

Village of Bartlett

Plan Commission Meeting

Minutes

April 9, 2015

Chairman Deyne called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Roll Call

Present: R. Deyne, M. Hopkins, J. Lemberg, J. Miaso, T. Ridenour, D. Negele, S. Cook, A. Hopkins, J. Kallas, T. Connor

Absent: None

Also Present: J. Plonczynski, CD Director; R. Grill, Asst. CD Director; M. Schwarz, Village Planner

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the December 11, 2014 meeting.

Motioned by: J. Kallas

Seconded by: D. Negele

Ayes: M. Hopkins, J. Lemberg, J. Miaso, D. Negele, A. Hopkins, J. Kallas

Nays: None

Abstain: T. Ridenour, S. Cook, T. Connor

The motion carried.

Case # 14-04 Iglesia Bautista Betel – Site Plan Amendment to Expand an Existing Parking Lot

The petitioner, Dr. Elmer Fernandez, Pastor for Iglesia Bautista Betel Church was present. The subject property is located at 600 W. Lake Street, Bartlett, IL.

Roberta Grill gave some background information.

R. Grill – The petitioner is requesting a Site Plan Amendment to a 2.9 acre church site to expand an existing parking lot. The building, as you may recall, was the former Bartwood Funeral Home that was re-zoned from B-2 Neighborhood Shopping District to the ER-1 Estate Residence District with an accompanying Site Plan review for the church back in 2003. The Iglesia Bautista Betel’s congregation has steadily grown over the years and has outgrown this site. They rented space within the former World Overcomers Church, now the Encounter Church, which is located at the southeast corner of Lake Street and Naperville Road and approached the owners to discuss possible options for a more permanent solution. The two churches entered into an agreement to swap church sites with Iglesia Bautista Betel agreeing to several improvements on the former site. These improvements included the expansion of the parking lot to meet the needs of the Encounter Church, engineering and drainage improvements, additional lighting and landscaping. The plans before you and submitted to Staff reflect these proposed improvements.

There are currently 37 spaces provided on the site and the petitioners are proposing to increase this number to 83 spaces, with four (4) accessible spaces which exceeds the Zoning Ordinance requirement of 63 spaces. At this time there are no changes proposed to the building or canopy. Access to this site will also remain the same with an existing right-in/right-out located along Lake Street and a full access point (private drive access) located along North Bartlett Road (*she indicates the locations on the map*). The private drive was widened to 20 feet in width to better accommodate two-way vehicular traffic. Two new light poles will be included within the expanded parking lot along with several wall lights placed on the building’s north and west elevations to improve security and lighting on the site. Dead landscaping will also be replaced and new landscaping will be added to screen the new parking areas to meet current code requirements. There is a 0.38 acre depressional wetland consisting of emergent vegetation and open water located along the north property line and continues off-site (*she indicates the location on the map*). A 50 foot buffer area has been provided around the wetland as well as an additional depressional area with a rain garden. This rain garden will consist of native plant species to aid in detaining the water draining from this site as well as improving the water quality and meeting best management practices.

Church services for the new Encounter Church are 10:00 am on Sundays and 7:00 pm on Wednesday evenings. Engineering and Landscape Plans are currently being reviewed by the Staff. Staff recommends approval of the petitioner’s request for a Site Plan Amendment to expand an existing parking lot subject to the conditions and Findings of Fact outlined in your Staff report.

R. Deyne – Thank you Roberta. Are there any questions from the Commission members?

T. Ridenour – Is the private drive on property they own or is it an easement?

R. Grill – It is an easement. It is a 30 foot wide access easement that has been there for many years. It was even there when the funeral home was there.

R. Deyne – Didn't it also come into play when the retail or commercial development was going in there?

R. Grill – Yes. There were more improvements that were going to be done to that drive if the commercial sites were going to be developed.

A. Hopkins – Will there be left turns permitted from the North Bartlett Road roadway?

R. Grill – Yes. You will be able to turn left from North Bartlett Road onto the private access drive. It is a full access point.

R. Deyne – Are there any other questions? *No response from the Commissioners.* Does the petitioner wish to add anything at this point?

Dr. Fernandez – No.

A motion was made to approve the petitioner's request for a Site Plan Amendment to Expand an Existing Parking Lot, along with the recommendations of Staff and the Findings of Fact.

Motioned by: J. Miaso

Seconded by: T. Ridenour

Roll Call

Ayes: M. Hopkins, J. Lemberg, J. Miaso, T. Ridenour, D. Negele, S. Cook, A. Hopkins, J. Kallas, T. Connor

Nays: None

The motion carried.

