 the street. You know, what we do or what we  
3 approve with regard to what we don't see, I guess,  
4 will kind of be up in the air a little bit.

5 We did talk quite a bit about  
6 the windows, and I think we did in our subsequent  
7 meeting make revisions to the plans that made the  
8 windows consistent between the elevations and the  
9 plan view drawings that were presented, and we're  
10 satisfied with that.

11 The lighting in the windows of  
12 the north building is also something that we had  
13 concerns about. Mike had presented as part of his  
14 hearing at the last meeting a copy of a picture  
15 or, I think, maybe he showed it on his phone.  
16 It's presented on Page 6 of your staff report,  
17 which shows how their facility in Lisle appears at  
18 night, which shows the open windows with the  
19 storage doors behind it and the hallway lit. One  
20 of the things we talked about when we met  
21 afterwards is how do you plan to light that? Is  
22 it really brightly lit? And the colors of the  
23 doors are a little bit of a concern if you have  
24 really bright lighting and some neon orange or

1 bright color, that's something that if you feel  
2 that's important to regulate, that's something  
3 that you may want to discuss. Or as he suggested,  
4 you can just leave the color of the doors up to  
5 him, which right now that's the way it would be if  
6 there is no further discussion about that.

7           Again, kind of going through  
8 the list on Page 6, the only real important thing  
9 I felt was necessary was to make sure that we  
10 specify reveals instead of just painted stripes.  
11 The additional building cornices, elevation  
12 heights, again, that's all very subjective. There  
13 is really nothing in the code that says you should  
14 utilize one, two, or ten of the recommended  
15 improvements. So if you feel that the building  
16 that's presented in the elevation that you see up  
17 on the board is appropriate and adequate, then you  
18 can proceed with your prior recommendation. If  
19 you feel some additional relief is required given  
20 the size of the building, we should add those to  
21 your conditions of approval.

22           Again, I think landscaping has  
23 pretty much been addressed. I did talk to the  
24 landscape consultant today, and we confirmed a lot

1 of things back and forth what I found on the plans  
2 and then also what she still needed to change. So  
3 those, I believe, are going to be taken care of.  
4 And, again, because we're going to be referencing  
5 these plans as being revised in the list of  
6 documents, we can go ahead and make those changes  
7 prior to the board meeting.

8                   With regard to the monument  
9 sign, I think, again, we did talk -- I did talk to  
10 the landscape contractor about that. Mike is  
11 right. We were just interested in moving it far  
12 enough away. The current plan that came in the  
13 last time showed that sign about one foot off the  
14 curb, and anybody maneuvering into the driveway  
15 could potentially interact with that sign, so the  
16 intent of the comment was to move it back but not  
17 get it so far to the north that it was dropping  
18 down into that swale where the wet materials are  
19 going to be located. As part of that discussion,  
20 I also talked to her about creating a lawn around  
21 that sign, so those details I'm fairly confident  
22 that she can make those revisions and get those  
23 documents revised prior to the board meeting.

24                   Wall signs I don't think we

1 have any issues on.

2 Garbage, based on Mike's  
3 comments earlier, I think what I would suggest you  
4 recommend is that the dumpsters be rolled out to  
5 the northeast corner of the north building as he  
6 suggested, with the understanding that the garbage  
7 trucks are going to transfer through the building  
8 to exit, which that will kind of get rid of all of  
9 those concerns we had about them backing down that  
10 long driveway. So as long as that's the method,  
11 I'm not as concerned. I'm also not as concerned  
12 as I would have been if it was on the south side  
13 of the north building about, you know, what  
14 happens if it's not rolled back in in a particular  
15 time frame. The northeast corner of that building  
16 for a lot of the reasons that we're not looking at  
17 some of the elevation issues is pretty secluded.  
18 There's a lot of trees back there. I don't know  
19 there's going to be a lot of people that would see  
20 it. So if he's agreeing to utilize that area for  
21 his garbage and we add that as a condition in the  
22 approval, I think that's satisfied.

23 Mechanical equipment was  
24 addressed to our satisfaction by his comments.

1                   The subdivision plat, again,  
2 we just need to make references to that Parking  
3 Easement Agreement that we provided you with a  
4 copy of.

5                   Landscape changes on Page 8,  
6 we agree to.

7                   In Section 3, the proposed  
8 conditions of approval. Let's see. He agreed  
9 with one -- correct me if I am wrong here, Mike,  
10 okay. I'm kind of going through the notes I  
11 jotted while you were talking. You were in  
12 approval with 1 and 2 and 3; correct?

13                   MR. SIUREK: Yes.

14                   MS. CHARLTON: And 4, you wanted to  
15 remove the language "without the written consent  
16 of the Village of Willowbrook." I guess after  
17 further consideration, the PUD itself will govern.  
18 I mean, when a PUD is approved, both the plat and  
19 the plat of subdivision and the plat of PUD when  
20 approved will reference that parking agreement.  
21 So not including that language probably isn't an  
22 issue because he can't change it without amending  
23 the PUD anyway. So I guess we kind of have our  
24 own written consent built in as part of the PUD.

1 So I don't have a problem with that condition.

2 No. 5. The tenant parking  
3 requirements. I think he was asking to remove the  
4 last part of that sentence "as long as the use on  
5 Lot 1 is for self-storage." My concern here was,  
6 you know, we're taking care of the parking  
7 requirement for the north building, and it works  
8 when it's a self-storage because most of the  
9 parking on this south lot is going to serve the  
10 uses on the north lot. If this changed to  
11 something, anything else, then there probably  
12 wouldn't be enough parking on this southern lot to  
13 accommodate both of those buildings. I'm just  
14 guessing because there's a lot of uses for that  
15 square footage that wouldn't be accommodated in  
16 the lot between those two buildings. Again, it  
17 might be one thing that we would be able to verify  
18 as part of an amendment to a PUD, which would be  
19 required. The only use that's being certified for  
20 this is self-storage. So I think he would need to  
21 come back at any point to change that use if that  
22 were to come about.

23 MR. SIUREK: And the number 29 should  
24 be 53.

1 MS. CHARLTON: In No. 5?

2 MR. SIUREK: Right.

3 MS. CHARLTON: Okay. Items 9, 10,  
4 11, and 12, I think you were all good with.

5 MR. SIUREK: I think 8. 8 I wanted  
6 to remove "to be approved by the Village  
7 Administrator."

8 MS. CHARLTON: No. 8 on Page 8?

9 MR. WAGNER: Color of the doors.

10 MS. CHARLTON: Color of the doors.  
11 Again, if you're good with any color that's  
12 chosen, you know, then you can take that out. If  
13 you have -- you know, the last motion at the last  
14 Plan Commission was pick one color, you know.  
15 Does it matter to you if it's really bright and  
16 neon colored? I don't know. If we don't specify  
17 something, they could pick any one really loud  
18 color.

19 MR. LACAYO: Mr. Chairman, can we ask  
20 a quick question now, or do you want us to wait?

21 MR. WAGNER: Why don't we wait and  
22 get through this first.

23 MS. CHARLTON: If you want to have  
24 some control of that, then we need, whether it's

1 the Village Administrator or some way to evaluate  
2 that if that's what you would like to do. I think  
3 we -- the dumpster condition on No. 14, I think  
4 we've decided that the dumpster will be rolled out  
5 of Building A in the northeast corner, that it  
6 will be -- the garbage truck will continue through  
7 the building. And, again, because of that  
8 location, I really don't have as much of an issue  
9 with any punitive types of things that might need  
10 to happen if it doesn't get done. I will tell you  
11 it's -- code enforcement is a very hard thing to  
12 do. I think as many of you know that have had to  
13 follow up on your own code enforcement issues, it  
14 can take a long time. The staff resources in  
15 Willowbrook are pretty limited; and when we have  
16 to have one or two people on staff spend hours  
17 chasing after a code enforcement issue, it's  
18 pretty hard. It's much easier if it's a condition  
19 if it's a problem to include it as a condition and  
20 to have that fall-back position so we don't have  
21 to spend all of those staff resources to get that  
22 job done. But, again, this location I'm not as  
23 concerned about.

24 Mechanical equipment, No. 15,

1 I think, is good.

2 The monument sign, I think  
3 we'll get there, and I guess, Mike, you mentioned  
4 that we would take a look at that as part of the  
5 building permit process. Typically, the final PUD  
6 approval documents control the development. So we  
7 typically don't see things change after the final  
8 PUD documents are approved, so I'm not sure  
9 whether that's something you expect to provide and  
10 get in before.

11 MR. SIUREK: I think you and I can  
12 pick that location and have that before the city  
13 council.

14 MS. CHARLTON: That's perfect.

15 MR. SIUREK: I think the words "as  
16 far as possible" I mean, there could be a  
17 misunderstanding of the interpretation because  
18 that could mean it goes all the way toward 75th  
19 Street.

20 MS. CHARLTON: Right. And we can  
21 specify as far as possible until the rain  
22 garden -- without going into the rain garden.

23 MR. SIUREK: Okay.

24 MS. CHARLTON: Okay.

1 MR. WAGNER: Where was the reference  
2 to "as far as possible"? Is that in 16?

3 MR. GIUNTOLI: 16.

4 MS. CHARLTON: 16. "The monument  
5 sign shall be relocated north as far as possible."

6 MR. WAGNER: So are we eliminating  
7 some of this language?

8 MS. CHARLTON: I think we're saying  
9 we're adding "as far as possible," and then add  
10 the words "without going into the rain garden."

11 With regard to the special use  
12 and planned development standards outlined in  
13 Section 4, again, these are things that we include  
14 either in your report or in exhibits. Sometimes  
15 they get kind of lost, but they are a state  
16 statute and a local code requirement. What I can  
17 say is that regardless, you know, if you're in  
18 agreement with generally how these are presented,  
19 if your recommendation includes modifications that  
20 would alter any of those slightly, and that would  
21 include things that reference the 29 versus 53  
22 parking spaces, I will make those changes as we  
23 prepare the ordinance for the Village board. But  
24 if there is anything else in those standards that

1 you reviewed that you would like changed, you  
2 should add those to your motion as well.

3 I did provide -- as I  
4 mentioned earlier, we had a few additional  
5 documents and some things that I thought were  
6 necessary to provide the applicant with some  
7 direction in terms of which documents we have,  
8 which ones need to be revised, or even including  
9 the revision dates. I think Mike mentioned that  
10 we got some revised documents as part of our most  
11 recent submittal, but the dates on those documents  
12 were the same as the previously submitted  
13 documents. So that gets a little messy down the  
14 road when we're trying to find the right  
15 documents. So one of the suggestions, and this  
16 will cover it, is that we're going to need to have  
17 all of those documents dated so that we have  
18 individual new dates on all of the documents.

19 The motion addresses the  
20 ability for you to add any additional design  
21 changes that you might want to do or changes that  
22 you might want to make. Otherwise, the conditions  
23 in 2 and 3 do everything to address the standards  
24 and reference the required changes to the

1 landscape plan that we discussed in the report and  
2 also references the conditions of approval. So I  
3 think we're good with that.

4 If there is any questions I  
5 can answer at this point.

6 MR. LACAYO: I would like to ask a  
7 few questions, a couple of questions.

8 MR. WAGNER: Please.

9 MR. LACAYO: Briefly because we  
10 already took enough time, where did we go wrong  
11 with procedure here because that's 45 minutes at  
12 two meetings? How come it came back? What did we  
13 do wrong in procedures?

14 MS. CHARLTON: The motion that was  
15 made at the last meeting, we -- typically, again,  
16 the standards that I included in this report are  
17 something that's required by both state statute  
18 and local code; and when I prepared the last  
19 report and didn't feel like we were quite there  
20 yet, I didn't include that in your report or in  
21 your sample motion. So when you made the motion,  
22 you didn't include the findings that you're  
23 required to make in order to send that on to the  
24 board. So basically what that does is it

1     tarnishes the potential record for the case. At  
2     some point in the future, you know, somebody could  
3     come back and challenge it. So in order to  
4     preserve the record and move the project forward  
5     as required, the board approved a motion to come  
6     back, finish up some of these details that we  
7     still kind of were a little unsure of, and then  
8     have a motion that included the standards.

9                     MR. LACAYO: If the owner isn't going  
10    to bring it up, we're going to have a similar  
11    situation next where we could be going through  
12    this process and then revisiting it at a later  
13    meeting. So let's make sure that we're clear.

14                    A question on page -- to you  
15    on Page 6. I mean, your subjective comment, is  
16    that something that we need to opine? I mean,  
17    your paragraph on a subjective matter. There is  
18    no motion. There is nothing you're asking from  
19    us; right?

20                    MS. CHARLTON: Well --

21                    MR. LACAYO: I mean, we can't say we  
22    don't like the building.

23                    MS. CHARLTON: Well, the code  
24    provides parameters, okay. And unlike many codes,

1 a lot of codes don't address architectural style  
2 at all. Your code does and it gives several  
3 different possibilities. I mean, I think at a  
4 minimum you need to have one; but you can also  
5 have additional ones if you don't think the  
6 building looks appropriate. You do have the  
7 ability to do that. The Village can control or  
8 specify, especially in a PUD, what you want the  
9 building to look like. If you think it needs  
10 additional chutzpah, you can do that; or you can  
11 leave it as proposed.

12 MR. LACAYO: My last question on Page  
13 8, No. 8 regarding the color, so how do we handle  
14 other M-1 facilities? Let's say the building  
15 across the street wants to do a green door today.  
16 Do they have to come to the Village Administrator?

17 MS. CHARLTON: No.

18 MR. LACAYO: Okay. So I mean, I  
19 don't see why we wouldn't strike it.

20 MR. REMKUS: I think one of the  
21 reasons they're doing that is because these doors  
22 are viewed through the window, and they're kind of  
23 showcased; and if somebody wants to come along and  
24 say I don't like what -- say they painted neon

1 green or neon yellow or something, that becomes a  
2 distraction, then I think that's where it comes in  
3 because those doors are showcased and they are  
4 meant to be showcased.

5 MR. LACAYO: But no different than  
6 the doors in the swimming club, then.

7 MR. REMKUS: Well, no. The doors in  
8 the swimming club, they're not made to be  
9 showcased. They are not a showcase door. What --  
10 this is part of the advertisement for a storage  
11 facility is you're looking at the doors, and  
12 you're seeing a door that provides security, and  
13 it's an advertisement and a showcase, and we want  
14 to have at least some say that we don't get an  
15 obscene color, you know. Hundreds of the colors  
16 would be acceptable, but there may be one that's  
17 not, and it's just a protection that, as Jo Ellen  
18 said, for code enforcement so at least gives them  
19 something and going to the Village Administrator  
20 to get approval for something simple, it's not  
21 like you have to go to court and get an order and  
22 everything. You ask the Administrator is this  
23 color okay. Yeah, it's fine. That's it. It's  
24 not a big deal.

1 MR. LACAYO: Okay.

2 MR. WAGNER: Any other questions from  
3 the Commissioners?

4 MR. KAUCKY: I just want to be sure.  
5 Mike, at the last meeting, you mentioned that the  
6 color is actually controlled by your contract  
7 management company?

