



Village of Itasca
Plan Commission Regular Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, July 15, 2020 - 7:00 p.m.
Plan Commission Meeting Conducted Through Zoom

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

1. Call to Order:

Commissioner Holmes called the Village of Itasca Plan Commission Regular Meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. on July 15, 2020.

2. Roll Call:

Present: Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray

Absent: Chairman Kischner

Others Present: Shannon Malik Jarmusz (Director of Community Development), Mo Khan (Village Planner), Yordana Wysocki (Village Attorney), Peggy Michet (Recording Secretary)

3. New Business:

A. Adoption of Plan Commission Public Hearings Protocols During Covid-19

Commissioner Holmes asked if the Commissioners had any questions regarding the adoption of Plan Commission Public Hearings Protocol During COVID-19 and none were raised. Each Commissioner and staff confirmed that they understood the protocols and had no questions.

Call for Motion: Commissioner Holmes asked for a motion to approve the adoption of Plan Commission Public Hearings Protocols during COVID-19.

Motion: Commissioner Swets

Second: Commissioner Carello

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Commissioners Daly; Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Motion Carried

- B. Case:** PC 20-007
Petitioner: Quadrangle Development
Owner: 870 Arlington, LLC & Arlington Thorndale, LLC
Location: 870 & 900 N. Arlington Heights Rd.
Request: Petition for Preliminary & Final Plat of Subdivision Approval

Roll Call to Open Case # PC 20-007:

Present: Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray

Absent: Chairman Kischner

Others Present: Shannon Malik Jarmusz (Director of Community Development), Mo Khan (Village Planner), Yordana Wysocki (Village Attorney), Peggy Michet (Recording Secretary)

Petitioner and Public Sworn In By the Court Reporter

Petitioner Presentation: Tim Sweeney presented on behalf of petitioner noting that in September 2019 the Commission granted approval for the construction of a 50,000 square foot Planned Development and Class I Site Plan review for a single-story manufacturing, warehouse and office building for Option Care (Case #PC 19-014). However, the plans submitted at that time indicated a Plat of Subdivision would be required to reflect a lot area. While a Petition for Subdivision and Plat of Subdivision was not prepared at that time pending more information, he shared it had been determined that the lot line would shift approximately 83 feet to the west. The petitioner anticipated completion of the building by August 20 and expressed their desire to finalize all outstanding Village items. He added all plats had been submitted to the Village and approved.

Staff Report:

Mr. Khan provided an overview of the Planning & Zoning Analysis prepared noting the following:

- There is no minimum lot standard requirements in a B2 District
- Provisions of the Subdivision Ordinance related to School & Park District Land Donation, payment or fee-in-lieu are not applicable as there are no proposed residential units
- Provisions related to public street design are not applicable as no new public streets are proposed
- Provisions related to storm water management have been addressed as part of the previous Planned Development and Class I Site Plan Approval
- The Final Plat requirements would be addressed during the final review by the Village's Community Development and Engineering staff after approval

In summary, Mr. Khan noted that the proposed Plat of Subdivision would clear up the property line and include the required parking needed for the Options Care business on its own property and would not alter the characteristics of the area. He also shared the Required Standards of Review for Subdivisions.

He continued noting two Staff Recommended Conditions of approval to be included if a favorable recommendation was made by the Plan Commission. The conditions included:

1. Final Plat of Subdivision must be in substantial compliance with the Plan Commission and Village Board Submittals.

2. Final Plat of Subdivision shall be reviewed and approved by the Village's Community Development and Engineering staff prior to recording the Plat with the DuPage County Recorder's Office.

Commission Discussion: Commissioner Swets asked if the lot would move to the east or west and Mr. Sweeney noted it would be moving to the west and this would not modify anything previously approved by the Board. Commissioner Daly asked if the change effects storm water storage and Mr. Khan stated that the change in lot lines has no effect. He also asked if it would have any tax implications and Mr. Khan stated the classifications would remain the same.

Public Comment: As of July 8, 2020, Village staff had not received any public comments regarding this petition. Commissioner Holmes asked if there were any public comments or concerns and with none raised, closed the public comment portion of the hearing.

