

VILLAGE OF ORLAND PARK

*14700 Ravinia Avenue
Orland Park, IL 60462
www.orland-park.il.us*



Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, May 22, 2007

7:00 PM

Village Hall

Plan Commission

Louis Stephens, Chairman

Commissioners: Judith Jacobs, Paul Aubin, Steve Dzierwa, Mike Culligan, Patricia Thompson, and Nick Parisi

CALLED TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order by the Plan Commission's Vice Chairman, Mr. Paul Aubin, at 7:00 p.m.

Present: 5 - Commissioner Jacobs; Commissioner Dzierwa; Commissioner Aubin; Commissioner Culligan, Commissioner Parisi

Absent: 2 - Commissioner Stephens, Commissioner Thompson

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Commissioner Culligan, seconded by Commissioner Dzierwa and carried to table consideration of the May 8, 2007 Plan Commission meeting minutes to its June 12, 2007 meeting.

A motion was made by Commissioner Mike Culligan, seconded by Commissioner Steve Dzierwa, that this matter be CONTINUED to the Plan Commission, due back on 6/12/2007. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

Aye: 5 - Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Aubin, Commissioner Culligan and Commissioner Parisi

Nay: 0

Absent: 2 - Commissioner Stephens and Commissioner Thompson

PUBLIC HEARINGS**2007-0196 Main Street Triangle Development**

AUBIN: Entertained a motion from the Plan Commission.

I move to continue the public hearing for file number 2007-0196, Main Street Triangle, to the June 26, 2007 Plan Commission.

A motion was made by Commissioner Nick Parisi, seconded by Commissioner Steve Dzierwa, that this matter be CONTINUED to the Plan Commission. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

Aye: 5 - Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Aubin, Commissioner Culligan and Commissioner Parisi

Nay: 0

Absent: 2 - Commissioner Stephens and Commissioner Thompson

2007-0268 Open Space Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan

AUBIN: Entertained a motion from the Plan Commission.

I move to continue the public hearing for file number 2007-0268, Comprehensive Plan Amendment, to the June 12, 2007 Plan Commission.

A motion was made by Commissioner Nick Parisi, seconded by Commissioner Steve Dzierwa, that this matter be CONTINUED to the Plan Commission. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

Aye: 5 - Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Aubin, Commissioner Culligan and Commissioner Parisi

Nay: 0

Absent: 2 - Commissioner Stephens and Commissioner Thompson

2007-0156 Crystal Tree Clubhouse Redevelopment

Steve Gregory, 11508 W. 183rd Street, Orland Park

Patrick Joyce, Joyce Builders, Inc., 1302 Spyglass Circle, Palos Heights

TURLEY: Staff presentation (made in Ms. Hofkens' stead) made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated May 22, 2007 as presented.

AUBIN: Invited comments and/or questions from the petitioner.

DZIERWA: Swore in Messrs. Joyce and Gregory.

GREGORY: Stated that Ms. Turley did a great job. Mr. Gregory ran a Power Point presentation entitled "The Club at Crystal Tree" depicting what it is they have tried to prepare. At the completion of their Power Point presentation, indicated they'd be happy to answer any questions anyone may have.

AUBIN: Asked the petitioner if they are comfortable with Staff's report and their recommendations therein.

GREGORY: We have received Staff's Report. We are in agreement with most of what is in there. There are a few points we have some issue with.

AUBIN: And you are willing to work with Staff in regard to those issues?

GREGORY: Yes.

AUBIN: Asked Ms. Turley if she has the sign-in sheet of speakers circulated?

TURLEY: Provided the Vice Chairman with said sign-in sheet of speakers on which 31 entries were made.

AUBIN: Stated that out of that list of 31 people, he would like only one or two representative speakers so that we do not get repetitious at which point we become non-functional.

AUBIN: Invited comments and/or questions from the public.

DZIERWA: Swore in Mr. Tom Burke.

BURKE, resides at 14412 Crystal Tree Drive: Stated he is a homeowner in Crystal Tree who purchased his residence the first night it was offered for sale in 1988. Indicated he and his wife find this to be the most fascinating and livable community they've ever lived in with no desire to live anywhere else. However, they currently have some questions. Asked what the Plan Commissioners are being asked to do this evening. Had heard the Plan Commission was supposed to rule on whether or not the proposed plan can even be done. What is the deal?