8 MR. SIUREK: Typically, again, just  
9 to reiterate for the Commissioners that weren't  
10 here. We're the developer. We are the owners and  
11 the owners of the business. We bring in a  
12 national operator. So it could be somebody like  
13 Public Storage. It could be something like Extra  
14 Space, The Lockup. It could be CubeSmart, and  
15 they all have their own color palette for what  
16 they would like to do, and I don't know who that  
17 will be just yet. It could be blue. It could be  
18 orange. It could be yellow. It could be green.  
19 Those are likely colors. It may just be white.  
20 But, you know, typically we try to pick their  
21 color that would be part of their identity or  
22 logo, and that's what we would do.

23 MR. RUFFOLO: Mr. Vice Chairman. Jo  
24 Ellen, on Page 3 of the staff report, which has

1 the images of these colored buildings, is that to  
2 read an example of what would not be appropriate  
3 in this industrial park?

4 MS. CHARLTON: Well, yes. Part of  
5 what I did in the last staff report was show -- I  
6 was trying to indicate that the comp plan  
7 designates this area as industrial, that this type  
8 of facade and appearance of a building is more  
9 commercial in nature and it would be more  
10 appropriate to regulate that part of the  
11 appearance of the building so you didn't have an  
12 overly commercial appearance. So it is a good  
13 example of how these businesses use store front  
14 windows looking into -- and in many cases, it's  
15 not even real. At least with their proposed  
16 facility, what you're seeing behind the store  
17 front window is an actual door. I've seen  
18 facilities that have -- it's like a big sign  
19 basically, and it's brightly lit, and they use the  
20 brightest colors possible. And in that case, you  
21 kind of get to the point is it a sign? Is it an  
22 identity? Or is it architectural parts of the  
23 building? So, you know --

24 MR. RUFFOLO: As a follow-up

1 question, we use the word "these images" yet we're  
2 talking about color. So if Life Storage -- I  
3 don't know if this is their typical color or not,  
4 this lime green.

5 MR. SIUREK: It is.

6 MR. RUFFOLO: If he chooses Life  
7 Storage and that's their brand, if it weren't the  
8 fact that there was all the glass and the retail  
9 look of this, are we to conclude from this  
10 presentation that that lime green would not be an  
11 appropriate color on the facade that he already  
12 identified for us in the pictures?

13 MS. CHARLTON: I think those images,  
14 in my opinion, and, again, it's a subjective  
15 evaluation, are more commercial in nature than an  
16 industrial building. I don't think you would see  
17 these types of color combinations on a typical  
18 industrial building. We don't have it in any  
19 other industrial building in the park.

20 MR. RUFFOLO: I would agree with you  
21 there.

22 MS. CHARLTON: So, again, it's an  
23 attempt to help this project fit with the  
24 comprehensive plan, which designates this area as

1 an industrial area, not a commercial area, which  
2 these types of building facades tend to promote.

3 MR. WAGNER: Just a point of  
4 clarification for whoever wasn't here at the last  
5 meeting. I think when we discussed this color  
6 issue, it wasn't a matter of what color will it  
7 be. I think the emphasis was on if we're going to  
8 see color through these windows with the lighted  
9 aisles and so on and so forth at night was that  
10 they all be one color as opposed to a rainbow of  
11 colors, and that's what I remember as part of the  
12 discussion. So I'm not sure I agree and, again,  
13 opinion, that we have the right to tell him what  
14 color it is. I suppose our ordinance says that we  
15 can, but I suspect that would be capable of being  
16 challenged at some point. That would be my  
17 personal opinion. I think what we were -- as I  
18 said, what we were trying to do was to control the  
19 fact that we were going to get a uniform look with  
20 a range of colors that your operating person would  
21 choose as part of their color palette or logo.  
22 And I think beyond that, I would not be sure that  
23 lime green isn't appropriate. It's behind a  
24 window. It's in the building. It's not a part of

1 the outside of the building. It would be similar  
2 in my view of approving a grocery store as part of  
3 a planned unit development who has clear glass  
4 windows across the entire front of their facade  
5 and then puts paper signs on the inside  
6 advertising the price of pork by the pound. I  
7 don't think you can control that. It's not  
8 signage on the outside of the building, nor can  
9 you control this. I think, though, and our  
10 suggestion was, uniformly keep it one reasonable  
11 color.

12 I have one other question  
13 myself, which I'm confused about. No. 6, the  
14 elevation as part of the proposed conditions of  
15 approval, No. 6, "Elevations and elevation plan  
16 details shall specify the use of 10-inch precast  
17 panels with painted reveal accent stripes." Would  
18 you explain to me what we're talking about? Page  
19 8, No. 6, as part of the proposed conditions of  
20 approval, Section 3. It talks about something  
21 we're not doing; is that correct?

22 MS. CHARLTON: I think so. The plans  
23 themselves talk about painted accent stripes  
24 instead of reveals, painted reveals. To me, my

1 understanding of a reveal is it's a difference in  
2 relief. So a reveal would be either something  
3 that comes out or is indented on a panel.

4 MR. WAGNER: I'm still lost. Mike,  
5 can you tell us what we're talking about or where  
6 this is?

7 MR. SIUREK: It's really an  
8 indentation in the precast, so instead of just a  
9 flat, there is an indentation, typically a groove  
10 or series of grooves and then that band would be  
11 painted. That's what's being proposed on the  
12 front elevations and the side elevations. It's  
13 the back of the building where I think it will be  
14 just a stripe. The same color would be continued.  
15 The reveal may not be present on the backside of  
16 the building. It is a minor issue. If the reveal  
17 is required, it is just a matter of ordering the  
18 panels that way. It's slightly more expensive to  
19 order it with a reveal but it's not a...

20 MR. WAGNER: So we're asking that you  
21 provide a 10-inch precast panel with a reveal  
22 stripe, is that what we're asking for?

23 MS. CHARLTON: Yes. On Page 5 of the  
24 report, it talks about what the code specifically

1 requires in an M-1 District. Right under the  
2 picture, second line, it says, "Provided adequate  
3 contrasting architectural accents and/or features  
4 are used. Such accents and/or features may  
5 include painted reveals, masonry bands, build-out  
6 cornices or quoins, decorative masonry copings,  
7 protruding soffits, and exterior trim of a similar  
8 nature." So he picked one of them.

9 MR. SIUREK: No. I picked several.  
10 I picked banding, the color banding. I have  
11 reveals on the front. I have a bump out in this,  
12 which changes the dimensions of the cornice so  
13 it's not flat. I added a steel structure here for  
14 an awning, so it's a powder coated steel  
15 structure, and there is different colors. I added  
16 glazing which breaks up. So I used more than one  
17 item out of that selection. I used several and I  
18 concentrated that including the metal  
19 architectural feature on the corner. I looked to  
20 your ordinance. I selected several of those  
21 items. I incorporated them on the elevations that  
22 I felt were most important, those which the people  
23 would see from the street. I didn't put those  
24 same number and quantity of elements on the

1 backside because it's facing a pond.

2 MS. CHARLTON: But they are on the  
3 front elevations, the reveals?

4 MR. SIUREK: Yes. Yes.

5 MS. CHARLTON: Painted reveals?

6 MR. SIUREK: Yes.

7 MR. WAGNER: So there is a painted  
8 reveal in the front elevations?

9 MR. SIUREK: Yes.

10 MR. WAGNER: So then 6 isn't an  
11 issue?

12 MR. SIUREK: 6 isn't an issue unless  
13 you're wanting me to carry that to the back, and I  
14 still don't think that would be an issue. It  
15 would be an additional requirement that I wasn't  
16 anticipating for the backside of those buildings.  
17 I don't think it's necessary, but if that's  
18 something you would want, I would do it.

19 MR. REMKUS: You're going to continue  
20 the painting around?

21 MR. SIUREK: Yes. The banding would  
22 look uniform.

23 MR. REMKUS: I don't think that's a  
24 critical issue. It's still going to look the

1 same. You're not going to -- it's not going to  
2 stick out or anything. Because you're not going  
3 to be able to see that backside while you're  
4 looking at the frontside, and just having that  
5 stripe there gives you the illusion that it's  
6 being carried all the way around. So I'm not  
7 concerned about that. If you look at what's back  
8 there, it's just a pond, you know.

9 MS. CHARLTON: Can I ask for a  
10 clarification? In looking at the plan, you know,  
11 the A, the Building A and Building B, when you  
12 look at those elevation drawings, for example, on  
13 Sheet A1.0, the elevation that faces Quincy on  
14 Building A, which is the north building, has a  
15 detail on that drawing that says 10-inch insulated  
16 precast panels with painted accent stripes. So if  
17 your intent is to have the reveals -- I just want  
18 to make sure we understand the intent; and if that  
19 means we need to change something on the plans,  
20 I'll make sure that gets done. But right now the  
21 plans show no reveals, only stripes all the way  
22 around the building.

23 MR. WAGNER: So there's a stripe on  
24 the building, but there isn't a reveal?

1                   MR. SIUREK: I think the note she's  
2 referring to says a painted stripe. The precast  
3 panels will have a reveal, and I think I can say  
4 that if -- and I prefer to have them on the front  
5 elevations of the buildings. In fact, you know,  
6 if you can either specify the elevations, or if  
7 says put the reveal on all four elevations, but it  
8 can be on the west elevation and the south  
9 elevation, those are the elevations that are  
10 exposed to the traffic. Everything else --

11                   MS. CHARLTON: Will it just be  
12 painted?

13                   MR. SIUREK: It will just be painted  
14 or flat panel.

15                   MS. CHARLTON: So the other sides are  
16 just flat panel with paint. The sides that are  
17 seen from the right-of-way have the reveals and  
18 the paint?

19                   MR. SIUREK: Yes.

20                   MS. CHARLTON: Am I saying that  
21 right?

22                   MR. SIUREK: Yes.

23                   MS. CHARLTON: I think we need to  
24 specify that, and then I'll make sure that gets on

1 the plan.

2 MR. WAGNER: Well, if we leave 6  
3 alone, is that acceptable?

4 MR. SIUREK: If you leave 6 alone,  
5 that will require me to put the reveals on all of  
6 the elevations.

7 MR. REMKUS: How about if we just  
8 make the reveals on the exposed elevations?

9 MR. WAGNER: Exposed to what?  
10 Exposed to the street?

11 MR. REMKUS: Yes.

12 MR. RUFFOLO: Why don't you use west  
13 and south.

14 MR. WAGNER: Sure. That works;  
15 doesn't it?

16 MS. CHARLTON: Or you can say on the  
17 street elevations. I'll know what that means. So  
18 Quincy and the Executive Drive elevations. Does  
19 that sound good to you, Mike?

20 MR. SIUREK: Yes.

21 MR. WAGNER: You're proposing the  
22 language to say what?

23 MS. CHARLTON: On the Quincy and  
24 Executive Drive elevations.

1 MR. LACAYO: Jo Ellen, can you make  
2 your conclusion on No. 5 and No. 8 so we can vote  
3 on it, the proposed conditions of approval,  
4 Section 3?

5 MR. WAGNER: I think we were talking  
6 about taking out the words "as long as the use on  
7 Lot 1 is self-storage" in No. 5.

8 MR. LACAYO: But staff had a concern.  
9 So are we okay with that?

10 MS. CHARLTON: I'm okay with that one  
11 because No. 2 talks about any changes to use  
12 requires approval of a major change.

13 MR. LACAYO: Perfect.

14 MR. WAGNER: The second one was No.  
15 8?

16 MR. LACAYO: Yes.

17 MR. WAGNER: About the last part of  
18 the sentence which says, "to be approved by the  
19 Village Administrator" should be eliminated?

20 MR. LACAYO: Since there is some  
21 concern about that, would you be opposed? I mean,  
22 it seems there's a lot of concern about color on  
23 the exposed doors, and it sounds like the  
24 process --

1 MR. SIUREK: It sounds like a simple  
2 enough process to do, and I'm not necessarily  
3 objecting to it; but, again, I don't think it's  
4 going to be an issue. I don't know who at the  
5 administration is it going to be? Roy? Is it  
6 going to be Tim Halik? Who is going to approve  
7 that? Somebody doesn't like the color that's  
8 chosen. It's a subjective issue.

9 MR. WAGNER: I have trouble with this  
10 myself. I would like to see it eliminated from  
11 the sentence personally but that's -- I would like  
12 to hear what you want to do because we need to  
13 make this decision so we can move on.

14 MR. SIUREK: In the spirit of  
15 cooperation, I will do whatever you require. The  
16 process needs to be simplistic.

17 MR. REMKUS: I just don't think the  
18 Village Administrator is going to be different  
19 people and everything, but it is a protection for  
20 the Village that --

21 MR. WAGNER: But what's --

22 MR. REMKUS: -- an obscene color  
23 doesn't --

24 MR. WAGNER: What's obscene, though?

1 To who?

2 MR. REMKUS: That's subjective. I  
3 understand that. But I mean, it at least gives  
4 the Village the opportunity without going through  
5 a long drawn-out process of going to court and  
6 spending taxpayer money on things that are  
7 unnecessary with a simple thing like here, this is  
8 the color we want to paint it. I don't ever  
9 see --

10 MR. WAGNER: Anybody else? In or  
11 out?

12 MR. RUFFOLO: If the Petitioner is  
13 willing to cooperate with this clause, and we  
14 changed some other clauses that work for him, then  
15 thank you and we'll move forward.

16 MR. WAGNER: Is there anything else  
17 in the list of 17 items? I believe 18 has been  
18 stricken altogether; is that correct?

19 MS. CHARLTON: Yes.

20 MR. GIUNTOLI: Yes.

21 MR. WAGNER: So is there any other  
22 questions or concerns about Items 1 through 17 by  
23 any of the Commissioners?

24 Let me just bring up one other

1 issue quickly. One of the trustees -- it's my  
2 understanding that one of the trustees raised a  
3 number of questions about this project and our  
4 approval from the last meeting. I felt as though  
5 at the last meeting we discussed all of the things  
6 that he had raised, and I believe we have  
7 discussed yet this evening all of the same issues  
8 that have been raised again, which came down to  
9 the style of the building, parking. There was a  
10 question about setbacks on the property. I felt  
11 as though we had addressed all of those questions  
12 either at the hearing or tonight. Are there any  
13 other questions or concerns that any of you have?

14 MR. REMKUS: No. I like the project.  
15 I think it's a great project. The only reason I  
16 voted no on the last one is because I didn't feel  
17 we were following procedure, the proper procedure.  
18 That was my reason for voting no. I like the  
19 project.

20 MR. WAGNER: I agree with you.

21 MR. SIUREK: Thank you.

22 MR. WAGNER: Well, with that, are  
23 there any questions or concerns of the audience?

24 Any questions or concerns from

1 the Petitioner?