Call for Motion:

Commissioner Holmes asked for a motion to approve.

Motion: Commissioner Swets made a motion to recommend approval of the Preliminary and Final Plat of Subdivision for 870 & 900 N. Arlington Heights Rd.

Second: Commissioner Carello

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Motion Carried

Commissioner Holmes stated that they would move to the Public Hearings and return to the regular meeting following closure of the public hearings.

4. **Review and Consideration of Regular Meeting Minutes June 17, 2020:**

Call for Motion:

Chairman Kischner asked for a motion to approve the June 17, 2020 meeting minutes

Motion: Commissioner Swets made a motion to approve the Meeting Minutes for the June 17, 2020 Plan Commission Meeting Minutes with the noted changes.

Second: Commissioner Daly

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Commissioners Daly; Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Motion Carried

5. **Public Comment:**

None made

6. **Project Updates and Announcements:**

Mr. Khan gave an overview of next month's meeting that would include the review and consideration of four applications. In addition, Attorney Wysocki noted that Case #PC19-014/Haymarket, would not be heard during the August Plan Commission meeting based on concern of a possible return to a COVID-19 Phase 3 and the continuation of Zoom meetings.

7. **Executive Session:**

None Required

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Holmes asked for a motion to adjourn the Village of Itasca Plan Commission Regular Meeting at 9:25 p.m.

Motion: Commissioner Carello made a motion to adjourn.

Second: Commissioner Swets

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Commissioners Daly; Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Motion Carried

NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 at Itasca Village Hall, 550 W. Irving Park Road, Itasca, IL 60143 (*Location subject to change.*)

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Call To Order

Commissioner Holmes called the Village of Itasca Plan Commission Public Hearings to order at 7:17 p.m.

1. **Case #:**

PC 19-014 (Continuation)

Petitioner: Haymarket DuPage LLC

Owner: Pearl Hospitality LLC

Location: 860 West Irving Park Road

Request: Petition for a planned development by special use with exceptions and Class I Site Plan approval all in order to permit a mixed-use residential and healthcare facility and other accessory uses in the B-2 Community Business District at 860 W. Irving Park Road.

Roll Call to Open Case # PC 19-014:

Present: Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray;

Absent: Chairman Kischner

Call for Motion:

Commissioner Holmes asked for a motion to continue Case #PC 19-014 to the Wednesday, August 19, 2020 Plan Commission meeting.

Motion: Commissioner Carello

Second: Commissioner Daly

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Commissioners Daly, Carello, Holmes, Drummond, Ray

Nay: None

Recused: Commissioner Swets

Motion Carried

It was noted that Bridget O’Keefe (legal representation for Haymarket) was online and asked if she had any question – none were raised.

2. **Case #:** **PC 20-010**
Petitioner: Rosaleen Ann Bradley
Owner: Rosaleen Ann Bradley
Location: 340 Home Avenue
Request: Petition for Variances to Lot Coverage Requirements in the R-2 Zoning District to allow for the construction of a patio.

Roll Call to Open Case # PC 20-010:

Present: Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray;

Absent: Chairman Kischner

Others Present: Shannon Malik Jarmusz (Director of Community Development), Mo Khan (Village Planner), Yordana Wysocki (Village Attorney), Peggy Michet (Recording Secretary)

Petitioner and Public Sworn in by the Court Reporter

Staff Report:

Mr. Khan provided an overview of the Planning & Zoning Analysis prepared regarding the petition and in summary noted that the subject property at 340 Home Avenue situated on a smaller parcel is required to have a smaller portion of their lot improved with impervious surface. Further, the location of the detached garage, being located further to the rear of the property, would require more pavement from the street to reach the detached garage thus resulting in less impervious area to be used for improvements (such as a patio). He then shared the three Staff Recommended Conditions of Approval - should the Plan Commission come to

a favorable recommendation – recommending 50% rather than variance request of 51.5%. He also noted three Staff Recommended Conditions of Approval that included:

1. Permit Documents must be in substantial compliance with the Plan Commission and Village Board Submittals.
2. The proposed patio must comply with all Village Ordinance and Building Codes in place at time of permit application.
3. The proposed patio shall be completed within one (1) year from the date of Ordinance approval.