R. Deyne - Good luck to you. Jim, do you know when this will go before the Village Board?

J. Plonczynski – We are trying to get it to the Village Board for the first meeting in May.

Case # 14-08 Artis Senior Living of Bartlett – Final Subdivision Plat and Final PUD/Site Plan for Lot 1

The petitioner, Jay Hicks on behalf of Artis Senior Living, was present. Also present were Attorney Katriina McGuire of Thompson Coburn LLC and Kevin Serafin of Cemcon Ltd.

Roberta Grill gave some background information.

R. Grill – The petitioner is requesting a Final Subdivision and Final PUD/Site Plan for Lot 1 approval for a vacant 10.1 acre parcel along the east side of Route 59, south of Apple Valley Drive. The Preliminary Subdivision, PUD and Special Use were recommended for approval by this Commission and approved by the Village Board back in November of 2014.

The proposed one-story brick and vinyl sided building for senior housing would be located on Lot 1 of the three lot subdivision. Lot 2 at this time would remain vacant and Lot 3 would consist of the detention area. The Site Plan on Lot 1 contains 38 parking spaces and exceeds the Zoning Ordinance requirement of 32 spaces. A circular turn-around area has been provided in front of the building to provide an accessible drop-off and/or pick-up of residents. The Final PUD/Site Plan identifies a right-in/right-out access point on Route 59. *She identifies the location on the map.* Route 59 is under the jurisdiction of IDOT and the permit for this curb cut would be issued by this agency. A 25-foot wide private drive would provide access to both Lots 1 and 2 of this proposed subdivision.

As discussed during the Preliminary review, a “Proposed Permitted Use List” for Future Lot 2 is attached and will be an Exhibit to the proposed Ordinance, if approved, at a later date. The petitioner considers these uses compatible with the proposed memory care facility. The Staff is continuing to review the Final Engineering and Landscape plans. The Final Subdivision Plat and Final PUD/Site Plan for Lot 1 are in substantial compliance with the approved Preliminary Subdivision and Preliminary PUD/Site Plan for Lot 1. Staff recommends approval subject to the conditions and Findings of Fact outlined in your Staff report.

R. Deyne – Are there any questions from the Commissioners?

J. Lemberg – Under 1-D of the Recommendations of Staff, it states “Ingress and egress for Proposed Lot 2 to and from Route 59 shall be re-evaluated at the time a PUD Plan and/or Plat of Re-subdivision is submitted for Proposed Lot 2 to determine whether utilizing the right-in/right-out on Route 59 along with the private drive provide for safe and efficient movement of traffic and access onto Route 59”. Shouldn’t we be more positive and have it “safe and efficient” now?

R. Grill – I’ll have the petitioner address that question.

K. Serafin – I’m Kevin Serafin and the design engineer on this site. I don’t know where the verbiage “safe and efficient” came from in the Staff report, but we don’t have any idea what will eventually go back there so we can’t really do a traffic study for any use back there. So, we will evaluate it at such time as something wishes to go back there. But that is the only access that they will have, i.e. the right-in/right-out access from Route 59. That is all IDOT will give us.

J. Lemberg – Okay, when something comes in there and you find out that it isn’t “safe and efficient”, what are you going to do?

K. Serafin – They will have to use that access point. It will have to be “safe and efficient”. So, the use for Lot 2 will have to be compatible with that access point. Because that is all that IDOT will grant us for this site.

R. Grill – I think that at the time that Lot 2 develops, depending on what goes back there, whether it is a Re-subdivision or simply a Site Plan, it will depend on the use, the number of trips generated, and the possibility that at a future time, a connection can be made to the north to provide access to a traffic signal at Apple Valley Drive. Maybe that comes back into the picture again; we don’t know. We have been in contact with the property owners to the north, but at this time they will not agree to an access or connection of a private drive.

T. Ridenour – And that connection would be through their parking lot?

R. Grill – Yes.

M. Hopkins – I was not part of the Plan Commission’s previous discussion of this project. Can I ask, how was a property with a right-in/right-out, as a single means of access, made acceptable to the Commission? In the Preliminary Plan?

T. Ridenour – Basically, because the residents of this project aren’t going to be traveling in and out of the site. It will only be employees and a few visitors.

M. Hopkins – So, when visitors or deliveries come and they need to go southbound on Route 59, what do we expect that they are going to do?