2 MR. SIUREK: No. I'm satisfied.  
3 Thank you.

4 MR. WAGNER: I would make a motion,  
5 and I will read this to the best of my ability.  
6 Based on the submitted petition and testimony as  
7 presented, I move the Plan Commission forward its  
8 findings of special use and planning development  
9 referenced in the staff report of PC 15-06  
10 prepared on December 2, 2015, meeting. It says  
11 here that except as the Plan Commission has  
12 modified. I think we have modified a few of the  
13 statements between 1 and 17 on Section 3. On Page  
14 8 and 9, I will say that we have modified them as  
15 discussed this evening and recommend to the  
16 Village board approval of the relief associated  
17 with PC 15-06, including the preliminary and final  
18 plat of subdivision, approval of a special use for  
19 a preliminary and final planned unit development,  
20 including the exceptions outlined in Exhibit 2 on  
21 December 2, 2015, staff report and other relief as  
22 may be necessary to accommodate the proposed  
23 project, subject to the following conditions:  
24 1 is a list of the staff

1 report from Page 1 through 15 as discussed this  
2 evening.

3 2, that the approval be in  
4 substantial compliance with the list of documents  
5 approved for PC 15-06 on December 2, 2015, for  
6 Plan Commission 15-06 except modified and required  
7 by all required changes of the conditions of  
8 approval identified in Section 2 and 3  
9 respectively of the staff report of 15-06 and  
10 except as many may be required for compliance in  
11 the department of the Village engineer and the  
12 building inspector as part of the building permit  
13 review process.

14 And, No. 3, compliance at all  
15 times with the conditions and approvals identified  
16 in Section 3 on December 2, 2015, staff report for  
17 Plan Commission meeting 15-06.

18 MR. REMKUS: So moved.

19 MR. KAUCKY: Second.

20 MR. WAGNER: Joanne, would you please  
21 call roll.

22 MS. PRIBLE: Commissioner Lacayo.

23 MR. LACAYO: Yes.

24 MS. PRIBLE: Commissioner Remkus.

1 MR. REMKUS: Yes.

2 MS. PRIBLE: Commissioner Soukup.

3 MR. SOUKUP: Yes.

4 MS. PRIBLE: Vice Chairman Wagner.

5 MR. WAGNER: Yes.

6 MS. PRIBLE: Commissioner Kaucky.

7 MR. KAUCKY: Yes.

8 MS. PRIBLE: Commissioner Ruffolo.

9 MR. RUFFOLO: Yes.

10 MR. WAGNER: Thank you very much.

11 MR. SIUREK: Thank you for your time

12 tonight.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 MR. WAGNER: We think it's a great  
2 project and I think it is going to be a nice  
3 addition to the Village.

4 MR. SIUREK: Thank you.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

1                   MR. WAGNER: Chairman Kopp will then  
2 rejoin us in taking over the regular meeting of  
3 the Plan Commission.

4                   MR. KOPP: Next item on the agenda is  
5 Zoning Hearing Case 15-07. The purpose of this  
6 public hearing shall be to consider a petition for  
7 an amendment to a special use permit for a  
8 previously approved Planned Unit Development to  
9 modify previously approved regulations with regard  
10 to the operation of a digital group sign in order  
11 to reduce the amount of time each digital message  
12 must be displayed before transitioning to a  
13 different digital message, for the property  
14 commonly known as Willowbrook Square Shopping  
15 Center and located at 14-106 West 63rd Street,  
16 Willowbrook, Illinois.

17                   The applicant for this  
18 petition is David Froberg of Willowbrook Square  
19 Management Company. Notice of this public hearing  
20 was published in the November 13, 2015, edition of  
21 The Suburban Life Newspaper.

22                   Is there a representative here  
23 to represent the applicant? You will need to be  
24 sworn in. You can sit if you're more comfortable,

1 sir.

2 (Whereupon Mr. David Froberg  
3 was sworn.)

4 MR. FROBERG: David Froberg,  
5 F-r-o-b-e-r-g. And I wonder if I can get somebody  
6 to help me pass those out to the board members.

7 Mr. Chairman, board members.  
8 I am back here today asking for revision of the  
9 current 20-second minimum display time requirement  
10 for each panel that appears on our Willowbrook  
11 Square monument sign. The individual panel  
12 display time is referred to as dwell time, so we  
13 are seeking a reduction in the dwell time for each  
14 panel from 20 seconds down to 6 or 8 seconds. The  
15 change that we are asking for is occasioned by a  
16 better understanding of the use of this medium for  
17 advertising and increased knowledge of the  
18 generally accepted and applied norms for operation  
19 of this type of sign.

20 Frankly, when we came in  
21 before you last time, it was virgin territory for  
22 all of us; and I think we've gone beyond that in  
23 the last year, and so now we are trying to refine  
24 this. The original applied dwell time requirement

1 was occasioned by a concern for safety issues  
2 which we were not certain -- the board was not  
3 certain that they felt that there might be safety  
4 issues which this type of sign might engender with  
5 a reduced dwell time.

6 Our monument signs -- since  
7 our monument sign's installation and operation, a  
8 more thorough survey of the literature and current  
9 practice for the operation of signs of this type  
10 has been undertaken, and the conclusion reached  
11 was that the prevailing norms and regulations  
12 generally employed by governing bodies with  
13 authority and experience in regulating this type  
14 of sign would safely allow Willowbrook to accept a  
15 reduction in dwell time to 6 seconds.

16 I draw your attention to some  
17 studies. What I'm going to do is ask -- we can  
18 just sort of -- I had a slick PowerPoint  
19 presentation set up for this and it disappeared.  
20 It blew up so we had to quickly print it, and I  
21 think we can follow this through here pretty  
22 quickly. I don't want to take too much time doing  
23 it.

24 There was a study which is

1 under Tab 1, which was prepared for the City of  
2 Minnetonka, Minnesota which concluded that while  
3 driver distraction is a significant factor in car  
4 crashes, no causal relationship has been  
5 identified between electronic changeable signs and  
6 crashes.

7                   Number 2, there was a study,  
8 which is Tab 2, which was prepared for the  
9 California Highway Department, Caltrans, and this  
10 is considered the gold standard reference for  
11 examining the effects of outdoor advertising  
12 displays on driver safety. The Caltrans -- I  
13 provided you with a copy of the executive summary  
14 from this report. The actual report runs through  
15 60 or 70 pages, but I thought that the executive  
16 summary would be all that we could possibly plow  
17 through tonight. This report concluded in part  
18 that there was no definitive research showing an  
19 increase in car crashes due to the presence of  
20 billboards or digital billboards. Although, there  
21 is an additional increased crash risk based on the  
22 effects of billboards on driver attention and  
23 driver distraction. There is significant research  
24 on the effects of outdoor advertising on driver

1 distraction, but there is little research  
2 definitively showing that outdoor advertising  
3 affects crash rates.

4                   There was a study under Tab  
5 No. 3 -- the reason you have it in two forms, we  
6 had to get this off a microfiche, and we retyped  
7 it so you could read it. I included the old one  
8 from the microfiche for whatever reason, but we  
9 had to get it done again so you could take a look  
10 at it. Mr. Panvy [phonetic] in the summer of 2010  
11 evaluated the traffic safety impact of a billboard  
12 near Sacramento State University. The project  
13 evaluated the traffic safety impact of the  
14 installation, looked at it one year before, then  
15 the installation, and one year afterwards. The  
16 presence of the -- their conclusion was that the  
17 electronic billboard does not appear to have a  
18 significant impact on traffic incidents in this  
19 section of highway and later there were no changes  
20 in measurable impact on road safety after the  
21 installation was observed. I also included a  
22 brief survey of uses of this type of sign which  
23 are found generally in the area and specifically  
24 our neighbors in Willowbrook.

1                   The City of Chicago, if you  
2 look at Tab 4, just produced a reduction to their  
3 ordinance which changes the dwell time for dynamic  
4 image display is now reduced to no more changes  
5 than once every ten seconds. I don't know how  
6 this happens, but these things seem to be honored  
7 more in the breach than in the actual operation of  
8 these things. And let me give you an example,  
9 which I think most of you would be aware of. The  
10 signs over the highway as you leave O'Hare  
11 Airport, even if you're going to 294 going to the  
12 Loop, there's big message-changing signs there  
13 which are not traffic directional or anything  
14 else. It says "Go see Navy Pier," or, you know,  
15 what else is going on but -- or "Congratulations  
16 Cubs." But it has nothing to do with traffic  
17 direction or anything else. These things operate  
18 at a 3-second level, even though the ordinance  
19 that they passed says it should be 10. And I  
20 think as we look at this, you'll see a recurring  
21 pattern of this, but apparently the villages or  
22 the village -- the City of Chicago and the  
23 villages around here operate in some ways in the  
24 breach of the agreement rather than in the letter

1 of it.

2                   Tab No. 5 is the Hinsdale sign  
3 ordinance. Now, Hinsdale has never yet approved a  
4 commercial sign of the type that we have at  
5 Willowbrook. They just haven't done it. But in  
6 their ordinance, they say that public service  
7 signs when authorized by a special use permit, can  
8 be put up; and it says the key thing is on the  
9 second page, it says the display message may be  
10 changed by intermittent light changes but such  
11 changes shall not exceed 12 per minute, so it's  
12 5-second changes if it's a public service sign.  
13 And the one I'm most aware of, because I drive by  
14 it all the time, is the one over next to the high  
15 school. And this one changes on a 3- or 4-second  
16 dwell time. And I think it's important because  
17 this sign probably comes closest to approximating  
18 the Willowbrook Square sign. It's right next to a  
19 stoplight. It has about the same traffic counts.  
20 It has very high pedestrian movements, and they  
21 operate very well with a 3- or 4-second dwell time  
22 on their sign.

23                   Moving on quickly. No. 6 is  
24 the City of Countryside. Their sign ordinance

1 which was fairly recently passed, they deal with  
2 electronic variable message signs, EVMs. It says  
3 the message shall change at intervals no more  
4 frequently than one time every 10 seconds. And I  
5 guess what I would point out to you is that the  
6 electronic billboards over on Plainfield Road  
7 where you have the LaGrange Highlands Middle  
8 School and the fire department, which are right  
9 next door to each other there on the north side of  
10 the street, just east of Wolf, their cycle times  
11 are 3 seconds. I mean, it doesn't follow what  
12 their ordinance says, but that's what it is. And  
13 the one for the fire department typically runs a  
14 series of 1- or 2-second panels that say "Don't  
15 text while you're driving" or doing something  
16 else. But the fact is if they did exactly what  
17 the ordinance said, it would be 10, but they  
18 operate on a lot less.

19 No. 7 is the City of Westmont  
20 sign ordinance, and I'm sure you're familiar with  
21 their signs that operate on Ogden Avenue for the  
22 supermarket over there. You look at Page 2 of the  
23 Westmont ordinance, Westmont ordinance says  
24 messages cannot change more than once every 5

1 seconds. So I'm only bringing that up because not  
2 that Westmont is any paragon, but they operate on  
3 a 5-second dwell time, and there are not a lot of  
4 accidents over there. It has just not proved to  
5 be a problem in the last two years the sign has  
6 been operational.

7 Tab 8 is a survey provided by  
8 Outdoor Advertising Association of America, which  
9 lists the changeable message dwell time ordinances  
10 or regulations by states. And if you look at  
11 Appendix A, you see that one of the states that  
12 have changeable message approvals, one of them is  
13 Illinois. You look at the next page, you see that  
14 the State of Illinois provides dwell time in their  
15 ordinances of 6 seconds. And then on the  
16 next page is just the same thing. If there's a  
17 changeable message thing, again, it just says  
18 there's a 6-second dwell time and a 3-second twirl  
19 time, which is kind of a misnomer, but what it has  
20 to do with those signs, older signs where they  
21 have things that are like triangularly shaped and  
22 they revolve to get a different sign face there.  
23 Well, if it's electronic and digital, they have a  
24 6-second dwell time. That's the State of

1 Illinois.

2                   Lastly, we surveyed the  
3 Federal Highway Administration guidelines for how  
4 do you determine what a safe and appropriate dwell  
5 time would be. And they have a formula for it.  
6 It's, you know, it's not all that complex. And it  
7 sets out that the sight distance in feet per  
8 second and the speed limit of feet per second  
9 equals -- the sight distance divided by the speed  
10 limit at feet per second equals the dwell time.  
11 For our Willowbrook sign, if you accept a 250-foot  
12 sight distance, I mean, we don't see that sign a  
13 mile away. You don't see it until you're well  
14 beyond the bank building if you're going west, and  
15 we judged it -- went out there and took a tape and  
16 said the most you can probably expect is to see it  
17 250 feet away. If that is the case, and you  
18 follow their formula for determining what the  
19 dwell time should be, it comes out to 4.26  
20 seconds. If you were to argue that maybe coming  
21 west to east you could see 350 feet you might see  
22 the sign, the dwell time would work out to 5.9  
23 seconds. So I guess what I'm trying to do, you  
24 know, in going through all of this, I'm trying to

1 do it quickly, but there are a lot of signs around  
2 us. They all operate on a much reduced dwell  
3 time, and all we are trying to do is capitalize on  
4 their experience and make the most out of this  
5 medium that we have there that we installed and we  
6 have -- the tenants and people in the  
7 neighborhood -- nobody has, you know, said  
8 anything but good things about it. And I'm hoping  
9 that we can make it operate just a little bit  
10 better with this tweak to the time. That's the  
11 end of my presentation. If you have questions, I  
12 will do my very best to answer them.

13 MR. KAUCKY: Mr. Froberg, are your  
14 tenants in favor of this happening where they  
15 get -- in other words they get more --

16 MR. FROBERG: Absolutely. We could  
17 have had 20 of them here tonight, but I didn't  
18 think it was probably purposeful. They -- it is  
19 their greatest concern that we would have an  
20 increased dwell time because they see some benefit  
21 from it the way it operates now on 20-second dwell  
22 times, but they feel like we're just missing a  
23 real bet with those 16,000 commuters that go by  
24 every day.

1 MR. KAUCKY: I see.

2 MR. LACAYO: What's the investment on  
3 a monument like that, on a sign like that?

4 MR. FROBERG: It was close to  
5 \$100,000. It's like building a house.

6 MR. LACAYO: Wow.

7 MR. KOPP: Jo Ellen, do you have  
8 anything?

9 MS. CHARLTON: Briefly, the Plan  
10 Commission approved this back in 2014. And as  
11 Mr. Froberg stated, there was -- it was pretty  
12 much virgin territory, so we really didn't have a  
13 lot of documents to go on except that there did  
14 seem to be this concern that changing the messages  
15 too fast could be a cause for a distraction and,  
16 therefore, crashes or collisions with pedestrians  
17 in the neighborhood. So I guess I wasn't too  
18 surprised very long afterwards to find out that  
19 people were concerned it was too long. They  
20 wanted to display the messages quicker and take  
21 advantage of the many people that were going by,  
22 and so he was advised at that point that an  
23 amendment would be required because we made a very  
24 specific time change. The intent, keep in mind,

1 was that we don't allow this anywhere in town  
2 currently, and he came through as an amendment to  
3 his PUD to get access to this approval. And I  
4 think the intent from the Village is to see how  
5 this works and then, you know, perhaps if it seems  
6 to be acceptable and it's not causing problems,  
7 that we might open it up as an opportunity for  
8 other commercial businesses. So when he came  
9 forward, I indicated we'd need to see -- it was  
10 his burden to kind of prove that it wasn't going  
11 to be a problem or a safety concern. And,  
12 unfortunately, he wasn't able to pull all this  
13 together and bring it before the meeting so we  
14 could evaluate it. I don't even have one of the  
15 handouts at this point. Joanne, did you get one?