AUBIN: The motion before the Plan Commissioners this evening is to approve this project and send it on to the Village's Board of Trustees for final approval.

BURKE: Stated that when he spoke to the Mayor the other day, he [the Mayor] indicated the Plan Commissioners would rule on whether or not we live within the restrictions, the governance of the Village.

AUBIN: I do not understand it that way at all. The petitioner has met all of the codes in the ordinance required by Orland Park. The Staff has looked at this Site Plan. The Staff has looked at the petitioner's Site Plans. The Staff has looked at the petitioner's elevations and his plans to put this project together. They meet all codes and the motion that is before us right now is to approve it. However, this Plan Commission, upon hearing evidence from the petitioner, the public and the individual Plan Commissioners, can make a motion to continue, deny or whatever the case may be. After we hear from the public, we will hear from the Plan Commissioners and then I will call for a motion; either one already recommended or a different motion.

BURKE: Complimented Mr. Joyce on his presentation which is a sales presentation – it is beautiful. We would all like an enhancement of the values of our property. Unfortunately, I don't really know what is going on here. The change we are asking the Plan Commission to give us states that we would waive the homeowners' covenant and restriction provisions, restricting subdivision and redistricting or repartitioning of development property as originally conveyed. I don't know how you do that and although I am not an attorney, I am sure there is some way it can be done. I'm simply asking the question. How do you take 101 and make it into all of these other things when it is against everything that we agreed upon when we purchased the property and that is in the covenants.

TURLEY: I am also not a lawyer, however, I know that the Village Attorney has looked at this and the way I understand it, this covenant has been removed by the title and the trust and the Village Attorney has reviewed this and has deemed it legally acceptable.

BURKE: Then I will get to what I want to talk about. There are three basic things

that I think the homeowners should think about before we rush into this. Quite frankly, I feel that this has been pushed along very rapidly and there has not been a lot of information disseminated to the homeowners. First issue - community. Mark Burns mentioned not long ago that the country club had removed some fence which required him to question whether or not we will have proper security for the entire development. Yet now, under this particular proposal, we have one entry point, one exit point, and we are going to staff this with "existing" security personnel through the Shrank organization. Currently, we have to have prior approval before anyone can come in or you have to have clearance from the homeowner. What will happen when we go 7/24 with an exit schedule with hundreds of contractors or contractor personnel, construction workers/truck drivers, real estate people and who knows who else, when we have this influx of people coming through the gate with two people there, hired by Shrank. Given that, when these people are coming through, how are we going to assure our security. Will we need additional security personnel and who will pay for it. I think, with appropriate planning, of which we've not seen evidence to date, no such planning has been put into place. I do not see it. I see no risk analysis for us as homeowners. We are told this is a two-year initiative (by Mr. Joyce). That is a long period of time. If you are burgled, who will pay for it. When you let people through the gate and you do not know who they are, who can protect us. That is a reasonable question which needs to be addressed. Previously, I asked about damage to personal or Village property, specifically to streets. We were told not to worry about it because the builder is bonded. It's a trust issue. It is not a trust issue. We, the homeowners, own those streets. The Village doesn't; we do. If anything happens to those streets, we pay for it. I think we need something more for any proposal that comes through this counsel. It just does not make sense. It could be significant. In particular with regard to the fact that the homeowners association did inform us not long ago that our streets needed a major rejuvenation within the next few years. How much forward are we going to bring that whole program because of this extra traffic. You have to remember, you have construction trucks coming in and out, wearing out all these streets. That is bound to happen. Someone saying they are bonded is not a good enough answer. I think we need some type of contractual arrangement with the builder, with the country club, that says that if anything happens, we, the homeowners, are covered. The builders and the country club should be covering us. I think that is reasonable and goes within the bounds of good business. Lastly, I would like to talk about inconvenience. Currently, when we pull out onto 143rd Street, it is a dance and we all know it. With this, double the traffic and think about the dance will have to do then. We have not had any accidents yet, however, can you imagine what is going to happen when drivers dart out because of the long lines we'll have to wait for. That is going to pose a great inconvenience. The Plan Commission should look at that. Asked if there is an alternative to what has been proposed. I just don't understand this. Asked what happened to our gate on 108th Street, on Misty Hill Road. If we put a construction gate there with a gate shack and all of the rest of it, we could eliminate most all of these problems. The problem is, someone will have to pay for it and I believe it should be the builder or the country club and not the