Mr. Khan provided background information on this petition noting that a patio permit was applied for in May 2020 and was determined during the permit review process that the property exceeded the maximum 40% lot coverage allowed for non-confirming lots within the R-2, Single-family Residence District; a new impervious area would not be permitted. The Petitioner asked for a variance to the lot coverage requirement to construct an approximately 210 square foot patio at the rear of the home.

Petitioner Presentation: Rosaleen Bradley presented on behalf of Oxford Bank & Trust #1217 - property owner of 340 Home Avenue had nothing to add.

Commission Discussion: Commissioner Drummond asked if the reduced size would be acceptable to the petitioner and they agreed. Commissioner Carello asked Mr. Khan why not approve the extra 1.5% and Mr. Khan responded that his recommendation was in line with the other zoning districts. Commissioner Daly asked if storm water retention would need to be reviewed and Mr. Khan stated that it would not be required by DuPage County guidelines. Commissioner Daly agreed with Commissioner Daly on the 1.5%. Commissioner Holmes asked for clarification of building and impervious coverage and Mr. Khan proceeded to provide the information to the Commissioners. Commissioner Ray also agreed with Commissioners Carello and Daly that the full 51.5% should be approved as was the consensus of the Plan Commissioners in attendance.

Public Comment: Commissioner Holmes asked if there were any public comments or concerns and with none were raised, closed the public comment portion of the hearing.

Legal Findings of Fact: Attorney Wysocki shared the findings of fact required for a variance that were included in the staff memorandum in the meeting packet. She noted that the property is a legal nonconforming property in a R2 and added that the variance met the standards for variance.

Call for Roll Call Vote:

Attorney Wysocki asked for a roll call vote to confirm agreement of Commissioners with her legal findings.

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Chairman Holmes, Drummond, Ray

Nay: None
Abstain: None
Motion Carried

Call for Motion:

Commissioner Holmes asked for a motion to approve the petition for variance.

Motion: Commissioner Drummond recommend approval of a variance to Section 7.05-7-b of the Zoning Ordinance to allow for a lot coverage of 51.5%, or 3,886 square feet as described in the petition, attached documents, and subject to staff recommended Conditions #1-3.

Second: Commissioner Daly

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Chairman Holmes, Drummond, Ray

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Motion Carried

Commissioner Holmes advised the petitioner that the motion passed and to discuss with staff when they would appear before the Village Board. Mr. Khan advised that he would be in contact with them.

Commissioner Holmes closed Public Hearing #PC 20-010.

3. **Case #:** **PC 20-009**
Petitioner: MRK Realty, LLC
Owner: MRK Realty, LLC
Location: 1133 North Prospect Avenue.
Request: Petition for Variances to Number of Permitted Wall Signs and Wall Sign Area to allow for the constructions of two wall signs.

Roll Call to Open:

Present: Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray,

Absent: Chairman Kischner

Others Present: Shannon Malik Jarmusz (Director of Community Development), Mo Khan (Village Planner), Yordana Wysocki (Village Attorney), Peggy Michet (Recording Secretary)

Petitioner and Public Sworn In

Staff Report:

Mr. Khan stated the petitioner is requesting approval of a wall sign that exceeds 48 square feet as required by Section 13.03-3 (signage review only). In addition, he also requested a variance to Section 13.03-3-a of the Zoning Ordinance to allow for two wall signs, whereas the maximum allowed is one. He shared that the Village Board had approved Ordinance #1918-

19 in July 2019 granting an amendment to the Prospect Courtyard Office Park Planned Development, Special Use Permit and Class I Site Plan approval for Kiddie Academy to operate a childcare facility.

He noted that the construction of the Kiddie Academy building is nearing completion. The petitioner submitted a sign permit application and, after zoning review by Village staff, it was determined that Kiddie Academy would need to request approval and a variance for their proposed wall signage. He stated that staff was in agreement to approve the signage as requested with the following Staff Recommended Conditions of Approval:

1. Permit Documents must be in substantial compliance with the Plan Commission and Village Board Submittals.
2. The proposed signage must comply with all Village Ordinance and Building Codes in place at time of permit application.
3. The proposed signage shall be installed with one (1) year from the date of Ordinance approval.