A. Hopkins – I agree, I think that is an issue and if Lot 2 wants to get developed, I can’t imagine that someone is going to want to have to deal with that type of right-in/right-out for a business back there.

K. Serafin – As you can see from the aerial photo, it is developed all around and IDOT will not give us two places of access. They will only give us one right-in/right-out access to this site. If the church site ever develops, we might be able to get a second means of access there, but at this point in time, there is no way to get safely in from southbound Route 59.

M. Hopkins – My gut reaction to that is this site is not ready for development and won’t be until such time that it has proper access.

J. Plonczynski – Let me just remind the Commission, that we have already granted the Special Use for the PUD. We have approved the Preliminary PUD and we approved the Preliminary Plat of Subdivision and the property has zoning and they have been granted this access point. So, all those factors figured in, if you didn’t want it, we should have talked about that earlier. But we have already granted all of those things. We have talked about the access to the south; we have talked about the access to the north. The petitioner has begged the property owner to the north to give him a cross-access easement. We have talked to him. He refuses to do anything. The property to the south could be a possibility. The right-in/right-out for a left turn, we have looked at a deceleration lane; we have looked at left turn lanes on Route 59. It is too close to the traffic light. It is in the taper. If a delivery truck wants to go into the site, they go in via a right-hand turn. If they want to go southbound, they have to go north, turn at Apple Valley and do a U-turn and then come back down. That goes the same for the employees that will

work here and for any of the residents' visitors. That is the type of maneuver that has to be done if you want to go south from this property.

M. Hopkins – So, what you are saying is that, based on the Village process is here, the right-in/right-out is a done deal and it is off the table.

J. Plonczynski – It is the only thing that IDOT will grant, you are right about that.

M. Hopkins – That is not what I am saying. In terms of what our process is and what the Village has already negotiated and approved...

J. Plonczynski – They looked at different locations for the right-in/right-out, but that is all they are getting.

M. Hopkins – What I am asking you is, based on our process, and I am prefacing this by saying that I was not here for the previous deliberations, so based upon our process, you are saying that it is not the right thing to do to object to this at this moment. Is that correct?

J. Plonczynski – You can voice concerns, but I am just reminding you that we have already done the zoning and the Special Use. This is in substantial compliance with the Preliminary Plat.

M. Hopkins – I understand that.

R. Deyne – They have approved the Preliminary Plan and have moved forward on it.

D. Negele – I think it will be difficult getting something on that site (Lot 2) knowing they only have a right-in/right-out access.

R. Deyne – Well, that would become their responsibility then.

D. Negele – Right. That site might sit there and not develop because it will not be favorable to a future development.

J. Plonczynski – Yes. I would agree with that.

D. Negele – So, whoever has money invested in that site, I don't know if they can afford to let it sit there like that.

R. Deyne - I would just like to draw everyone's attention to item # 7 under the Discussion Topic (page 2). It says "The Final Subdivision Plat and Final PUD/Site Plan for Lot 1 are in substantial compliance with the approved Preliminary Subdivision and Preliminary PUD/Site Plan for Lot 1." So, that is where we are at.

M. Hopkins – My second question has to do with mechanical equipment and being exposed on the building. Is there any? On the site or the roof that we are not seeing on the drawings?

R. Grill – To my knowledge they will not be visible, but I would like the petitioner to answer that. They are not visible from the street? They are screened from the residents?

K. Serafin – That is correct.

M. Hopkins – Thank you. That's it.

R. Deyne – Are there any other questions or comments from the Commissioners?

J. Kallas – I think we sort of messed this up the first time around. As much as I opposed a lot of this, I was the only one. And I can oppose it again.

T. Ridenour – Well, I'll speak to the other side of that coin. When we discussed this the last time, because of the limited use of vehicles by the residents here, at least I, made the assumption that this right-in/right-out was sufficient for that. They may never get anything on the back lot because of this or unless they find another way, but for this use that we are addressing now...

J. Kallas – I still don't believe that you can have something like this and not have any type of emergency exit/entrance. And I still believe that whole heatedly, that something has to be done but in order to do that. Because, as I am going to put it very bluntly, if there is an accident at that point and where you can't get in and out, and they need an ambulance, and somebody dies, you can consider that, by approving it, as murder.

A. Hopkins – I have just a quick question about the retention pond. That will be added in, correct? Will that be sufficient drainage with the surrounding houses? I know there is a big issue down at BAPS down the road and other areas. I just want to make sure that the retention that will be put in there, will be able to hold a 100-year flood and everything.