homeowners. Why should we risk life and limb on 143rd Street. Why should we risk security in the development. Why should we risk having the problem of property damage when, if you opened up that gate, put in the guard shack and told the builder and the country club they have to be responsible for that and pay for it. There should be Rosemary Shrank involved in the planning effort that puts together something that says to the entire homeowners association that there doesn't need to be any concern. It is a simple thing. Bring the trucks in the other way. You could make sure there was a system in place to identify all the work, we know who everyone is. It would cost a little money but as it stands now, we are the ones who will pay the price for this conversion. This should not be at the expense of the homeowners. If you look at the petitioner's proposal, the homes are great, however, there is nothing that protects us, the current homeowners, from any inconvenience, any cost exposure, any security problems. Nothing from the builder. Nothing from the homeowners association. I don't understand it as these issues have been raised before. Additionally, this initiative, whichever way it goes, is going to cost somebody some money – a lot of money – and quite frankly, the initiative to put the homes up is a multi-multimillion dollar deal. They can very well afford to put in a gate and a shack and video protection for us on Misty Hill Road. How can you argue with that? I am sure that Rosemary Shrank could come up with a comprehensive plan that is cost effective and could do the job for us. As of right now, I do not believe we have been given the information to make an intelligent decision to ask the counsel to go forward with this recommendation.

AUBIN: Asked Messrs. Gregory and Joyce to respond to the comments and concerns just raised by Mr. Tom Burke (specifically, security, construction and the inconvenience to the homeowners).

BURKE: Added the fact that he has been a businessman for a number of years and he has never seen anything that looked more like a ramrod than this.

AUBIN: Channeled Mr. Burke away from the direction his last comments were headed by reiterating the responsibilities the Plan Commissioners are charged with. Then asked the petitioner to comment on Mr. Burkes earlier comments.

GREGORY: Stated that Mr. Burke raised a lot of very good points. Apologized if his earlier presentation didn't clearly answer those questions. Stated that the issue of security is definitely a concern of theirs as well. Indicated he has been fortunate enough to work with Mr. Joyce on other projects. Mr. Joyce requires that all of this contractors and subcontractors are licensed, bonded and insured and that they are quality builders and contractors. He knows them. He will make sure they are signed in and accounted for when they are on the premises. There will be a certain amount of disruption at this location during construction. There is a certain inevitability to that. We are very conscious of it and will try to do everything they can to limit that. One of the things to remember is that it is 23 units, however, there are only six new buildings being constructed there that will require foundations, etc., so it is not going to be like a large subdivision where you see

tracts of housing going up, all at one time. It will all be controlled; very contained. We will maintain as much of that berm along the front so that we can limit any of the visual impacts that happen because of that. We are very cognizant of that. We are concerned about that will work with the current security to determine the best plan of attack for, if this goes forward, how that will happen. An issue raised by Mr. Burke that we've heard previously from the homeowners, is the concern in regard to the streets. We understand there are concerns with the condition of the street now and that they have been told that there are some problems and they will need to be fixed. The petitioner is looking to have an evaluation done of those streets, prior to construction starting, so that we have a clear handle on what is there and what will be there when we are done. Any damage directly attributable to us will be repaired to us and we will contribute to that road and any new homeowners that were to live here will then be coming on board and paying their share of any improvements that would happen. The traffic on 143rd – I couldn't agree more – I've been in and out of there many times and everyone who enters/exits there knows there is a hill there and it is not an easy situation now. During construction, we know there will be traffic there. We believe that traffic will be significantly reduced because the club traffic that is there now will be down at 153rd and 108th Avenue. All the club activities will go out of a different gate which will take all of that traffic out of here and actually making it much more secure as well because, especially once all of our construction is done, the only people coming in and out of this gate will be residents. We looked at both the short- and long-term situation and we feel that all-in-all, this will be an improvement in both situations. The concern Mr. Burke raised in regard to an alternate plan and the possibility of a gate another location, that was not a decision for us to make. We were told we had to work within the confines of what is presented here. We are trying to work with the road network and the system that is in place to control our impact on this community. I hope I've addressed Mr. Burke's concerns to the satisfaction of Mr. Burke and the Plan Commissioners. We will continue to listen and respond as we go along.