Petitioner Presentation:

Mr. Kunjun Shah, a representative of the owner of MRK Realty, LLC came before the Commission and stated that he had nothing to add to Mr. Khan's presentation.

Commission Discussion: Commissioners Holmes, Drummond and Swets complimented the Petitioner on the signage plan presented.

Public Comment: Mr. Khan asked if there were any additional questions or comments from the public and with none raised, the Public Comment portion of the hearing was closed.

Legal Findings of Fact: Attorney Wysocki stated that the Required Findings of Fact for Variances was included in the meeting materials for information and review. The proposed finding of fact were shared and she noted that the request met the standards for variance.

Call for Roll Call Vote:

Attorney Wysocki asked for a roll call vote to confirm agreement of Commissioners with her findings.

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Chairman Holmes, Drummond, Ray

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Motion Carried

Call for Motion:

Commissioner Holmes asked for a motion to approve Case # PC 20-009.

Motion: Commissioner Drummond made a motion to recommend approval of the wall sign that exceeds 48 square feet as required by Section 13.03-3 and variance to Section 13.03-3-a of the Zoning Ordinance to allow for two wall signs.

Second: Commissioner Swets

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Chairman Holmes, Drummond, Ray

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Motion Carried

Commissioner Holmes advised the petitioner that the motion passed and to discuss with staff when they would appear before the Village Board. Mr. Khan advised that he would be in contact with them.

Commissioner Holmes closed Public Hearing #PC 20-009.

4. **Case #:** **PC 20-006**
Petitioner: BSTP Midwest, LLC
Owner: Bridge Itasca, LLC
Location: Southeast Corner of Rohlwing Road & Devon Avenue
Request: Petition for Planned Development by Special Use, Petition for Subdivision, and Class I Site Plan Review for the development of a multi-tenant retail/restaurant site, hotel site, and gas station site.

Roll Call to Open:

Present: Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray,

Absent: Chairman Kischner

Others Present: Shannon Malik Jarmusz (Director of Community Development), Mo Khan (Village Planner), Yordana Wysocki (Village Attorney), Peggy Michet (Recording Secretary)

Staff Report:

Mr. Khan provided background on the petition noting that the Village Board had approved Ordinance #1893.3.-19 in June 2019, granting a Planned Development by Special Use, Final Plat of Subdivision, and a Final Class I Site Plan Review for the construction of three warehouse buildings and the designation of a site along Rohlwing Road (approximately 7 acres). Construction would include a multi-tenant retail building, two freestanding restaurant sites, a hotel and a storm water/common area open space. He added that the construction of the shells for all three industrial buildings were nearing completion adding that a portion of Building #2 currently being built out by a tenant. The property owner, Bridge Itasca, LLC and their real estate brokers marketed the commercial portion of the development and BSTP Midwest, LLC is under contract to purchase the commercial portion of the development pending approval of this request. Further, the commercial components of the overall Planned Development were negotiated as a condition of approval for the industrial portion of the

development - all governed and consistent with the Village Board approved Planned Development agreement.

Mr. Khan provided an overview of the Planning & Zoning Analysis prepared for this petition that included bulk standards and off-street parking requirements, site access, landscaping requirements and signage. Mr. Khan shared the Bluestone Planned Development Class I Site Plan Review & Subdivision Proposed Site Plan for information purposes only noting that the hotel review had been previously approved.

Petitioner and Public Sworn In by the Court Reporter

Petitioner Presentation: The petitioners provided a signage study. The presentation began noting that the majority of variances are signage related. Eastbound IL390 overview provided and then signage visibility coming the westbound IL 390. The dimensions were based on visibility/readability from the distance. The IL 53 study demonstrated the visibility allowing time for decision-making. Topography challenges were noted and added that the Village Code allows up to a 25' pylon sign (allow two on lot 2) and an additional 2 in Lot 1A. Rather than building four separate pylon signs, they proposed grouping the square footage into one monument sign. Note: All monument signs proposed were code compliant.