16 MS. PRIBLE: Yes.

17 MR. FROBERG: That's yours.

18 MS. CHARLTON: So my recommendation  
19 would be that we continue the hearing so that we  
20 have an ability to evaluate what he described. I  
21 think it's important to see what instances are  
22 included in the references that he provided. Are  
23 they all public service types of signs? I know  
24 many codes for a long time have allowed those to

1 the exclusion of digital signs for commercial  
2 businesses. And if that's the case, there's a lot  
3 fewer of those. If you open it up for commercial  
4 businesses and you have 20 of them lining a  
5 street, that's different than the occasional  
6 dotted public notice sign. So I think there's a  
7 lot of reasons we should spend at least a little  
8 bit of time evaluating what he submitted and come  
9 back. If there's no comments from the public on  
10 this, I would suggest you go ahead and close the  
11 public hearing and then we could just continue  
12 your deliberations and discussions as to a further  
13 time after we've had a chance to evaluate the  
14 information that's been submitted and feel  
15 comfortable that that change is something that's  
16 now grounded in some research and some data and  
17 that we're not going to be opening ourselves up to  
18 safety risk for the community.

19 MR. KOPP: Okay. Any of the  
20 Commissioners have any questions for the applicant  
21 or Jo Ellen?

22 Does anybody in the audience  
23 like to speak to this? If you would stand up and  
24 be sworn in please.

1 (Whereupon Ms. Nancy Brown  
2 was sworn.)

3 MS. BROWN: It's Nancy Brown,  
4 B-r-o-w-n. I have a question. Where does he  
5 propose the sign to be? Is it going to be on the  
6 south side of the current 83 and Plainfield.

7 MR. KOPP: It's already in place.

8 MR. FROBERG: It's already in place.  
9 It's just west of Route 83 on the north side of  
10 63rd just past the bank. It's been there for  
11 about a year.

12 MS. CHARLTON: Right across from  
13 Hinsdale Lake Commons, the entrance to Hinsdale  
14 Lake Commons. The shopping center where Bernard's  
15 Cafe is located and right in the entrance to that  
16 shopping center is this digital sign that we're  
17 talking about.

18 MS. BROWN: Oh, there by Bernard's.

19 MR. FROBERG: Yes.

20 MS. BROWN: Oh, over there. Okay. I  
21 thought it was on 83 and Plainfield.

22 MR. FROBERG: No, it's not.

23 MS. BROWN: Okay. Because it was  
24 never stated where it was.

1 MR. FROBERG: I'm sorry.

2 MS. BROWN: Okay. I notice there is  
3 a sign there.

4 MR. FROBERG: Good.

5 MS. BROWN: There is. Right by the  
6 stop sign.

7 MR. FROBERG: Yes.

8 MS. BROWN: Uh-huh. Okay. Thank  
9 you. That was my question. And I got my answer.

10 MR. FROBERG: Anyone else?

11 MR. KOPP: All right. With that  
12 being the case, I will close the public part of  
13 this hearing.

14 (Discussion had off the  
15 record.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1                   MR. KOPP: The next item on the  
2 agenda is Zoning Hearing Case 15-08. The purpose  
3 of this public hearing shall be to consider a  
4 petition for approval of a special use authorizing  
5 a Planned Unit Development, approval of a  
6 preliminary and final plat of subdivision, all  
7 including any exceptions and variations necessary  
8 to modify an existing commercial structure  
9 (previously occupied by K-Mart) and construct an  
10 additional commercial structure, all to be  
11 occupied by a mix of commercial, service, and  
12 restaurant uses, for the property located on the  
13 northeast corner of Plainfield Road and Route 83  
14 and legally described as follows. And, excuse me.  
15 With an address of 820 Plainfield Road,  
16 Willowbrook, Illinois.

17                   The applicant for this  
18 petition is Eugene Grzynkowicz, for the property  
19 owner Rt. 83 and Plainfield LLC.

20                   Notice of this public hearing  
21 was published in the November 13, 2013, edition of  
22 The Suburban Life Newspaper.

23                   MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Good evening. You  
24 have the package but I have a PowerPoint that we

1 were able to blow it up and show you to answer any  
2 questions you may have. There are some larger  
3 color illustrations here, but it is pretty much  
4 what you have in your package.

5 Also with me is Michael  
6 Werthmann from KLOA, our traffic consultants, and  
7 Jim D'Alexander from Manhard Engineering  
8 pertaining to all the exterior roadwork.

9 (Whereupon Mr. Michael  
10 Werthmann, Mr. Jim  
11 D'Alexander, and Mr. Eugene  
12 Grzynekowicz were sworn.)

13 MR. WERTHMANN: Michael Werthmann,  
14 W-e-r-t-h-m-a-n-n, KLOA.

15 MR. D'ALEXANDER: Jim D'Alexander,  
16 D-'-A-l-e-x-a-n-d-e-r, with Manhard,  
17 M-a-n-h-a-r-d, Consulting.

18 MR. KOPP: I'm pretty sure she knows  
19 what you're going to say.

20 MR. GRZYKOWICZ: We talk often so...

21 MR. KOPP: You can get started.

22 MR. GRZYKOWICZ: Okay. So  
23 basically, we want to give you some insight on the  
24 existing site information. The property is

1 10.6669 acres. Existing building square foot as  
2 it sits today is 117,076. Existing height of the  
3 building is 28.5. Existing parking lot square  
4 footage is 464,651, and existing parking stalls to  
5 date 704, with 14 handicapped stalls.

6 Next. You can blow that up if  
7 you'd like. This is the existing survey so you  
8 can just get an idea of how the building is  
9 sitting currently. Here. And then they have  
10 their auto and garden center that they added on  
11 over here. Basically all parking lot, all  
12 asphalt, no green space. Just existing conditions  
13 as we see it today. Looking north. This is the  
14 back of the building currently with an existing  
15 loading dock here. There was a compactor here at  
16 one time. Again, just to get you guys familiar  
17 with the existing conditions.

18 This here is basically to talk  
19 about this upcoming retaining wall. Currently,  
20 the retaining wall is wood here, concrete which is  
21 distressed here, some newer concrete that was put  
22 in position that is in pretty good shape with a  
23 staircase, and then it goes to a block retaining  
24 wall. This is the north side of the property.

1 Existing guardrail and fence conditions, tree  
2 lines. This is basically to show you that there's  
3 some gaps here between where there's not a lot of  
4 foliage that's really covering the building.

5 So our proposed site plan is  
6 still, again, same acreage. The anchor building  
7 is going to be 123,240 square feet. That's  
8 modifying the existing building. The height of  
9 that building at its tallest point that we're  
10 proposing is 32.4. The out lot building is  
11 15,549. That building is going to be 24 feet 10  
12 in height. And on total square footage is about  
13 or exactly 138,789 square feet. Total parking  
14 stalls 548, with 21 handicapped stalls.

15 This is the current proposed  
16 site plan. And what we have here is we have the  
17 Pete's Market. We have Stein Mart, and we have  
18 Ulta Beauty over here. Our out lot is here  
19 consisting of six tenants here. This is our  
20 proposed existing entrance that we currently have  
21 here on Plainfield. We're going to be increasing  
22 this length in here to eliminate the slope  
23 currently that's sloping at about 7 percent.  
24 We're going to have that at about 2.5 to 2.8.

1 We're also proposing the existing entrance on 83  
2 is here. We're moving that 60 feet to the south,  
3 and that is for multiple reasons. One, we want to  
4 control the flow coming into the center. Here  
5 you'll turn left. It will turn right. It also  
6 stops the flow of movement where people are trying  
7 to cut through. That was a constant problem  
8 before, and we have this in other centers. This  
9 is the best way to control that. We're also doing  
10 a proposed entrance here on the northwest corner.  
11 Our truck routing will come through here, come  
12 around and exit on Plainfield. You will also have  
13 a right in, right in, right out, and also a left  
14 turn coming into the center.

15                   Landscape wise, what we're  
16 proposing here Plainfield, Route 83 right-of-way,  
17 all of the trees will be removed and new trees  
18 will be put in. Along the backside of the north  
19 property line, we propose to clean up all the  
20 heavy growth trees and dead trees and give it some  
21 uniformity and also to give it more density so  
22 that the home owners don't have so much sight of  
23 the building.

24                   Inside the parking space, all

1 of our islands are landscaped with trees, shrubs,  
2 and flowers. Currently, we're proposing over 1  
3 acre of additional or new green space that the  
4 property did not have before.

5                   Elevations looking east.  
6 South. Getting more a whole capture of the  
7 center. This, again, would be our tallest point  
8 of the anchor building. Pete's Market which takes  
9 from here to here. Stein Mart and Ulta. And this  
10 is just the back of the building. This is the out  
11 lot retail. Excuse me. So we're looking  
12 northeast here. South here again. West.  
13 Northwest. East. This is the view looking south.  
14 This is what you would see of the out lot  
15 building.

16                   This is just a story board  
17 what you have in your possession, talk about the  
18 materials, our selection of materials in case you  
19 have any specific questions.

20                   This is our proposed fountain.  
21 It's conceptual to some degree. Right now  
22 currently we're showing some water wall features  
23 which we're not going to be doing. Currently,  
24 what we propose and which is on our landscape plan

1 is more of a well. So there will be concrete well  
2 from here to here. It's about 2 feet from grade  
3 up. Water will be shooting upward. This is a  
4 portal walk path with sidewalk which connects the  
5 anchor building or Building A to Building B, the  
6 out lot building. These are portals, light  
7 portals and more of a decorative feature but also  
8 creating a nice illumination if you walk back if  
9 you wanted to go from building to building.  
10 That's another view of the fountain.

11 Proposed civil plans interior.  
12 Basically, catch basin structures, water main,  
13 things like that. Utility.

14 Now we get into our roadwork.  
15 This is something that we've been working now with  
16 IDOT for quite some time. We're through that  
17 hurdle now and we're in our final phases of  
18 drafting a design. This talks about our  
19 truck vehicle movements. This is that northwest  
20 entrance that we're talking about. That right  
21 through here, this is owned by the Sequoia Group  
22 or this office park. This detention area, we  
23 presented this to IDOT. We have approval to  
24 proceed with this. Basically, what we're doing in

1 here, we're not taking out any capacity within  
2 their detention. We're creating -- there's a  
3 retaining wall there now that we have to  
4 restructure to this contour. But our drive  
5 entrance in here. There's an AT&T box here.  
6 We're not modifying that at all. And then we're  
7 going to be doing -- next page. We have a  
8 proposed construction easement and we also have a  
9 proposed more permanent would be dedicated  
10 easement for the piece of property that these  
11 people currently own, that Sequoia currently owns.  
12 The other balance of this property here is in the  
13 right-of-way. This is just an overlay to give you  
14 an idea what that's going to look like, what it  
15 currently is and what it will be. A complete  
16 aerial view of the site. Pylon signage. This is  
17 more about our building signage and identification  
18 which you should have in your packages.  
19 Photometrics also you have. Did you display them  
20 in the package?

21 MS. CHARLTON: I don't think I have  
22 photometrics.

23 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Basically,  
24 photometrics for the entire site, the back of the

1 building as well on the north. The LED lights we  
2 use for our wall backs and our pole lighting. And  
3 that's it.

4 MR. KOPP: The signage you're  
5 proposing, is that per code? Is that going to --

6 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Yes. Yes. We've  
7 been back and forth with Jo Ellen many times.

8 MR. KOPP: Okay.

9 MS. CHARLTON: It includes digital,  
10 though, as part of the PUD so that is not  
11 currently per code but it's part of the PUD.

12 MR. KOPP: Right. Is that -- which  
13 one is the digital? Is it on the pylon underneath  
14 the Pete's?

15 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: I'm sorry, say  
16 again.

17 MR. KOPP: Which part is the digital  
18 sign?

19 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Can we go back to  
20 the pylon? This section here will be the watch  
21 fire sign which is our digital sign. This will be  
22 the Pete's Fresh Market. The watch fire sign is  
23 here and then our tenants' are here.

24 MR. KOPP: Do the Commissioners have

1 any questions for the applicant? Or we can have  
2 Jo Ellen can give her presentation and then we  
3 can.

4 MS. CHARLTON: I have a very brief  
5 presentation because, as Eugene indicated, they've  
6 been spending a lot of time on this project  
7 working with both the State and DuPage County on  
8 their roadway improvements. There is so much  
9 focus that's been on that in terms of the actual  
10 physical improvements to the roadway due to the  
11 traffic that's generated, as well as some of the  
12 access points. That northwest access point that  
13 you indicated along Route 83 has some inherent  
14 issues with it that need to be still coordinated  
15 with that property owner to the north, and they're  
16 working on some of those things.

17 Long story short, there are,  
18 again, still some things that they need to  
19 finalize before we can move forward and get a  
20 recommendation from you, but we felt it was  
21 necessary at this point to present this to the  
22 community, find out, let you guys see where we're  
23 at at this point, and more importantly start to  
24 get some feedback from the residents. I know I've

1 met some of you probably a long time ago now just  
2 to get an initial reaction as to what some of  
3 those concerns might be. We have some people in  
4 the audience that live to the north, and we met  
5 with them a long time ago to see what their  
6 concerns would be, and the plans that Eugene and  
7 his group have put together address a lot of those  
8 issues that we discussed at that point, which  
9 include some of the landscaping that's proposed.  
10 I will tell you, I think, you know, staff and the  
11 applicant are both of the opinion that that area  
12 is something that impacts them. So if they have  
13 opinions on whether it should be completely  
14 removed and relandscaped or whether we want to go  
15 with some culmination of materials that are there  
16 and filling in, you know, that's kind of okay.  
17 We're hoping to hear that from the community.

18                   Some of the other things they  
19 did along the north elevation that's above and  
20 beyond as a way to mitigate impact on those  
21 northern neighbors is to enclose some of their  
22 truck docks, so they actually not only have a wall  
23 but they have roofs over some of the truck docks  
24 that you would otherwise see over the fence to

1 those areas. Otherwise, a taller wall and the  
2 landscaping, especially further east on the  
3 project because of the changes in elevations, you  
4 can actually achieve some really good screening  
5 with the wall and the landscaping and another  
6 screening wall by the loading dock areas. So,  
7 again, we're interested in that.

8 He's also worked very hard  
9 with some of the adjoining property owners. That  
10 northwest access at 69th Street will have some  
11 obvious impacts on movement through that  
12 intersection for businesses that are on the west  
13 side of Route 83, and there was some initial  
14 discussions with them. I don't know if we have  
15 anybody here in the audience that might want to  
16 talk to some of those. They've also worked very  
17 closely with the owners and businesses to the east  
18 where the Chase Bank property is because the  
19 improvements from DuPage County that are required  
20 to add turn lanes and increased widths and with  
21 the signalization that's happening there creates  
22 some really odd movements if they leave everything  
23 the same as it exists today. So I think they're  
24 looking at some alternatives and working with

1 those owners to come up with something that would  
2 be acceptable, you know, short term, long term and  
3 those are some issues that still need to be worked  
4 out. The benefits, obviously, of this project are  
5 after all this hard work that we will be seeing  
6 the long awaited signal at the access on  
7 Plainfield Road which will be important not only  
8 for this shopping center, but for the shopping  
9 center to the south and, hopefully, maybe the  
10 traffic engineer can better explain how traffic  
11 will flow through Plainfield Road for some of the  
12 current situations that I know many people have  
13 concerns about.