K. Serafin – Yes. We are going back and forth with the Village and IDOT. IDOT actually has more stringent requirements than the Village or the County. We are working through those issues with the Village now.

R. Grill – Yes, we are still working on that.

J. Kallas – Roberta, can we put something in the motion that they need some kind of an emergency exit/entrance.

R. Grill – The problem is that Route 59 is under the jurisdiction of IDOT. This is what IDOT has granted. Any emergency access out on Route 59 would have to be approved by IDOT.

J. Kallas – No. I mean, can't we get the owner of the property to the north to have them access the strip mall to the north? I know there is a way to get from one property to another.

R. Grill – The owner to the north would have to give permission to utilize that. We have approached them many times over many years on the different projects that have come in to this site and we have always been told no.

J. Plonczynski – I will remind you that our Fire District reviewed these plans and they are satisfied with the design and the wrap-around-drive in order to get to all sides of the building. They are satisfied with that.

J. Kallas – Fine. That’s into the building, but what happens if there is a situation, I hope it never happens, but the situation where you need an emergency into the site. Then what?

J. Plonczynski – I think they would have to figure out a way to drive over the lawn or drive around the accident or they would move the car. That is what they would end up doing.

R. Grill – That’s what they do. They would move the vehicle.

R. Deyne – Yes, they will get in there.

J. Kallas – My comments still stand from the last meeting and they will stand for this one too.

A motion was made to approve the Final Subdivision Plat and Final PUD/Site Plan for Lot 1, along with the recommendations of Staff and the Findings of Fact.

Motioned by: J. Miaso
Seconded by: T. Connor

Discussion

None

Roll Call

Ayes: M. Hopkins, J. Lemberg, J. Miaso, T. Ridenour, D. Negele, S. Cook, A. Hopkins,
T. Connor

Nays: J. Kallas

The motion carried.

R. Deyne – Our recommendation will be forwarded to the Village Board.

Case # 14-15 Sanzeri's Subdivision – Rezoning from ER-1 to SR-2 and Preliminary/Final Subdivision – PUBLIC HEARING

The petitioners, Dana and Linda Sanzeri, were present and sworn in. The subject property is located on the south side of West Railroad Avenue, west of South Western Avenue, commonly known as 429 West Railroad Avenue, Bartlett, IL.

Chairman Deyne opened the Public Hearing.

The following Exhibits were presented:

- Exhibit A - Picture of Sign**
- Exhibit B - Mail Affidavit**
- Exhibit C - Notification of Publication**

M. Schwarz gave some background information.

M. Schwarz – The petitioner is requesting a Zoning Map Amendment or Rezoning from ER-1, Estate Residence District to SR-2, Suburban Residence District classification and a Preliminary/Final Plat of Subdivision for a proposed two lot residential subdivision, known as Sanzeri's Subdivision. The subject property is currently developed with a one-story, 900 square-foot, detached house, a detached 2-car garage and a 20' by 12' detached shed. The petitioner is proposing to demolish the existing structures to allow for the construction of two, new single-family houses. As shown on the Plat, the larger, Lot 1 is 17,325 square feet and the smaller lot, Lot 2, is 10,844 square feet.

The petitioner has stated she intends to construct a home on the western lot, Lot 1, and market the eastern lot, Lot 2, for sale as a built-to-suit property. Both of the lots meet the minimum standards of the SR-2 Zoning District and the minimum lot requirement. The project would be in line with a net density of 2.76 dwelling units per acre, which is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, designating the area as Suburban Residential. There are public utility and drainage easements along all property lines in accordance with the Subdivision and PUD Ordinance. Since the subject property is less than 3 acres, no detention is required for the subdivision. However, in accordance with the new DuPage County Stormwater Ordinance, Post-Construction Best Management Practices (PCBMP) will be required on an individual lot basis if the impervious area for each house is more than 2, 500 square feet. This will be reviewed by the Building and Public Works Departments during the building permit review process.

The existing house is already connected to Village sewer and water service. There is no surface visible evidence of a well or septic field. If they are discovered during the construction, they will have to be capped in accordance with the DuPage County Health Department standards. There is an existing 5-foot concrete sidewalk that transitions to a deteriorating 5-foot path in front of the property. In accordance with the most recent West Bartlett Road Corridor Plan and as part of this development, the existing 5-foot sidewalk/path will be replaced with an 8-foot asphalt path along the frontage of both lots. The Engineering Plans are currently being reviewed and new Bartlett addresses will need to be assigned to the two lots. Staff recommends approval of the Map Amendment/Rezoning and the Preliminary/Final Plat of Subdivision, subject to the 4 conditions listed in your Staff report and I would like to verbally add this Finding of Fact: 1) The proposed Re-zoning and the Preliminary/Final Plat are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan for the area.