Mr. Khan stated the requests were consistent with other in the area, in scale and not oversized. He provided an overview of each individually. The wall signs for the Holiday Inn Express & Suites is in proportion to the building/in scale while not meeting size requirements; there were no reservations in approving the request noted and stated that engineering had reviewed the plans.

In summary, he stated that the proposed development was consistent with the B-3 Zoning District, would bring a diverse development with significant economic development impact to the previously undeveloped parcel and aligned with the Village's Comprehensive Plan of bringing more commercial sites and activity along Rohlwing Road. Mr. Khan noted that adequate access would be provided along both Rohlwing Road and Devon Avenue as well as internal drive aisles. Significant landscaping would provide a balance between hardscape and green space on the site and the proposed signage was consistent with those for developments located next to major highway system. He then provided an overview of the Required Standards of Approval for Planned Developments, Required Standards of Review for Subdivisions and the following eight Staff Recommended Conditions of Approval:

1. Final Plat of Subdivision, Final Engineering Plans, and Final Building Elevations must be in substantial compliance with the Plan Commission and Village Board Submittals.
2. Final Plat of Subdivision shall be reviewed and approved by the Village's Community Development and Engineering Staff prior to recording the Plat with Du Page County's Recorders Office.
3. The project must comply with all Village Ordinances, Building Codes, Subdivision Regulations, Standards Specifications, and the DuPage County Storm Water Ordinance in place at the time of permit application.

4. The project must comply with the approved Development Agreement (Ord. # 1889-18) governing this mixed-use industrial and commercial site.
5. Any favorable recommendations is subject to final building permit approval.
6. The proposal is subject to adherence to previously issued review comments.
7. Ordinarily, project approvals of this nature are conditioned to be valid for one year. Staff recommends that the phasing schedule and timeline of the proposed development be consistent with the approved Development Agreement.
8. If the project does not commence within three years of Village Board approval, the requests shall return to the Board for reauthorization. Furthermore, if for any reason BSTP Midwest, LLC is not able to complete this project, any future assignees will be required to obtain Village Board approval to amend the approvals for the new ownership entity.

Commission Discussion: Commissioner Holmes asked the comparison of the truck and auto canopy heights and the following was shared: Auto-14-1/2'; Commercial Fueling 17-1/2'. He also asked about the site plan relative to Lot 2 - it appears the garbage is in a storage area is along IL53 and asked why not behind the building. The petitioner noted it would be a grading and access challenge. While not the typical location, the grading is problematic. Mr. Khan stated that the waste storage area would be screened by landscaping from the roadway. The Petitioner added that the architecture would match the building and face the commercial area keeping the trucks away from the car parking. After some discussion, the Petitioner offered to work with staff to potentially move the refuse storage. Subsequently, Commissioner Swets stated that he has never noted refuse locations at Thornton's and Commissioner Daly added that he had no objection to the refuse storage.

Commissioner Swets, Drummond and Holmes agreed with all presented with the exception of the 80' elevated sign. After considerable discussion and concerns raised, the petitioner withdrew the variance request for the 80' pole sign to move forward on the other items.

Commissioner Holmes asked if all the buildings would be built concurrently and the Petitioner responded that they would like one contractor to begin next year with all - with perhaps the exception of the retail due to COVID-19. He noted that only Lot 1A was open/available and the remaining are all in conversations. It was the consensus of the Plan Commission to set timing restrictions and Ms. Malik Jarmusz r that there was an underlying agreement that addresses their market and timing concerns.

Public Comment: Mr. Khan asked if there were any question from the public and with none raised, Chairman Holmes closed the public comment portion of the hearing.

Legal Findings of Fact: Attorney Wysocki clarified that D&E of the proposal be withdrawn from the application. She noted the findings available in the staff memo provided in the meeting materials and stated that the request met the Required Standards of Approval for Planned Developments and Required Standards of Review for Subdivisions.

Roll Call Vote:

Attorney Wysocki asked for a roll call vote to confirm agreement of Commissioners with her findings.

Call for Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Chairman Holmes, Drummond, Ray

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Motion Carried

Call for Motion:

Commissioner Holmes asked for a motion to approve Case #PC 20-006.