14                   So rather than get into the  
15 typical staff analysis at this point, we were  
16 really hoping to open it up to the public, get  
17 some feedback, finish the public hearing if we get  
18 everybody's comments but then wrap drawings up and  
19 then present to you at a later time the more  
20 typical staff response and findings and conditions  
21 of approval at that time.

22                   MR. KOPP: That's fine. I think  
23 since traffic has -- seems like it's what we  
24 talked about 80 percent of the time on this

1 project to date, maybe if the traffic engineer  
2 could sort of address the issues. And, John,  
3 you're more attuned to this than anyone, if you  
4 can make sure he addresses the issues that need to  
5 be addressed.

6 MR. WERTHMANN: How are you doing?  
7 I'm Michael Werthmann with KLOA. Can you go to  
8 the site plan? That's probably good. So we all  
9 know where the shopping center is, the east corner  
10 of Plainfield and 83.

11 Access to the center will be  
12 provided via three access drives. A main access  
13 drive on Plainfield Road opposite the Willow Town  
14 Center. There's an existing drive here that we  
15 will utilize and improve as Eugene indicated.  
16 This access drive will be signalized. We will be  
17 providing a separate left-turn lane and a separate  
18 right-turn lane into that access drive. We also  
19 have a right-in, right-out access drive. It's  
20 basically on 83, just relocating the existing 83  
21 access drive a little further south, right in,  
22 right out. And then utilizing the existing median  
23 at 69th Street, we're proposing a three-quarter  
24 access here where you can allow the lefts in, the

1 rights in, and only rights out. Left out will be  
2 prohibited. If you want to go back left on 83,  
3 you'll have to come out and come around.

4 We've been working probably  
5 for a year and a half, two years with the Village,  
6 DuPage County, and IDOT on the appropriate  
7 improvements out here to enhance existing  
8 operations, to improve safety, as well as to  
9 mitigate some of the impact that the development  
10 will have, and I'll go through those improvements.  
11 One thing is there is an existing access drive  
12 right here on Plainfield that will be closed, so  
13 we are eliminating one drive. But the  
14 improvements that will be provided along as part  
15 of this development, Plainfield Road will be  
16 widened through this intersection in order to  
17 provide dual left-turn lanes along Plainfield  
18 Road, so you'll have dual left turns from  
19 Plainfield to north on Illinois 83 and westbound  
20 to southbound on Illinois 83. That's a  
21 significant improvement as you have upwards of 200  
22 to 300 left turns now. So it's a capacity  
23 improvement that's really needed out there. It's  
24 also a safety improvement right now. You can make

1 the left on the green arrow as well as on the  
2 green ball are permissive. With the dual left and  
3 the additional capacity, you will only be able to  
4 make that left on the arrow.

5 As part of this improvement,  
6 we will also maintain the existing westbound to  
7 northbound right-turn lane on Plainfield Road. So  
8 as you're going westbound, you'll have the dual  
9 left, two throughs, and the separate right. And  
10 as you're going eastbound, you'll have dual lefts,  
11 a separate through lane, and then the shared  
12 through/right-turn lane. We are proposing a  
13 signal at this location which will be utilized by  
14 both the Town Center and the shopping center. As  
15 Jo Ellen said, the Town Center has been trying to  
16 get a signal at this location for a number of  
17 years.

18 In addition, along 83, we're  
19 proposing to provide a third through lane through  
20 the intersection all the way north along the site  
21 frontage, and that will taper back down to two  
22 lanes just north of the site. It will basically  
23 serve as a separate right-turn lane into the site  
24 providing additional capacity through capacity

1 from the center section. In the morning, you have  
2 around 1800 through movements. So that additional  
3 through lane really helps with the flow of  
4 traffic. To accommodate the left turn in here,  
5 the median will be widened, so we can provide a  
6 separate left-turn lane into the site. Those are  
7 the main improvements. This whole signal will be  
8 improved given the widening and so forth. One of  
9 the big concerns IDOT had is the pedestrian  
10 crossings through here. We worked with them. We  
11 set them back so that as you cross, if you get  
12 caught in the middle, the crosswalk will be within  
13 the median so you have a refuge area to stand if  
14 need be as you're crossing through here. So we  
15 worked really closely with DuPage County and IDOT  
16 on the improvements in this area. And then truck  
17 access, as Eugene said, will come in through the  
18 back. It will be one-way access. So you will  
19 come in, come around, come back out and exit  
20 through the signal.

21 That's the summary. I don't  
22 know if you have any specific questions.

23 MR. KAUCKY: I do have a question.  
24 Going north on 83, you didn't talk about left-hand

1 turns into the west side businesses.

2 MR. WERTHMANN: Over here? There is  
3 already a left-turn lane, but we will match that  
4 left-turn lane so there will be a left-turn lane  
5 into the businesses as well northbound and  
6 southbound.

7 MR. KAUCKY: Okay. All right.

8 MR. RUFFOLO: In some previous  
9 conversations with staff, they mentioned that  
10 there might be some changes to the traffic control  
11 west of the intersection, Plainfield Road  
12 southwest of your site. Specifically, Jo Ellen, I  
13 believe we talked about some changes to the side  
14 streets that were connecting.

15 MS. CHARLTON: Talk about the median.

16 MR. WERTHMANN: Yeah. One of IDOT's  
17 requirements in DuPage County when you put dual  
18 lefts in, they want a barrier median. So there  
19 will be a barrier median along here which will  
20 extend past, I believe, it's Crest Street, which  
21 is the first street -- north/south street just  
22 west of Plainfield Road. That will become a right  
23 in, right out and will no longer allow left turns  
24 in or left turns out. There is other ways through

1 the neighborhood for those people that need to  
2 make a left out or left in. If they're coming in,  
3 they can make a right and come down, I forget -- I  
4 think it's Janet Street to the south.

5 MR. RUFFOLO: Just to follow up with  
6 respect to left turns and the numerous accidents  
7 that occur going into the Wendy's parking, is  
8 there any discussion about no left turns when  
9 you're westbound or is that the barrier you're  
10 already talking about?

11 MR. WERTHMANN: That barrier will be  
12 there, so you will not be able to make a left into  
13 the Wendy's. Anybody who wants to go into the  
14 Wendy's will continue south into this access  
15 drive. Or if you're coming down Plainfield you  
16 can make the left to get in.

17 MR. RUFFOLO: That's a good  
18 enhancement.

19 MR. WAGNER: I think this is where we  
20 should all stand up and applaud. That movement is  
21 just tremendously terrible.

22 MR. WERTHMANN: As the traffic  
23 engineer, I'm not applauded very often. Thank  
24 you. It will be a first, actually.

1 MR. WAGNER: My question is you  
2 explained a lot as it relates to the site, but I  
3 think we need to talk about going further east.  
4 How are you going to deal with Chase Bank and its  
5 facilities there? And how are you going to deal  
6 with I think it's TCF Bank across the street from  
7 Chase? This whole street or Plainfield Road in  
8 the afternoon is in total gridlock. I would hope  
9 that there would be some resolution not only to  
10 this site, but moving further east all the way to  
11 Adams, which is going to end up being, I think, a  
12 large problem.

13 MR. WERTHMANN: You know, a lot of  
14 this is existing conditions. The site plan. And  
15 we've been working closely with the County on all  
16 of these issues. We can use the aerial. I think  
17 the site plan shows it well. So here's the Chase  
18 Bank access drive. This is a full inbound and  
19 outbound. This is really an outbound from the  
20 drive-thru. We will be adding a signal here, so  
21 there will be some queuing past here. One  
22 solution is, you know, I mean, most people if they  
23 see a vehicle there will give you the courtesy gap  
24 and let you out. We can look at -- it's the 90/10

1 people rule. 90 percent of the people do it. 10  
2 percent don't.

3 MR. REMKUS: Not on Plainfield. It's  
4 the other way around.

5 A MALE: Amen.

6 MR. WERTHMANN: By the way, it backs  
7 up back there now. But one solution is to put  
8 signs up, "Please do not block intersections."  
9 The other thing that this signal will do to the  
10 benefit of Chase is it will stop traffic and  
11 provide more gaps for the vehicles that want to  
12 come out and make the left turn. Right now  
13 without the signal, you have the traffic coming  
14 here and it's hard to get a gap through here.

15 There is only so much we can  
16 do. I think we've been looking at providing some  
17 sort of cross access, but there's a lot of issues  
18 that come with providing that cross access. You  
19 know, we can work with the County to see if  
20 there's anything more we can do; but, you know,  
21 we're trying to redevelop this site, and we've  
22 gone a long way to improve where we can, providing  
23 capacity and safety improvements. We'd love to  
24 improve this, but we can only do so much. But

1 we're willing to work with the Village and work  
2 with the County to see what we can do.

3 MR. WAGNER: Is there going to be a  
4 left-turn lane to allow traffic moving east to  
5 turn into Chase Bank?

6 MR. WERTHMANN: There isn't one now.

7 MR. WAGNER: That's correct.

8 MR. WERTHMANN: And given the volume  
9 coming into the Town Center, we can talk to the  
10 County, but if you put a left into here, your left  
11 into the Town Center becomes very small.

12 MR. WAGNER: Well, the reason I ask  
13 is today, people -- there is a left-turn lane in  
14 the opposite direction in the oncoming side, and  
15 people drive into that. The same goes a little  
16 further east for TCF. There is a left-turn lane  
17 going east to turn into Adams Street, and I've  
18 personally had virtually two or three head-ons  
19 where people come down that -- my left-turn lane  
20 going east to turn into TCF. So, I guess, my  
21 concern is it doesn't work today. I mean, it's  
22 getting to the point where I'm surprised we don't  
23 have more head-on collisions. I think either the  
24 left-turn lane going eastbound to turn north onto

1 Adams should be shortened so that it would allow  
2 another space for people going west to turn into  
3 TCF because they're using the oncoming left-turn  
4 lane now.

5 MR. WERTHMANN: Once again, it's a  
6 great suggestion. We haven't done counts here.  
7 We haven't looked at this. This is sort of out of  
8 our scope of work. I don't know what we can do  
9 with it. It's a great suggestion. As we go  
10 through the approval process, we can talk to the  
11 County about that. But it is sort of out of our  
12 scope of work. If it's something that we need --

13 MR. WAGNER: I'm not asking for you  
14 to do it. I'm just saying if we're going to go to  
15 this extent to do all these improvements on  
16 Plainfield Road and Route 83 and even on the west  
17 side of Route 83 on Plainfield Road, it would seem  
18 to me that we should be looking a bit east and  
19 solve all of them at the same time as opposed to  
20 having to deal with a lot of accidents and doing  
21 this down the road. Now, I clearly think that  
22 Chase or TCF would need to contribute to this,  
23 certainly, because it will be ultimately to their  
24 benefit. But I think as part of this larger

1 project, and we wanted to see this signalization  
2 at Plainfield Road with the Harlem Irving  
3 development, and for whatever reasons it didn't  
4 happen. So I guess my only other question is: Is  
5 there a relationship with this new light for the  
6 entrances here to the right at Route 83? Are they  
7 going to be timed together?

8 MR. WERTHMANN: Yes. Yes.

9 MR. WAGNER: So that we might improve  
10 the backup that goes all the way to Madison Street  
11 now.

12 MR. WERTHMANN: Yeah. These lights  
13 will be timed so that, you know, when this one is  
14 red, it's not going to back up through here or  
15 most of the time it won't back up through there.  
16 The County is very confident and we've run  
17 analysis to show them they can time this so that,  
18 you know, when this one turns red, this one is  
19 going to stop. There's going to be enough, you  
20 know -- the queue will stop at a certain point so  
21 you can still get out. There is a certain volume  
22 of traffic on Plainfield that even if you have  
23 this, there's no signal here, it's going to back  
24 up a certain distance, particularly in that

1 evening peak hour when you have all the traffic  
2 coming back. You're still going to have a queue,  
3 but what we're trying to do is time these two so  
4 we can still get the traffic in and out of the  
5 center efficiently and make sure everything flows  
6 on Plainfield and within and out of the shopping  
7 center. And we've been working closely with the  
8 County.

9 MR. KOPP: All right. You all have  
10 been very patient. Do you have any questions or  
11 people in audience have any questions for the  
12 applicant? It does not have to be about traffic.  
13 It can be about anything.

14 Yes, sir. But you're going to  
15 all need to be sworn in if you speak as well.

16 (Whereupon Mr. Jim Brown was  
17 sworn.)

18 MR. BROWN: Jim Brown. I live at 812  
19 69th Street, directly behind the proposed project,  
20 and I am directly impacted by this. I know this  
21 is the beginning of the project, and they have a  
22 lot of work that they put into it already. And  
23 before it goes to any approval, my concern is the  
24 landscaping and what happens behind the building.

1 The facade on the front is beautiful.

2 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Sure. We can talk  
3 about the back.

4 MR. BROWN: Are these conceptual?

5 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: These are actual  
6 what we're going to build.

7 MR. BROWN: If I may, in your packet,  
8 I believe you have a series of these pictures.  
9 This is the north elevation is not shown  
10 correctly. This shows a level grade and there's a  
11 three-foot drop in elevation right in front of my  
12 house. This looks pretty. It's nice and straight  
13 where actually the road drops three feet.

14 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Can you show me on  
15 the photo? Are you talking in the back on the  
16 north?

17 MR. BROWN: The back. Right next to  
18 the cul-de-sac. You can go to your aerial view.

19 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Go to the aerial  
20 please.

21 MR. BROWN: And I know that Jo Ellen  
22 and Eugene here and my wife and I met briefly  
23 about a year ago, I believe it was, to discuss  
24 some of these things. And now we're to the next

1 step. This will work. This will work. This is  
2 my house right there. And this is right where  
3 their shipping dock is going to be where all this  
4 traffic is coming in. They're going to bring it  
5 in here, and I'm going to take the biggest hit out  
6 of everybody in the neighborhood with what happens  
7 here. I've got 30 years of documentation of  
8 problems with the previous owner. And, you know,  
9 I saved these for future reference going all the  
10 way back to 1986. So I would hope that the next  
11 30 years I wouldn't have to do this. The K-Mart  
12 company was grandfathered in, so the fence still  
13 looks like this. They couldn't do anything about  
14 it. So I know we got a long way to go before we  
15 get this approved, and I would welcome any members  
16 of the board that would like to have an onsite  
17 meeting looking at this problem because it's not  
18 just all about the front of the building and how  
19 nice the facade is. All the --

20 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Oh, no. Mr. Brown,  
21 let me interject.

22 MR. BROWN: Excuse me. I didn't  
23 interrupt you.

24 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Go ahead.

1 MR. BROWN: I'm almost done, but this  
2 is my turn.

3 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Go ahead.

4 MR. BROWN: So just before the board  
5 goes to approve anything that they put some  
6 consideration to the back of the building. I  
7 think it's a good project, but I don't want to be  
8 left out and lose and the next 30 years, I got to  
9 start another folder of complaints. Thank you for  
10 your time and I appreciate it.