AUBIN: Asked for further, new questions, from the public.

DZIERWA: Swore in Mr. Mark Burns.

BURNS, President of the Crystal Tree Homeowner's Association: Asked that there be serious consideration given to continue this petition until outstanding issues are resolved. Stated he has given both the developer and the country club a list of requirements and agreement between the club and the association and the builder and the association that deals with everything Mr. Burke talked about and more specific procedural issues about letting people in and out, about bonding, and all of these kinds of things. I would like you to hold action on this until the two parties have signed these agreements so that the homeowners' association and the people who have lived here for 18 years have their rights protected. Also, as Mrs. Turley indicated, this property was transferred from a state of open land or recreation for 20 years to residential. That seems a bit out of

phase with the Village setting aside 20 million dollars to buy open land and maintain open land approximately three years ago. Collectively, that is our money. As I look at this transaction, the country club is going to take in excess of two million dollars. The builder is going to take in excess of ½ million dollars because I do not think Mr. Joyce works for less than a 20% margin. He knows what he is doing. What about the homeowners' association? As I see it, we get no benefit. One of the things I have asked both parties to participate in is helping us to solve a problem that is unique to the Crystal Tree Community. We will be the only large residential area as a community within Orland Park that does not have a single park for its owners' children and grandchildren. The only semblance of a park is owned by the country club and that is coming down. You talked about reducing density, however, you might want to consider directing the developer and the country club jointly to set aside a piece of land out of this complex as a park and help fund the creation of a park if you are going to move ahead with this. The Mayor has stated to me twice that he does not want to see a community of 450 homes without a single park. Those are my requests. Again, I request that you seriously consider continuing this petition until we have signed agreements on everything because if this moves forward we are in a very poor negotiating position in terms of protecting the rights of our people. Thank you.

PUBLIC: Loud applause.

AUBIN: Invited further, non-repetitive comments from the public.

DZIERWA: Swore in Mr. George Groebel.

GROEBEL, resides at 10522 Golf Road: Stated he has lived in this community for 19 years. This is a dramatic revision of what we all entered into when we bought this property. Listening to the developers presentation, it appears as if the petitioner is creating an independent unit within our unit and they are going to call it Crystal Tree Club. That is not us. That is not our nature. We have 324 townhomes, all under a restrictive covenant as to what we can do with our townhome. We cannot even replace a window unless it matches the specifications. Our rooflines, painting, decorations, everything has to be in conformance. Now it appears to me that they wish to interject a whole new concept known as The Club within our community. I think that is going to be very detrimental to our community. We have a lot of money of our own invested in that community. We all pay our dues and our assessments. We are all very much involved in our community. This is a terrible interruption of what we came here for. I suggest that this is not in the best interest of our community. Thank you.

PUBLIC: Loud applause.

AUBINS: Invited comments and/or questions from the Plan Commissioners.

CULLIGAN: Stated there seems to be some discrepancy between both parties

in regard to how much information has been provided one another. Asked for clarification in that regard.

GREGORY: Stated they actually went through a presentation, similar to the one given this evening, just a little over one week ago, which explained what is being presented here.

CULLIGAN: Asked how that meeting was attended.

GREGORY: It was attended by approximately 200 people. There had been two sessions held with one session attracting approximately 150 people and the second session attracting approximately 50 people.

CULLIGAN: In regard to the plan before us this evening, there is a recommendation from the Village to make up ten feet on the single-family lot. The Village was looking to remove three townhome units and reconfigure units 1 – 3 and 7 – 9 in order to accomplish that. I do not see the reason why we are going to remove three units for this. The plan itself can be done with just removing one and keeping two of the three buildings which would be two and three in that unit. Asked for clarification in that regard.

GREGORY: Indicated Commissioner Culligan has made reference to item 1 in Staff's Report. This is the one point we have looked at long and hard in terms of making this a profitable venture. There is a reason there are a number of units shown on that plan. We feel we've done a great job given the constraints on this site and in providing views. One of the points brought up was that the views weren't as good from 7, 8 and 9. What wasn't brought up was that the entire other side of this is also golf course. When we looked at that, we looked at all of those from 7, 8 and 9 getting a view out to the east. We felt we had done the best we could with the constraints we were given and the quantities we had to hit in making this a profitable venture and a project that Mr. Joyce feels he can go forward with.