Motion: Commissioner Drummond made a motion to recommend approval a Planned Development by Special Use in accordance with Section 14.12 of the Zoning Ordinance for the construction of a hotel, gas station, and multi-tenant retail;/restaurant building, with the omission of Items D&E (80' pole sign); approval of a Class I Site Plan Review in accordance with 14.13 of the Zoning Ordinance and the approval of a Final Plat of Subdivision in accordance with Section 7.09 of the Subdivision Ordinance, and subject to staff recommended Conditions #1-8.

Second: Commissioner Swets

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Chairman Holmes, Drummond, Ray

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Motion Carried

Commissioner Holmes advised the petitioner that the motion passed and to discuss with staff when they would appear before the Village Board. Mr. Khan advised that he would be in contact with them.

Commissioner Holmes closed Public Hearing #PC 20-006.

5. **Case:** **PC # 20-005 (Continuation)**
Petitioner: Village of Itasca
Owner: N/A
Location: N/A
Request: Petition for Text Amendments to Section 13.01-27 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding Dynamic Sign Regulations.

Roll Call to Open:

Present: Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Holmes, Drummond, Ray,

Absent: Chairman Kischner

Others Present: Shannon Malik Jarmusz (Director of Community Development), Mo Khan (Village Planner), Yordana Wysocki (Village Attorney), Peggy Michet (Recording Secretary)

Petitioner Presentation/Staff Report: Mr. Khan noted a concern among members of the Village Board and Plan Commission regarding the use of dynamic signs in residential areas. The Dynamic Sign ordinance was reviewing the current sign modify the operational hours in or adjacent to residential areas from shutting off during the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. If approved by the Village Board, the current signs would be grandfathered but noted that the Village would ask for their compliance to the new guidelines but not mandated. He noted that the Commissioners had asked for additional information be provided for context and examples were provided.

Commission Discussion: Commissioner Drummond noted that the Eaglewood sign pulses and she asked if they could be asked to change it; Mr. Khan responded it had been approved and they would be grandfathered in. It was believed that the sign might have been in place prior to the area being annexed to Itasca. She asked for timing of the Village Hall sign and Ms. Malik Jarmusz responded that she does not know off-hand. T

The purpose of the proposed change was cited as an effort to be more business friendly. Commissioner Ray asked if there is data of all Village signs (noted St. Luke's sign). Ms. Malik Jarmusz provided a listing of various Village signs and their timings thru a 2018 staff report. Mr. Khan stated the standard timing is 60 seconds at present. Commissioner Daly stated we need to do an audit of Village signs and that it should be done routinely to ensure rules are followed. He also stated that the Village sign must follow the new ordinance. Commissioner Carello asked if we could differentiate dynamic vs. digital signage. Attorney Wysocki noted the government mandates regulations. Commissioner Swets believed no change should be made adding that if the timing creates a hardship, business owners can request a variance. Commissioner Holmes agreed with him and stated that he did not believe there was a compelling reason to change it at this time.

Public Comment: Mr. Khan asked if there were any question from the public and with none raised, Chairman Holmes closed the public comment portion of the hearing.

Call for Motion:

Commissioner Holmes asked for a motion to deny Part I of the proposal (time of a single message) and for a motion to approve Part 2 (shutoff times).

Motion: Commissioner Drummond made a motion to recommend denial of the Dynamic Sign ordinance modifying the minimum time a single message must remain static from 60-seconds to 15-seconds.

Second: Commissioner Daly

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Chairman Holmes, Drummond, Ray

Nay: None

Abstain: None
Motion Carried

Motion: Commissioner Drummond made a motion to approve the Dynamic Sign ordinance modifying the operational hours in or adjacent to residential areas from shutting off during the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.

Second: Commissioner Daly

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Commissioners Daly, Carello, Swets, Chairman Holmes, Drummond, Ray

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Motion Carried

Commissioner Holmes closed the Public Hearings and returned to the regular meeting.

Respectfully submitted by Recording Secretary, Peggy Michet

Mo Khan

Mo Khan, Village Planner

Approved: August 19, 2020