11 MR. KOPP: Can you show the landscape  
12 plan again.

13 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: I want to go to  
14 that, but I think -- I don't want to say that  
15 we're misrepresenting the elevations. The  
16 elevations were not showing -- basically to show  
17 the building elevations, it's very hard -- I can  
18 do a section view, if you like, to give you a cut  
19 through the building showing this invert here  
20 because this is where it increases and comes up to  
21 69th Street.

22 Mr. Brown, what we are  
23 proposing is you're going to have a new fence,  
24 8-foot wood fence all the way down. The trees

1 that are in here that are compromising the fence  
2 currently, and that's part of the reason why the  
3 fence is leaning, we're going to be correcting  
4 that by getting rid of those trees that are  
5 intertwined with that fence. We're also going to  
6 be spacing those trees evenly, which means our new  
7 trees, our big trees, are going to be spaced  
8 evenly, and then we're going to have evergreens  
9 and other shrubs in between that so that you don't  
10 see the open gaps. And when we met last time, I  
11 said I would pay a more focused attention on your  
12 corner to give you more density.

13 MR. BROWN: We didn't nail anything  
14 down, though.

15 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: No. Because we're  
16 still in that planning stage. So if we go to the  
17 landscape plan.

18 MR. LACAYO: Here is a hard copy if  
19 you want to share it.

20 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Here you go right  
21 here. All this is all new. New. New. New.  
22 New. All the way down. New fence all the way.  
23 Which you can't really see in here is in between,  
24 the different shrubs and plants that we're putting

1 in in between the trees.

2 MS. CHARLTON: Eugene, show the  
3 sections that you did provide on that drawing.  
4 There's two sections that are shown in the bottom  
5 right corner.

6 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Here?

7 MS. CHARLTON: Yes.

8 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Here it's kind of  
9 hard to see, but you're going to have a wood  
10 fence.

11 MR. WAGNER: Look at the handout  
12 right there. It's clearer.

13 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: So this will show  
14 you here in the lower section. Here we have the  
15 wood fence. We're showing the invert here which  
16 is, you know, the angle proposed for the grade.  
17 The new trees. 8-foot wood fence and we're going  
18 to have shrubs on the other side as well. And  
19 then you'll have infill in between each of the  
20 trees.

21 MR. BROWN: Okay.

22 MS. BROWN: What side of the fence  
23 will those trees be on?

24 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Mine. Our side.

1 Now, and you can see that here.

2 MR. BROWN: That's a very mature  
3 tree. The canopy of the tree is above the 8-foot  
4 fence.

5 MS. BROWN: My question is are you  
6 going to put pines in? Because right now, there's  
7 no leaves on the trees for six months. Okay.

8 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: We will work with  
9 the Village on species of the trees, but currently  
10 we do have a selection of evergreens and deciduous  
11 trees.

12 MS. BROWN: Well, evergreens is a  
13 must because right now --

14 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: We can talk about  
15 it. And we're going to acknowledge that.

16 MS. BROWN: -- they're all twigs.

17 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: But a lot of times  
18 what I'll do is I'll propose a landscaping and  
19 species of trees that we like to use, but the  
20 municipalities don't want us to use, but they want  
21 a different selection. In this particular case,  
22 we're going to work with you, and we'll pick those  
23 trees that will best suit the Village's  
24 requirements, our requirements for longevity and

1 give you screening you're looking for.

2 MR. KOPP: Sorry. Maybe we can  
3 retroactively swear you in.

4 THE COURT REPORTER: I swore her in  
5 before.

6 MR. BROWN: I just have one more  
7 question. We mentioned the 8-foot fence. Now, at  
8 the peak of the elevation on 69th Street, what are  
9 we going to do as it drops that three feet in  
10 front of my house? Can we maintain a level top  
11 rail so actually the fence might be 10 foot tall  
12 at my house instead of the fence coming down with  
13 the grade? That's what I have now. And we look  
14 right over the top of it. I agree it's only a  
15 6-foot fence, and we touched on this, I believe.

16 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: We did. And I  
17 think it's hard for us to get a fence up to 10  
18 feet. We can do it. No, we can do it. We don't  
19 like to do it. We don't even put 8-foot fences in  
20 any of our properties. Six is the highest that  
21 we'll go, and most of it is 4 feet.

22 MR. BROWN: I appreciate the extra  
23 two feet.

24 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: We're reaching out

1 in that respect. The other thing that we talked  
2 about doing in that area where it drops, where the  
3 grade drops, is putting in more mature evergreens,  
4 and that would help to give you that offset as far  
5 as tree versus fence.

6 MR. WAGNER: All the vegetation, is  
7 it on your side of the fence or the north side of  
8 the fence?

9 MR. GRZYMKOWICZ: Both. The mature  
10 trees that we're planning to put in are going to  
11 be on our side, and then you'll have the fence and  
12 you'll have some smaller shrubs on the other side.

13 MS. BROWN: So if you're putting  
14 smaller shrubs on the other side, right now  
15 there's a guardrail. So is that going to come  
16 out?

17 MR. GRZYMKOWICZ: That's proposed.  
18 I'm not 100 percent that we're going to be doing  
19 that. Once we work through the landscaping with  
20 the Village, if they say it's going to be a  
21 maintenance thing, the plowing is going to kill  
22 it, you know, things like that.

23 MS. CHARLTON: To add one other thing  
24 to that. There's going to be an improvement on

1 69th Street to add a curb to the south side of  
2 that street.

3 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Correct. Can you  
4 go to that?

5 MS. CHARLTON: Depending on how we  
6 put the curb in -- right there.

7 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: So currently, the  
8 curb -- if you go down to the cul-de-sac, there is  
9 a curb and then it stops at the corner of the  
10 K-Mart building currently. We're going to  
11 continue that curb all the way through.

12 MR. BROWN: Can I just ask, why is it  
13 necessary to go through that expense of a curb?

14 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: It's just something  
15 the Village asked us to put in.

16 MR. BROWN: Okay.

17 MS. BROWN: So is there enough room,  
18 okay, to put all these trees on because we walk  
19 around there a lot, and it looks really bad right  
20 now. And fall, everything is down.

21 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: You're right.  
22 Because some of the trees are on this side. Some  
23 of the trees are on this side. Not many but it's  
24 here and there.

1 MR. BROWN: The wild ones.

2 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Right. So we're  
3 going to clear it out completely, construct our  
4 new fence. Our new trees will be on our side,  
5 which will have plenty of room to come up, and  
6 then the canopy will come over the fence line up  
7 to here.

8 MS. BROWN: But my question is: Is  
9 there enough room?

10 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Oh, yeah. There's  
11 plenty of room.

12 MS. BROWN: Because you have all  
13 these railroad ties that are all falling down.  
14 Those got to go. Those -- are you going to keep  
15 those? Is that what you're proposing, to keep  
16 those broken --

17 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Which ones? On our  
18 property?

19 MS. BROWN: On your property. If you  
20 walk back there --

21 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: The back of the  
22 property here. Let's take a look at this one  
23 instance here. We have a retaining wall here that  
24 she's speaking of of wood ties. This continues to

1 the corner and goes all the way down to the west.

2 MS. BROWN: Yes.

3 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: This will be  
4 completely removed, all of this here. And there  
5 will be a new block retaining wall through here.  
6 It will continue to the corner of the building to  
7 here. And then going down that route, we're going  
8 to have to reconstruct that retaining wall. And  
9 what we're looking at doing is almost  
10 eliminating -- so we'll bring that retaining wall  
11 as far to the west, probably middle of our  
12 building, and it will go down a grade. It will be  
13 zero. So it will be asphalt to landscaping  
14 because we need to bring in a new ComEd line  
15 through here, so it has to be removed.

16 MS. BROWN: So those railroad ties  
17 will be taken out?

18 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Yes. Yes. Some  
19 will stay because ComEd has a restriction on how  
20 we build around the transformer. So we might do  
21 some retaining wall, some block to cover it or  
22 concrete wall. It's to be determined in that  
23 section. But there will be retaining wall  
24 replaced and, like I say, it will taper down to

1 grade where asphalt sweeps to the landscaping.

2 MS. BROWN: Will the fence be in the  
3 same position or are you going to push it back  
4 towards your store?

5 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Do you walk a lot  
6 in the back of the building?

7 MS. BROWN: I do. We do.

8 MR. BROWN: It looks like Detroit  
9 right now. It looks like we live in Detroit.

10 MS. BROWN: It's bad.

11 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: It's not going to  
12 look like that.

13 MS. BROWN: It's really bad. Will  
14 the fence be pushed back a little bit? If you  
15 notice, our street is very narrow to begin with.  
16 So if you can push the fence back a little bit.

17 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: The fence currently  
18 is riding on our property line and I will talk  
19 with the Village.

20 MS. BROWN: It's half a road. We  
21 have a half a road back there. It's very narrow  
22 and if you can push the fence back a little bit  
23 towards the building, it might visually look like  
24 the road is larger and we have some more

1 landscaping.

2 MS. CHARLTON: One thing to note  
3 about that, because for the most part, Eugene,  
4 correct me if I'm wrong, that slope goes down. So  
5 if you put the fence further from yours, it's  
6 going to go downhill. So it's going to -- you're  
7 going to lose the effectiveness of the screen.

8 MR. GRZYMKOWICZ: So if I move the  
9 fence currently a foot or two feet, you're going  
10 to drop that distance.

11 MS. CHARLTON: Instead of looking  
12 like an 8-foot fence, it's going to look like a 7-  
13 or 6-foot fence.

14 MR. KOPP: Yes, sir.

15 (Whereupon Mr. Phillip  
16 Voorhees was sworn in.)

17 MR. VOORHEES: My name is Phillip  
18 Voorhees, V-o-o-r-h-e-e-s. The thing I would like  
19 to take issue with is the item about Plainfield  
20 Road, and when you're going in one particular  
21 direction and you want to make a left turn, you're  
22 facing another set of cars which tends to give you  
23 a head-on. Very clearly, that's what that problem  
24 is. What's wrong with putting a small divider in

1 the center of Plainfield Road? Believe me, that's  
2 a wide -- very wide road. And I don't think a  
3 small divider would make a big difference. It  
4 will prevent for your left turns or if two cars  
5 would not face each other anymore. In other  
6 words, you know the other guy is going to have  
7 to -- isn't going to hit your divider.

8 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: I have an idea what  
9 he's saying.

10 MR. VOORHEES: 83 is a lot safer than  
11 Plainfield Road if you want to cross it.

12 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: What Michael  
13 alluded to, what happens in this scenario is we  
14 take the center, our site plan development.  
15 Michael starts working on the traffic studies.  
16 Once those are done sufficiently, we submit them  
17 to the entities, meaning the County, DuPage County  
18 and then IDOT. They're going to tell us X, Y, Z.  
19 We want dual lefts. We want the acceleration  
20 here. This distance and so forth. So as we talk  
21 about the impact here on Plainfield, because it  
22 seems to be a point of contention, Plainfield,  
23 DuPage County, pretty much their limit is here.  
24 And as you guys talk about a problem, you know,

1 ongoing over this way, we're going to go back to  
2 the County and see what we can do with this. I'm  
3 not sure. I don't have that answer, but we're  
4 going to go back and research it.

5 MR. WAGNER: I think the research  
6 needs to be from at least Adams Street to 83.

7 MR. GRZYMKOWICZ: Noted. Noted.

8 MR. VOORHEES: Crossing Plainfield  
9 Road, if you want to cross it from Adams going  
10 south, good luck. That's almost impossible.

11 MR. WAGNER: You would be better off  
12 going to Madison Street.

13 MR. VOORHEES: We do. And we do.  
14 That's exactly what we do.

15 MR. GRZYMKOWICZ: I want to make it  
16 clear, if we come up with a solution over here,  
17 it's really not -- this area of problem is not  
18 from this project's impact. So we're going to  
19 have to talk with the other entities and see what  
20 the actual impact is here and the cost and who is  
21 going to participate in doing that work. Now, if  
22 we can get them on board and we can get this work  
23 done at the same time, I'm all for it. All for  
24 it.

1 MR. KOPP: Yes, sir.

2 (Whereupon Mr. Dave  
3 Pendill was sworn in.)

4 MR. PENDILL: My name is Dave  
5 Pendill, P-e-n-d-i-l-l. I live at 546 Plainfield  
6 Road. And I know you guys are talking about  
7 further east, and he's talking about Adams. I  
8 live east of Adams, and when they built the last  
9 Town Center, they did a bunch of traffic surveys,  
10 and they put in a right-hand turn lane. They said  
11 it was going to make our situation getting in and  
12 out of our driveway better. Well, they were  
13 clearly wrong. It's worse now than it was then by  
14 far. I think Ray will attest to that. They were  
15 told last time that they wanted to put a stoplight  
16 there, and IDOT said no way they're going to let  
17 them do it because it was going to create more of  
18 a problem. I want to find out why now it's okay  
19 when last time IDOT said no, we're not going to  
20 let you do it because it's going to mess up the  
21 traffic more on Plainfield. Everything they told  
22 us last time pretty much was wrong.

23 MR. GRZYMKOWICZ: You mean this  
24 signal?

1 MR. PENDILL: Yeah, that signal.  
2 They were told no signal.

3 MR. GRZYMKOWICZ: That, I can't  
4 answer.

5 MR. PENDILL: I understand that. The  
6 reason we were told they wouldn't let them do it  
7 because it was going to block us.

8 MR. WERTHMANN: The reason they never  
9 got the signal here was you have to have a certain  
10 volume of traffic. There is traffic signal  
11 warrants you have to meet, and they could never  
12 meet the warrants. With the redevelopment of this  
13 site with the Town Center, we can meet those  
14 warrants. In addition, we're providing the  
15 additional improvements along here to get  
16 everything to work together. So it's really  
17 getting that volume of traffic. This Town Center  
18 has been trying for years to warrant a signal, and  
19 they've done a number of studies and they kept on  
20 coming up short.

21 MR. PENDILL: The lady who did the  
22 traffic for the last developer for that corner,  
23 she came back and said that the State wouldn't let  
24 them do it because it was too close to 83. They

1 would not let them put that light in because of  
2 the proximity to 83. So now it's okay now. And  
3 there is no way you can -- you're going to tell me  
4 that it's not going to make -- we can't get out of  
5 our driveway in the afternoon, and it's not just  
6 for a short period of time. It's from 4:00  
7 o'clock until like 6:30, getting out of my drive  
8 at 546, I'm a couple doors east of Adams, it's  
9 impossible. And they swore up and down last time,  
10 "Oh, this is going to be better. We extended the  
11 right-hand-turn lane so that should cut it back."  
12 Okay. That's great they did that, but it made no  
13 difference in our situation. They told us it  
14 would make it better, and it was clearly wrong.  
15 I'm not saying they lied to us, but they  
16 completely screwed the pooch on that one. It  
17 wasn't even close to -- they told them before --  
18 the thing that they made a big point about saying,  
19 they wouldn't let them put the stoplight in  
20 because it was too close to the proximity of 83  
21 and they shut them down, and they said it would  
22 create more gridlock going to the east going  
23 westbound. Now it's okay. And I don't see how  
24 that's going to help us. And, you know, I know

1 you were talking about your situation, but you  
2 said down here is really not something that we can  
3 control. Well, before this thing gets approved --  
4 I like the project, too. I think it's a great  
5 project. The traffic for eastbound getting out of  
6 where we're at, it's not acceptable; and I don't  
7 see how it's going to make it any better. I have  
8 a lot of statistics from the last lady, what was  
9 it, eight years ago when they did that. I don't  
10 know how long it's been, and it was completely  
11 wrong. It was absolutely off the charts, and we  
12 laughed at her then. I know Vice Chairman Wagner  
13 had the same problem.