CULLIGAN: I do appreciate some of the issues raised by the public such as the roads, security, traffic issues at 143rd. The petitioner will work with the homeowners to assure that to the best of their ability, these issues are addressed.

GREGORY: Yes.

CULLIGAN: Asked Mr. Burns (President of the Homeowners' Association) to approach the podium for a question. Asked him if he feels that the residents of Crystal Tree and himself have had adequate meetings with Mr. Joyce and his group.

BURNS: Yes. I feel that the Board of the Association needs to meet with them again. We need to get this agreement that deals with many of the issues that were talked about and many of the issues that were not talked about and

specifically requires them to join the Association so that they are not a separate entity. We need more meetings to get that done and we need that signed and that includes the definition of what they are going to do such as pay for the roads – there are two pages of this – will not go over that here. However, further meetings are required. We need more work.

CULLIGAN: I've been a resident of Orland Park since 1977 and I am familiar with Crystal Tree. I've been an invited guest at Crystal Tree. I am disappointed that we do not have a park going anywhere in this development, however, was park space considered at the new club house (not that that is in this petition).

GREGORY: That is not our property.

JACOBS: Abstained from any discussion/vote in regard to this petition as she is a resident of Crystal Tree.

PARISI: There are a lot of unresolved issues. Noted it is the responsibility of the Plan Commission to uphold the standards as set forth by the Village for the builders to comply with, and that while we have some assurances that all building setbacks and guidelines and density are met, I do not want to forget that we are Plan Commissioners for the Village and as such we are responsible for several hundred homeowners. In that regard, can say that this looks like a very nice project and know that the builders' reputation precedes him – that is not an issue – however, there are a lot of issues such a security, traffic, etc., that remain unresolved, any one of which would prompt him to ask for a continuance. Expressed his opinion that there hasn't been a sufficient discussion period between the homeowners and the developer. This should be continued.

DZIERWA: Directed his first question to Mr. Burke. Mr. Burke mentioned security, something that is important to all of us. Asked if he personally knows how security for Crystal Tree was handled while it was being developed.

BURKE: Stated that his recollection is sketchy, however, indicated that there was a very, very good attempt at security until one of the homeowners had some serious removal from his garage area (golf clubs and such) at which time the hammer came down. Rosemary came in at that time and did a great job of establishing a better program. At that time it was sufficient, however, that no longer is the case. Currently, there is no video, there is no radio communication between security officers and quite frankly, we are understaffed.

DZIERWA: Indicated he visits Crystal Tree as an invited guest with some frequency. Expressed his observation that there are security concerns. Stated that if homeowners present during the original construction have any recollection as to how security was handled at that time, to please relay them to the builder now, in an attempt to assure security is maintained to a level where you thought it should be.

BURKE: I'd like to talk with Mark on the side because this is a big issue and there are a lot of things we could do. Complimented Mark on what he said this evening to help position the homeowners on what really should be done here. Agree that we should defer this petition until we can get an agreement and get some plans in place.

DZIERWA: Asked Mr. Gregory if he has a time frame as to when the 153rd Street will be open versus when construction will start.

GREGORY: It was my understanding that the new club at its new location would have to be up and running first, prior to it commencing.

DZIERWA: Eventually, 143rd Street is going to be widened. That will make that entrance a whole lot worse. Townhomes 4 – 6 create an obstruction for the site line from 7 – 9. Staff thought that they should go south and basically stay with 1 – 3 and 7 – 9. I think there is a way to compromise here. What really impresses me about Crystal Tree is that everyone has a really nice view but it seems to me that the residents of 7 -9 will be cheated a little bit. I'm thinking that if there is a way to reconfigure by losing an end unit off of two of those such as unit 7 and unit 6 and create a bit of a site line for units 8 and 9 or if the petitioner could simply work with Staff to drop one or two of those townhomes so that we could maintain that community feel. Then by reconfiguring, adding that ten feet onto that single-family lot, that would really bring it closer to the widths in that community. I would recommend continuing this petition.

PARISI: Asked Mr. Gregory if the option was ever raised about the possibility for traffic to get in with an entrance or gate either by 108th or Misty Hill Drive.