M. Hopkins – Mr. Chairman, I need to recuse myself from this discussion. (Time: 7:28 pm)

J. Kallas – I am looking at the map showing the two lots. It lists the street as Railroad Avenue. The other maps in our packet list the street as West Bartlett Road. What is the name of the road?

M. Schwarz – Well, it is actually both. The transition line is just at the edge of this property where West Bartlett Road is officially re-named West Railroad Avenue.

A. Hopkins – Why is this to be re-zoned to SR-2 over SR-3, which is right there and SR-4 is just to the north?

R. Deyne – The zoning designation is simply a density issue. The density represents the number of dwelling units per acre.

R. Grill – In addition, the lot sizes are closest to the SR-2 Zoning District requirements.

T. Ridenour – Does the impervious surface area of 2,500 square feet apply to any size lot in the SR-2 District? Because one lot is 17,000 square feet and the other lot is 10,000 square feet. So, is it for any size lot?

R. Grill – Yes, 2,500 square feet.

M. Schwarz – That would include the paved surfaces, the patio, the driveway, the front sidewalk, and the footprint of the house itself.

J. Plonczynski – It is a new requirement. The DuPage County Stormwater Ordinance has taken into account undeveloped lots, throughout the county. So, when you disturb that much, you have to use these Best Management Practice guidelines/requirements.

R. Deyne – Are there any questions from the audience?

Margaret Deyne resides at 511 Morse Avenue, Bartlett, IL.

M. Deyne – I am a Deputy Assessor in Cook County. This property is in Cook County and you keep saying DuPage County. It is not in DuPage County, so why are you saying DuPage County? I am puzzled.

J. Plonczynski – Just to clarify, we use the DuPage County Stormwater Ordinance throughout the Village, whether the property is in Kane County, Cook County or DuPage County for uniformity.

R. Deyne – Are there any other questions from the audience? *No response from the audience.* Are there any other questions from the Commissioners? *No response from the Commissioners.*

A motion was made to approve the petitioner's request for Rezoning from ER-1 to SR-2 and Preliminary/Final Subdivision, along with the recommendations of Staff and the Findings of Fact.

Motioned by: **A. Hopkins**
Seconded by: **J. Miaso**

Discussion

None

Roll Call

Ayes: J. Lemberg, J. Miaso, T. Ridenour, D. Negele, A. Hopkins, J. Kallas, T. Connor

Nays: None

Abstain: S. Cook

The motion carried.

Chairman Deyne closed the Public Hearing.

R. Deyne – Good luck. We will pass on our recommendation to the Village Board.

Case # 15-04 Seasons Produce – Special Use Permit (2nd Amendment) – a) to Allow for the Expansion of the Outdoor Sales Area and b) Add Friday Hours - PUBLIC HEARING

The petitioner, Valery Kapadoukakis on behalf of Seasons Produce and Specialty Market, was present and sworn in. The subject site is located on the west side of Route 59, north of Stearns Road, in the Bartlett Commons Shopping Center, Bartlett, IL.

Chairman Deyne opened the Public Hearing.

The following Exhibits were presented:

- Exhibit A - Picture of Sign**
- Exhibit B - Mail Affidavit**
- Exhibit C - Notification of Publication**

Mike Schwarz gave some background information.