14 MR. WERTHMANN: I'm not claiming the  
15 signal is going to help you get out here about two  
16 blocks down.

17 MR. PENDILL: No.

18 MR. WERTHMANN: I don't believe it is  
19 going to make it any worse. The volume of traffic  
20 coming through here is going to be the same with  
21 or without this signal. The trouble with you  
22 getting out is there's just not enough gaps in the  
23 traffic stream, particularly in the p.m. peak for  
24 you to get out. You know, the signal is -- the

1 traffic would be stopping here anyway. So it's  
2 going to back up to where it is. All we're doing  
3 is stopping it a little short so we can get our  
4 traffic out. So the queue is not going to extend  
5 that much longer from the signal, particularly in  
6 the p.m.

7 MR. REMKUS: You're going to add dual  
8 turn lanes down there; right? So you're going to  
9 move more traffic.

10 MR. WERTHMANN: In theory, we're  
11 going to get more traffic. One of the big  
12 problems now is, you're right, is you have a  
13 single left turn. It backs up and extends into  
14 the through lane.

15 MR. PENDILL: I understand that but I  
16 would say that afternoon at that time, I believe  
17 98 percent of the traffic does not go down  
18 Plainfield and turn south on Route 83. People are  
19 going straight or they're going north.

20 MR. WERTHMANN: You got about 200  
21 making a left. And you have another hundred --  
22 we're also extending the right-turn lane all the  
23 way to our drive. So we're doing everything we  
24 can, sir. I understand your concerns and we can

1 take a look at what we're trying to do. You're  
2 right. There was concern about the proximity.  
3 We've been working with DuPage County and IDOT.  
4 DuPage County controls Plainfield. They're  
5 comfortable now with the improvements and the  
6 volumes that they can get the two signals to work.  
7 So we have their preliminary approval. We even  
8 have plans in for the design of the signal.

9 MR. PENDILL: I understand that. But  
10 the point I'm trying to make, they gave all this  
11 last time, and they said it would be better -- the  
12 way they did it last time would make it better for  
13 us; it would reduce the volume of traffic. It  
14 didn't. It made it worse. Now you're telling me  
15 it's going to help. I mean, getting in and out of  
16 my property right now is impossible.

17 MR. WERTHMANN: I'm not saying it's  
18 going to help your property, sir. I don't even  
19 know where your property is. All I'm saying is  
20 the capacity improvements we're providing here is  
21 going to improve the operation of these  
22 intersections.

23 MR. PENDILL: I understand your  
24 project is looking at that. But your project

1 affects me, even though I'm outside your scope of  
2 what you really care about. Let's be honest;  
3 right? I mean, you don't really care if I can get  
4 in and out of my driveway at 546.

5 MR. WERTHMANN: I do care, sir.

6 MR. PENDILL: I've had this  
7 conversation. This is the second meeting I've  
8 ever been to for any kind of development. And the  
9 first time they told me a bunch of stuff and it  
10 didn't work out. So understand my skepticism.

11 MR. GRZYMKOWICZ: I'm glad you're  
12 voicing that opinion because the only really  
13 contention we've had here is Chase Bank. We heard  
14 nothing else this way. This is the first day I've  
15 heard this. Like I said, though, we're going to  
16 go back. We'll present the issue with the  
17 Village's concerns to the County, and we have to  
18 see what they say. It's not us or Michael that  
19 says, "Put in a median or do this or do that."  
20 They basically look at his counts and what the  
21 movements are and they decide what to do. It's  
22 their ruling.

23 MR. PENDILL: I think they should  
24 look a little further east when they're looking at

1 traffic impact. I mean, I know Vice Chairman  
2 Wagner likes to point out Adams, which he's  
3 absolutely right. It's a nightmare. But the  
4 nightmare goes all the way to Madison.

5 MR. WAGNER: I agree with you. At  
6 5:30, 6:00 o'clock, there's a double line of  
7 traffic all the way from 83 well past Madison.

8 MR. PENDILL: Right. And I don't  
9 know how adding another stoplight in the middle of  
10 all that is going to make it better.

11 MR. WAGNER: I don't think -- to be  
12 honest with you, I don't think it's going to  
13 change anything. I think it's going to be worse  
14 just because we deal with the traffic now, and  
15 it's going to have added traffic because this  
16 should be a successful development. Is it going  
17 to get any better? I don't think so. However,  
18 the one thing that it might do for us is it might  
19 because that light is closer to Adams and closer  
20 to your house, it might give you a gap in the  
21 traffic going east to be able to get out now  
22 because there will be a time where only traffic is  
23 coming out of the developments to go east on  
24 Plainfield Road. I'm hoping that it will give a

1 traffic -- you know, because today there's no --  
2 it's just a continuous stream. And I'm hoping  
3 that that light will then at least make a gap in  
4 the traffic long enough where we can get out of  
5 Adams Street or you can get out of your driveways.  
6 The traffic coming from the east going west isn't  
7 going to get any better. I mean, we all know --  
8 the other day when they had ComEd out there, I  
9 mean, it was backed up to Garfield Street. I  
10 couldn't get home either. So personally, I'm  
11 rerouting. I'm going to go down Madison to 72nd  
12 and come up to 75th instead because from Adams to  
13 83 takes seven turns of the light to get across 83  
14 going west on Plainfield.

15 MR. PENDILL: And the thing is we  
16 don't have that option that you have. We can't  
17 reroute.

18 MR. WAGNER: No. I understand. I  
19 don't think this development is going to do  
20 anything to improve your situation because it's  
21 already in gridlock.

22 MR. PENDILL: I understand that.

23 MR. WAGNER: And I don't think there  
24 is any solution they can do to achieve a better

1 outcome for you on your driveway.

2 MR. PENDILL: Basically, what you're  
3 saying is we got to take it.

4 MR. WAGNER: I don't know how we  
5 can't. I mean, I would love to see this three  
6 lanes in each direction myself. But I don't think  
7 realistically that's going to happen. And I hear  
8 your concerns, and I know what they are because I  
9 live right virtually across the street, but I just  
10 don't see the traffic being improved by this  
11 because it's already gridlocked back beyond  
12 Madison Street.

13 MR. PENDILL: Well, that's maybe the  
14 push should be for something like they've done in  
15 other areas up and down 83 where 63rd or  
16 Plainfield goes underneath it, something more  
17 major. I understand that's a big undertaking.

18 MR. WAGNER: I raised my concerns  
19 tonight in hopes that they're going to look  
20 further east and maybe that will help resolve some  
21 of this because I think we have two issues. I  
22 think there's the amount of traffic which is in  
23 gridlock now. So I just don't see a way to  
24 improve that at the moment.

1 MR. PENDILL: Right.

2 MR. WAGNER: The other thing, though  
3 is the traffic movements, which are becoming  
4 critical. I have honestly been in situations out  
5 on Plainfield Road where turning onto Adams, I've  
6 virtually head-on people. I mean, it happens  
7 constantly. I know Greg lives in the area, and  
8 I'm sure he can attest to the same thing.

9 MR. RUFFOLO: I can.

10 MR. WAGNER: I think there's a couple  
11 issues. The volume of traffic, which I don't  
12 think we have any control of. But I think if we  
13 can control the movements and stop the craziness a  
14 little bit on Plainfield Road, then I think the  
15 traffic may move a little faster. But, like I  
16 said, at rush hour, seven turns of the light the  
17 other day for me to go from Adams across 83.

18 MR. PENDILL: Trust me. You don't  
19 have to tell me that. I know that as much as  
20 anybody. What I'm saying is all the project is  
21 going to do is exacerbate that problem. It's not  
22 going to make it better, and maybe that's not  
23 their point. But that's why we're here to talk  
24 about things like what it does to your property

1 value and things of that nature. We're just  
2 taking it right in the face, and basically there's  
3 only a couple of us that live down that street,  
4 and it's going to fall on deaf ears. I know how  
5 it's going to work. It worked last time. The  
6 thing is it's so bad now and it's only going to  
7 get worse. And what is the Village of Willowbrook  
8 going to do with the State and the County? You're  
9 right, it's gridlock. Well, it needs a grander  
10 plan, but who's pushing that? This is going -- I  
11 don't care how -- we can talk traffic survey.  
12 This corner is going to be a nightmare, and it's  
13 only going to be worse. Chase Bank is going to be  
14 better. You can throw in a turn lane, that's  
15 great. But the traffic -- the basic traffic  
16 itself is increasing. The volume is increasing  
17 all the time. I've been living there for 15  
18 years. It wasn't nearly that bad that long ago.  
19 And look how bad -- K-Mart doesn't do any  
20 business, they've been gone for years. Now you're  
21 going to have a successful business, you're going  
22 to have a lot of people coming in and out of  
23 there. The double left turn you provide on  
24 Plainfield might help a little, but that's not

1 going to offset all the people coming in and out  
2 of that shopping center.

3 MR. WAGNER: I think the best thing  
4 we can do is we raised these concerns to them  
5 tonight, both from the Commission, from the  
6 audience, people who live in the area. I think  
7 let them go back to the County. Let them see what  
8 they can do. Maybe the participation of some of  
9 the other businesses, if they can improve  
10 Plainfield Road somehow, maybe it won't impact us  
11 as much as if they didn't do anything. So let's  
12 give them the benefit of the doubt for the moment.  
13 Let's let them go back and do some planning, and  
14 they'll come back to us at another meeting and  
15 show us a different plan, and then you can make a  
16 judgment whether you think it will work or not  
17 work.

18 Yes, sir. You'll have to be  
19 sworn.

20 (Whereupon Mr. Ray  
21 Royce, Sr. was sworn in.)

22 MR. ROYCE: My name is Ray Royce,  
23 R-o-y-c-e. I live at 604 Plainfield Road, next  
24 door actually, and it is senior after that. And I

1 agree with John over here. The only thing my  
2 concern is I just want to -- you said Adams.  
3 You're talking about Adams. We're talking about  
4 between Adams and Madison. And when you said  
5 other businesses across the street, we got  
6 Walgreens, we got Paulson Center. We got a lot of  
7 businesses across the street. So maybe they can  
8 help participate in solving their problem, too,  
9 because they're going to have the same problem on  
10 that side as we're going to have on our side.

11 MR. WAGNER: I agree with you. The  
12 only additional benefit they have on that side of  
13 the street is that all of those properties are  
14 interconnected through their parking lots, and  
15 they can navigate all the way to Madison, and they  
16 can navigate all the way to Adams without going  
17 onto Plainfield Road.

18 MR. ROYCE: That's right. They have  
19 that.

20 MR. PENDILL: Not only that, they  
21 have a left-hand-turn lane going westbound. When  
22 we try to turn into our driveways if we're going  
23 east, we have to jump into that lane because if we  
24 try to stop on Plainfield to turn left, we get

1 people, they're all over us. They're hammering  
2 the horn on us because they think that's a double  
3 turn lane and it's not. And we have to go in  
4 there otherwise we think we're going to get  
5 crushed.

6 MR. ROYCE: That's right. And you  
7 can ask IDOT to change that also for the people  
8 that live between Adams and --

9 MR. WAGNER: As I said, the County  
10 will look at that and see how far back we can get  
11 some traffic resolution.

12 MR. ROYCE: Okay.

13 MS. BROWN: Okay. I know Jo Ellen  
14 mentioned something about the garbage screening  
15 and the truck screening. Can you please go over  
16 that? And has the proposal changed from the last  
17 time we met?

18 MR. GRZYMKOWICZ: Can I have your  
19 plan? It's too hard to see. So currently, each  
20 of these debris zones have a brick wall 8 to 10  
21 feet tall. So not only do you have the wood  
22 fence, the trees and shrubs, and then all of our  
23 garbage areas have screened-in brick walls.

24 MS. BROWN: Okay. That's good but

1 what about the now the trucks, the trucks are  
2 going to pull in.

3 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Loading zones for  
4 the trucks have the screen wall as well. Ours  
5 particularly, we have a loading dock, so our truck  
6 pulls up and drops into the dock.

7 MS. CHARLTON: With the roof.

8 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Yes, with a roof.

9 MS. BROWN: The one truck dock --

10 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: This is a  
11 compactor, garbage compactor with a screen wall.  
12 This is the building. This is the loading zone.  
13 This is the semi that will pull in to the back of  
14 the loading dock. You won't see it. When it  
15 backs in, you don't see the truck.

16 MS. BROWN: That looks like it's  
17 directly across from the cul-de-sac.

18 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: It is.

19 MS. BROWN: Because we're farther  
20 over here.

21 MR. VOORHEES: How do the trucks get  
22 out?

23 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: How do they get  
24 out? They pull in and drive out this way and they

1 go out Plainfield. Our operations are 7:00 to  
2 10:00. Our deliveries are 7:00 to 4:00.

3 MS. BROWN: So there's one loading  
4 dock? There's one truck loading dock for the  
5 whole store?

6 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: For the Pete's  
7 Market, there's one truck loading dock.

8 MS. BROWN: So where's the other  
9 loading docks?

10 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Right here.

11 MR. BROWN: The existing?

12 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: That's going away.  
13 That drop dock is going away. 100 percent. That  
14 will be slab on grade. They have a loading zone  
15 so they have smaller box trucks. They'll pull up.  
16 They'll have a screen wall, and then they'll  
17 unload, and they'll go away as well.

18 MS. BROWN: That's a tall screen  
19 wall, too?

20 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Yes. Not as tall  
21 as the truck, but it will cover the truck to some  
22 degree. Our attempts is to give you the foliage  
23 and the fence. At my level and your level, you're  
24 not going to see over that fence. You're not

1 going to see the truck. As you're walking down  
2 there...

3 MR. SOUKUP: Did I hear the garbage  
4 is before 7:00 o'clock?

5 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: The garbage?

6 MR. SOUKUP: Garbage pickup.

7 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: No. Garbage pickup  
8 I didn't talk about. I said deliveries.

9 MR. SOUKUP: Are they going to be  
10 after 7:00?

11 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Yes.

12 MR. SOUKUP: And garbage you don't  
13 know. I live three blocks -- three houses down  
14 from Mr. Brown. And our garbage is picked up at  
15 7:00.

16 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Our garbage usually  
17 for our other buildings are usually between 8:00  
18 and 10:00. Usually. So we don't have one in  
19 Willowbrook. Oak Brook is the same thing,  
20 about -- is Flood out here? I'm not sure who you  
21 use.

22 MR. WAGNER: Could I ask you to  
23 research that a little bit more? The only reason  
24 I'm asking is the Harlem Irving development across

1 the street, I think they do pickups at 4:30 or  
2 5:00 a.m., and all you can hear is the garbage  
3 trucks with that backup beeping backing into the  
4 docks over there, and you can hear it from blocks  
5 away.