GREGORY: That was never brought up to us as an option. That is more of a club and homeowners decision to make.

BURNS: That is also an emergency fire and police entrance and so you do not want to muck that up, however, most important in his mind, that is entirely on the other end of the complex. You'd be dragging the cement trucks through the entire property by coming in on 143rd Street, you're in a half-a-mile and you're in the building area. That would really tear up the place. We have tried with IDOT over the past four years and I have been able to get every politician in this community to support our petition for some form of lighting fixture because I do not want to see that resolved when someone dies. We are not getting anywhere. IDOT and the traffic counts we had done, discounts right turns coming out of your place. That is 2/3rd of our traffic. The other area is not practical. Thank you.

AUBIN: Thanked everyone for their comments. To Messrs. Joyce and Gregory, stated that his question earlier to them about Staff's report and reviewing the conditions for this to go forward, obviously mean that townhome units 4 and 6 and

reconfiguring units 1 and 3, is part of the condition for the site line, and they'll need to sign off on that in order for this to go forward. In regard to the issue of the parks, the developers in Orland Park always have to have cash in lieu of, if they are not going to put a park in a subdivision which is well within the codes of Orland Park. The petitioner has obviously agreed to do that for this particular subdivision so the concern for the park – the petitioner is going to pay for it one way or another. As far as IDOT is concerned, we have absolutely nothing to do with them, obviously. It is simply out of our hands, what they are going to do with that intersection. They have codes and requirements for distances between stop lights that are cast in stone and it will be very difficult, possibly down the road, to put a stop light there. All the questions in regard to security and the integrity of this developer are all in place. I do not think there is anything to worry about, however, I believe there is more conversation that needs to be made between the homeowners and the homeowners' association as well as the developer. Directing this comment to Mrs. Turley, stated there is some guest parking involved with this particular project. Do we need homeowners' association approval to have this particular project, with the guest parking, in order to move forward?

TURLEY: Yes we do. Staff would like to see, if this is continued, as one of the questions resolved as it is pretty basic to this plan working. If the guest parking cannot go along the main drive, then we will have to arrive at another solution.

AUBIN: Entertained a motion from the Plan Commissioners.

I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission the findings of fact set forth in this staff report, dated May 22, 2007.

and

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of the preliminary site plan titled "Proposed Planned Unit Development for Crystal Tree in Orland Park, IL," prepared by Kon-Fer, Inc., dated 02/27/07, job number 2007, sheet SP-1 and the building elevations titled "Old Crystal Tree Townhomes," prepared by LindenGroup, dated 03/12/06, project number 80-06, sheet A-1, subject to the following conditions.

1. The petitioner remove townhome units 4-6 and reconfigure townhome units 1-3 and 7-9 to provide a 100'x135' single family lot instead of a 90' x 135' single family lot.
2. That the petitioner submit a plan showing the proposed property lines for the townhomes and clubhouse, if any, prior to the Committee meeting.
3. That the petitioner submit a landscape and mitigation plan within 60 days of final engineering approval for separate review and approval.

4. That the petitioner receive permission from the Crystal Tree Homeowners Association to construct the proposed parallel parking spaces along Crystal Tree Drive or incorporate those spaces into the clubhouse property.

5. That all final engineering related items are met.

and

I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission the findings of fact set forth in this staff report, dated May 22, 2007.

and

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of a Special Use Permit for Planned Development for the Crystal Tree Clubhouse Redevelopment, subject to the same conditions as outlined in the preliminary site plan approval.

and

I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission the findings of fact set forth in this staff report, dated May 22, 2007.

and

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of a Subdivision for the Crystal Tree Clubhouse Redevelopment subject to the same conditions as outlined in the preliminary site plan approval.

A motion was made by Commissioner Steve Dzierwa, seconded by Commissioner Nick Parisi, that this matter be CONTINUED to the Plan Commission. The motion CARRIEDunanimously.

Aye: 4 - Commissioner Dzierwa, Commissioner Aubin, Commissioner Culligan and Commissioner Parisi

Nay: 0

Abstain: 1 - Commissioner Jacobs

Absent: 2 - Commissioner Stephens and Commissioner Thompson

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

AUBIN: There being no further business before the Plan Commissioners, the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Teri Dougherty
Recording Secretary