M. Schwarz – This is a request for a Special Use Permit - 2nd Amendment as indicated to allow for the expansion of the outdoor sales area and to add Friday hours. Initially, the petitioner was granted a Special Use Permit in 2011 for outdoor seasonal sales. The petitioner was subsequently granted an amendment to the Special Use Permit in 2013 to expand the area of the market and to expand the season of the market. The petitioner is now requesting a second amendment to the Special Use Permit to again expand the area itself and to add Friday hours. The petitioner is now requesting an area of 50' x 90' that would have a 40' x 80' tent within that area. The petitioner is currently operating the market every Saturday and Sunday from 8 am until 5 pm from May 1st through November 30th. Now they are seeking to operate on Fridays from 11 am until 8 pm. The market would consist, again, primarily of whole produce with a small amount of flowers and oils. Only one vendor would be at the site and one small box truck would deliver the produce. Again, the tent would be increased from the previous 30' x 40' to a proposed 40' x 80' tent. As a reminder, the petitioner previously contacted the DuPage County Health Department and because only whole produce is being sold at this location, no permit is required. There will be no food preparation on the site. A building permit will be required for the proposed seasonal tent as has been required in the past. The market will only occupy approximately 20 parking spaces, which includes 2 parking spaces for a small box truck. The Bartlett Commons shopping Center currently has 422 parking spaces. Staff believes that the site will adequately accommodate this proposed use. Finally, the owner of the property has granted permission for the petitioner to expand their outdoor sales area and to apply for the Special Use Permit 2nd Amendment. The letter is in your packet. Staff recommends approval of the petitioner's request, subject to the two conditions listed and the three Findings of Fact stated in your Staff report.

R. Deyne - Are there any questions from the Commissioners? *There was no response from the Commissioners.* Does the petitioner wish to add anything?

V. Kapadoukakis – Only to ask, how soon can we open?

R. Deyne – Well, you will have to wait until you have approval from the Village Board. From what I have heard tonight, it should be the first Tuesday in May.

J. Plonczynski – We are going to try to get this to the Village Board a little quicker.

R. Deyne – The best thing you can do is to keep in touch with Staff and they will let you know when this will be on a Village Board agenda. Are there any other questions from anyone? *There was no response.*

A motion was made to approve the petitioner’s request for a Special Use Permit, 2nd Amendment to (a) allow for the expansion of the outdoor sales area and (b) to add Friday hours, along with the recommendations of Staff and the Findings of Fact.

Motioned by: J. Miaso
Seconded by: J. Kallas

Discussion

None

Roll Call

Ayes: M. Hopkins, J. Lemberg, J. Miaso, T. Ridenour, S. Cook, A. Hopkins, J. Kallas,
T. Connor
Nays: None
Abstain: D. Negele

Chairman Deyne closed the Public Hearing.

R. Deyne – Good luck to you.

Old Business / New Business

R. Deyne – I would like to welcome new Commissioner, T. Connor, to the Plan Commission. Why don't you take a moment to tell us something about yourself?

T. Connor – I have been a Bartlett resident for 33 years and in my third house in Bartlett. My wife worked for Bartlett High School and we raised our son here. I am a partner in an insurance agency in Lisle, Illinois. And I am happy to be a civic servant.

R. Deyne – Well, welcome aboard. We are pleased to have you. I know that I am conflicting old business with new business, but this is my last meeting with the Plan Commission and as Chairman. I think it is appropriate this evening that we have an election for a new Chairman. With that, I would like to nominate Jim Lemberg for that position. Are there any more nominations from the floor? *No response from the Commissioners.*

A motion was made to nominate Jim Lemberg for the position of Chairman of the Plan Commission.

Motioned by: R. Deyne
Seconded by: J. Kallas

Roll Call

Ayes: R. Deyne, M. Hopkins, J. Miaso, T. Ridenour, D. Negele, S. Cook, A. Hopkins, J. Kallas, T. Connor
Nays: None
Abstain: J. Lemberg

The motion carried.

R. Deyne – Congratulations, Jim. Is there any other new business?

J. Plonczynski – I have something else, but I will wait until you are finished.

R. Deyne – No, I will close the meeting before I say what I have to say.

J. Plonczynski – Okay, I'll go then. As Ray stated, this is his last meeting and those of you here know that Ray is not leaving us, he is just leaving the Plan Commission and going on to become a Village Trustee. That is something that we all look forward to. Ray has served 34 years on the Plan Commission and most of them as Chairman. He has been a great Chairman. The Staff, past and present, has loved working for him and the Village has always appreciated your efforts, your guidance and your service to the community. That being said, we have a token of our appreciation to give to you.

Jim Plonczynski presented Chairman Deyne with a congratulatory plaque with gavel.

R. Deyne – When someone asked me why I didn't want to serve one more year, for 35 years, I told them I believe in term limits. *(Laughter)* And as my last official duty as Chairman of the Plan Commission, I would like to recommend that all of your salaries be increased by 100%. But, seriously, I have enjoyed

Plan Commission Minutes
April 9, 2015

serving with you all. You have been great. And, Staff has been wonderful. If it wasn't for Staff, this Village wouldn't be where it is at. Thank you all very much. Let's go have cake.

The meeting adjourned at 7:44 pm.