6 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Right.

7 MR. WAGNER: And I would hope that we  
8 wouldn't have garbage pickups before 7:00.

9 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Our containers are  
10 concealed compactors. So when they come, they  
11 pick up the box, they take it away. They dump it  
12 and they come back and bring it back. It's  
13 usually done during operations in case something  
14 is going on with the chute or people are doing  
15 something, so it's usually done when the store is  
16 open.

17 MR. WAGNER: I realize that Pete's  
18 Fresh Market would generate a lot of garbage, and  
19 I realize you have a container. But I'm concerned  
20 maybe about Ulta and the other stores would have  
21 probably something quite a bit smaller where  
22 you're going to get a garbage truck in there in  
23 the middle of the night or very early in the  
24 morning, and that would not be beneficial to the

1 neighbors.

2 MR. BROWN: The Village has  
3 ordinances for times of scavenger pickup.

4 MR. WAGNER: I don't know if  
5 Willowbrook has such a thing.

6 MS. CHARLTON: We do.

7 MR. GIUNTOLI: I was hoping I had a  
8 Title IX book here. I don't. There is a time. I  
9 just don't want to quote it incorrectly.

10 MR. BROWN: If you can post it on the  
11 back of the building so now when I call at 3:00  
12 o'clock in the morning, they give them a ticket on  
13 the spot because it's posted right there.

14 MR. GIUNTOLI: You call 911

15 MR. BROWN: Ignorance is no excuse  
16 for not knowing the law because I also have some  
17 police paperwork.

18 MR. GIUNTOLI: Call 911 and they will  
19 dispatch someone. If they are still there, they  
20 would be directed to issue a citation.

21 MR. BROWN: I had a guy pick up  
22 pallets at 3:00 o'clock in the morning. I've been  
23 through the whole thing. So it sounds like you've  
24 got it covered and we're going to be good

1 neighbors.

2 MR. GRZYMKOWICZ: That's what we  
3 want. And, again, with this northwest drive, one  
4 of the impetuses we did to do this was, one, for  
5 our truck movements. Two, to alleviate the  
6 pressure on Plainfield so people coming that want  
7 to make this left into the center, otherwise you  
8 would have to go all the way here and here and  
9 here. But we're also creating a walk path from  
10 here, here, and also this way to the office  
11 building.

12 MR. KOPP: Anybody else in the  
13 audience have questions or comments?

14 Yes, sir.

15 MR. VOORHEES: I was wondering if  
16 people realize how difficult it is to drive north  
17 if you live in that area north of what we're  
18 talking about, what is known as the Schiller Dish  
19 [phonetic].

20 MR. WAGNER: You mean north on 83?

21 MR. VOORHEES: North anywhere.

22 MR. WAGNER: Oh, it's gridlock.

23 MR. VOORHEES: You can't get onto  
24 Plainfield Road going -- if you try to get on

1 Plainfield Road, you want to go north --

2 MR. WAGNER: The only way to go north  
3 from our area right now is through Madison.

4 There's no point in going on Route 83.

5 MR. VOORHEES: Then you're crossing  
6 Madison going left --

7 MR. PENDILL: Madison is getting to  
8 be a pretty bad street on its own. Everybody uses  
9 Madison.

10 MR. WAGNER: Madison at 68th is  
11 becoming a real challenge.

12 MR. PENDILL: That's where I would  
13 like to see the town more than this development, I  
14 think you really need to look at everything from  
15 Madison to 83 is a nightmare, and it has to be  
16 addressed on a major issue. I mean, I know that  
17 the State does all kinds of things going  
18 underneath 83. You see up and down 83 where  
19 they've added to it. Chicago Avenue in Clarendon  
20 Hills. Ogden Avenue.

21 MR. WAGNER: Part of the problem is  
22 Madison Street and Plainfield Road are controlled  
23 by the County.

24 MR. PENDILL: I understand that.

1 MR. WAGNER: I mean, it's not like  
2 Willowbrook can do anything.

3 MR. PENDILL: No. But if you guys  
4 don't advance the conversation to IDOT and the  
5 County, no one else will. I'm not expecting the  
6 the development to do it, and that's not their  
7 job. But I mean, the traffic between those --  
8 between Madison and 83 has gotten worse every  
9 year, and it's going to continue to get worse  
10 until something really big is done. Something  
11 along the lines of going underneath 83, and then  
12 it has been done before, and you're the only  
13 people that can really advance that argument, not  
14 us.

15 MR. REMKUS: You're right. It's not  
16 just Plainfield. It's 63rd Street. It's 75th.  
17 It is 55th, all these streets, the more they  
18 develop out west, the more traffic we get that's  
19 coming through our area and flowing in both  
20 directions.

21 MR. PENDILL: Look at --

22 MR. REMKUS: They never planned for  
23 it. None of these towns -- you look out west.  
24 They're still making the same mistakes they made

1 around here years ago. They're not building roads  
2 to take the traffic until it gets so bad, then  
3 they raise taxes and build all these roads and  
4 everything, you know.

5 MR. PENDILL: Unfortunately, as much  
6 as I don't want my taxes raised, I mean,  
7 Plainfield is as bad as any other road that  
8 finally got changed. Ogden was horrible at 83  
9 forever, and then they finally fixed that. Again,  
10 that's between Hinsdale and Clarendon Hills, so,  
11 you know, you got to take care of it. You take  
12 care of the people that pay the bills, but I would  
13 suggest that Plainfield between Madison and 83 is  
14 as bad as any stretch around on 83 up and down the  
15 line. And, again, like John said, it's getting  
16 worse every year. I mean, it needs to be  
17 addressed by a government body to go to IDOT and  
18 to the County. And this development, as nice as  
19 it is, it's just going to be another brick on top  
20 of a bad situation. It's going to be up to you  
21 guys and the board and the town to address the  
22 State and the County. And I would hope at some  
23 point that's going to happen.

24 MR. REMKUS: All we can do is try.

1 MR. PENDILL: That's all we can ask.

2 MR. KOPP: All right.

3 Mr. Grzynkowicz, would you like us to continue  
4 this until next -- are you going to want to  
5 present stuff to us?

6 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Traffic wise?

7 MR. KOPP: I was trying to wrap it  
8 up.

9 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: My concern here, I  
10 understand your traffic concerns and we're going  
11 to look at this with the County. Big picture,  
12 it's not going to be part of our development but  
13 we will see what we can do. I want you to  
14 understand that what we're doing here we talked  
15 about it in depth. Traffic movements, Michael has  
16 alluded on traffic flow. We are in the  
17 proceedings with IDOT in drafting, so we have the  
18 approvals to do everything that we're doing here.  
19 We're going as far as today we did potholing  
20 exploration which will continue into next week to  
21 find the utility lines with the utility  
22 contractors, BP, Gulf of Mexico. We're doing all  
23 that.

24 As Jo Ellen alluded, there are

1 some things that we're going to tie up. One of  
2 this -- I wanted to make sure you had no issues  
3 with this -- what we're doing here because I'll be  
4 working with the Sequoia Group on easement. One,  
5 the construction easement which will be part with  
6 the Village. Two will be with the final submits  
7 which will be with Sequoia. They have about 7,000  
8 square feet that is theirs. So now we're going to  
9 proceed with that.

10                   Landscaping, we're going to  
11 want to address that one more final time. If  
12 there's something, you know, that you really want  
13 to see in the species, I think it's something you  
14 need to tell Jo Ellen what you would like to see  
15 and we can incorporate that into the plan. I  
16 don't want to draft something that you say I don't  
17 like it. Do it now and then I'll put it into the  
18 plan.

19                   MR. REMKUS: If I can add something  
20 on landscaping. I notice what you're calling the  
21 species of the trees, you're having maples and  
22 some arborvitaes and maybe you look a little  
23 closer to native species of trees so that we don't  
24 find ourselves in the same position as we have

1 with the ash trees and the emerald ash borer. The  
2 last thing we want is the same variety of trees  
3 one right after another that we get some borer or  
4 something in here that destroys all the trees, and  
5 we look a little bit more -- sometimes our native  
6 trees aren't as attractive as some of these other  
7 ones, but they're built for the area.

8 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: I'm going to work  
9 closely with Jo Ellen on that, and we'll come up  
10 with a good plan on that.

11 On the building, on the  
12 elevations, are there anything you want to talk  
13 about?

14 MR. KOPP: I'm sorry because you came  
15 here for feedback from us, too. I think it looks  
16 great. Very attractive.

17 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Can you go to the  
18 elevation, please.

19 MR. KOPP: I have no -- we've talked  
20 about the traffic to death. But I have no  
21 concerns about the exits onto 83. I don't know if  
22 other people want to given input.

23 MR. WAGNER: I think it's a  
24 fabulous-looking project. I mean, normally we,

1 you know, we get hung up on, you know, how big is  
2 a sign or what color is this going to be or  
3 whatever, you know. Generally, I think it's a  
4 great-looking project. I'm looking forward to  
5 having something here that's, you know, really  
6 developing; and I know it's going to create  
7 traffic problems, and that seems to be where we  
8 end up, but all in all, I think it -- I can't  
9 wait.

10 MR. KOPP: This and a new Whole Foods  
11 and Town Center, it's really --

12 MR. WAGNER: It's good for the  
13 Village.

14 MR. SOUKUP: A lot of people ask me  
15 do you have a target date when you're going to get  
16 this there?

17 MR. GRZYMKOWICZ: Give me approval.  
18 No. This project, basically because of the  
19 roadwork -- I can finish this building tomorrow.  
20 We couldn't open it unless we had the light and  
21 the roadwork improvements done. With Manhard and  
22 Michael, we're working on getting all that  
23 drafting work and we're still going to get another  
24 submission back from them, and we're going to go

1 back. With that said, we're looking at doing the  
2 construction during next year and spring of '17  
3 opening.

4 MR. SOUKUP: What's that?

5 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Spring of '17  
6 opening. This project is about a year and three  
7 months.

8 MS. BROWN: I have one question. On  
9 your out lots, the ones that are in front of the  
10 store, how many total are you proposing, and what  
11 kind of stores would they be possibly?

12 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Go to the  
13 elevations.

14 MS. BROWN: Restaurants or --

15 MR. GIUNTOLI: I just gave her the  
16 site plan which shows it.

17 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: So --

18 MS. BROWN: Strip mall with six  
19 shops.

20 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: For types of  
21 businesses, we have Lumes Cafe, which is a  
22 breakfast/lunch cafe. They don't serve dinner.  
23 We have Firehouse Subs. We have AT&T. We have  
24 Mod Pizza, Smoothie King.

1 MS. BROWN: According to your plan  
2 here, it looks like they're like a little strip  
3 store, like they're all strip?

4 MR. GRZYMKOWICZ: They are all  
5 strip-type stores.

6 MS. BROWN: All together?

7 MR. GRZYMKOWICZ: Yes, they're all  
8 joined. The architecture, we broke it up to give  
9 them an identity to have them look like they're on  
10 their own.

11 MR. VOORHEES: What was the reason  
12 for eliminating the exit there?

13 MR. GRZYMKOWICZ: In the development  
14 area?

15 MR. GIUNTOLI: Behind the gas  
16 station?

17 MR. VOORHEES: There is an exit right  
18 behind the filling station.

19 MR. GRZYMKOWICZ: The reason to  
20 eliminate that?

21 MR. VOORHEES: Yes.

22 MR. GRZYMKOWICZ: I think it was a  
23 requirement from the County to remove it.

24 MR. VOORHEES: Is that right?

1 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Yeah. Yeah.

2 MR. KOPP: Do you want us to continue  
3 this for one month? Did you want to come in in  
4 January?

5 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: I would like to  
6 come in as soon as possible. The easement isn't  
7 going to take us too long to do. It's a matter of  
8 what Jo Ellen can put together.

9 MS. CHARLTON: I think if you're  
10 comfortable closing the public hearing, you can  
11 close the public hearing and you don't need to  
12 continue your deliberation to any date certain  
13 specifically. So we can, you know, see what  
14 happens, get everything in, and then schedule it  
15 for the next available meeting.

16 MR. KOPP: And then have another  
17 public hearing, you mean?

18 MS. CHARLTON: Right. If you close  
19 the public hearing tonight, then we don't need to  
20 continue it to a date certain.

21 MR. KOPP: Okay. But then we would  
22 have another public hearing?

23 MS. CHARLTON: It would just be a  
24 public meeting for discussion.

1 MR. KOPP: I think we should continue  
2 the public hearing.

3 MS. CHARLTON: Continue the public  
4 hearing? And that way you would leave it open if  
5 additional people came, you know, if somebody  
6 didn't hear about it or...

7 MR. KOPP: Yeah. This is a big  
8 enough project, I think we should. I would prefer  
9 to continue it.

10 MS. BROWN: I have one more question.

11 MR. GRZYMKOWICZ: I have to ask you  
12 for the quickest day we can get.

13 MS. CHARLTON: January --

14 MR. WAGNER: I think you're  
15 suggesting that we continue and leave the public  
16 hearing open to a date certain of January 13 --

17 MS. CHARLTON: 13.

18 MR. WAGNER: -- which is our next  
19 scheduled meeting. And if there's any additional  
20 comment, it can be on the record.

21 MS. CHARLTON: Yes. Okay.

22 MR. KOPP: Do I need to make a  
23 motion?

24 MS. CHARLTON: Yes.

1 MS. BROWN: I have one question. I  
2 thought Ulta was not going to be part of this  
3 project because on your large billboard --

4 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Ulta Beauty?

5 MS. BROWN: -- it was scratched off.

6 MR. GRZYNKOWICZ: Not by us.

7 MR. KOPP: So why don't we make a  
8 motion to continue the public hearing.

9 MR. LACAYO: I make a motion.

10 MR. SOUKUP: I second.

11 MR. KOPP: All in favor, say aye.

12 MR. LACAYO: Aye.

13 MR. REMKUS: Aye.

14 MR. SOUKUP: Aye.

15 MR. WAGNER: Aye.

16 MR. KAUCKY: Aye.

17 MR. RUFFOLO: Yes.

18 MR. KOPP: Aye.

19 Opposed, say nay.

20 Motion carries.

21 (Which were all the  
22 proceedings had in the  
23 above-entitled cause.)  
24

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

(The public hearing concluded  
at 10:10 p.m.)

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS )  
2 COUNTY OF COOK )

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I, MARY WOOLSEY, C.S.R., do hereby  
certify that I am a court reporter doing business  
in the City of Chicago; that I reported in  
shorthand the public hearing on December 2, 2015;  
and that the foregoing is a true and correct  
transcript of my shorthand notes so taken as  
aforesaid.

Certified Shorthand Reporter

Illinois C.S.R. License No. 084-002894

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

STATE OF ILLINOIS }  
COUNTY OF COOK }

I, MARY WOOLSEY, C.S.R., do hereby  
certify that I am a court reporter doing business  
in the City of Chicago; that I reported in  
shorthand the public hearing on December 2, 2015;  
and that the foregoing is a true and correct  
transcript of my shorthand notes so taken as  
aforesaid.

*Mary Woolsey*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Certified Shorthand Reporter

Illinois C.S.R. License No. 084-002894