

VILLAGE OF ORLAND PARK

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



Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, April 24, 2012

7:00 PM

Village Hall

Plan Commission

Louis Stephens, Chairman

*Commissioners: Judith Jacobs, Paul Aubin, Steve Dzierwa,
Nick Parisi, John J. Paul and Laura Murphy*

CALLED TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order by the Plan Commission Chairman, Mr. Lou Stephens, at 7:00 p.m.

Present: 7 - Jacobs; Dzierwa; Aubin; Stephens; Parisi; Paul, Murphy

APPROVAL OF MINUTES**2012-0243 Minutes of the April 10, 2012 Plan Commission Meeting**

A motion was made by Commissioner Aubin, seconded by Commissioner Paul to approve the minutes of the April 10, 2012 Plan Commission Meeting with the following changes:

On page 2 under Thomas Cachey's testimony change the number "16" to "60".

On page 3 under Thomas Cachey's testimony add "with" between "contact" and "Fifth Third".

On page 4 under Chairman Stephens testimony add "the" between "which" and "developer".

On page 6 under Commissioner Dzierwa's testimony the words connect ability should be one word read as "connectability".

On page 7 under the motion number 4 should read "list code required tree mitigation and site plan"

APPROVED

Aye: 6 - Dzierwa, Aubin, Stephens, Parisi, Paul and Murphy

Nay: 0

Abstain: 1 - Jacobs

PUBLIC HEARINGS**2012-0171 167th Street Fence - Churchill Variance**

FLOM: Staff presentation made in accordance with the written Staff Report dated April 24, 2012 as presented.

STEPHENS: Thank you Mrs. Flom, one question I have for you: the guardrail that the County is looking at, where would they look to place that at?

FLOM: It would be in the general location along the properties. I do not have the exact spot.

STEPHENS: So you don't know if it is going to start from the corner and run east?

FLOM: I don't. I'm sure that they have some requirements on grading and that is probably their next step in looking into the guardrail.

STEPHENS: Ok, thank you. The petitioner is present. Would you like to address us in regards to this petition? Please step up to the podium to be sworn in.

AUBIN: Swore in Clifford Bedar, 10740 Churchill Drive, Orland Park, Illinois.

C. BEDAR: I did met with Kim and there are three points that I want to make in behalf of the petition. I brought some graphic material. If I could bring that in front it would help me to explain these points a little. Would that be ok? Thank you. This is an elevation, a photographic elevation along 167th Street. The point I want to make is that although this is characterized as a similar situation as 143rd Street. We disagree as petitioners with all due respect. As you can see and I don't know if any of you have been down there; but the road is raised in the middle and the natural property dips and comes back up. So the effect of the fence as it exists now, there is a red line here. That would be the pavement elevation projected over to the fence line. For this property here, the fence is only one foot above the street elevation. At this property line, it is only 11 inches. This might show it a little better.

STEPHENS: Excuse me, are you talking about the one that has a fence but no landscaping? There is one in the middle.

C. BEDAR: Well the one that has no fence, a car went through it. Actually those people are here. They have been waiting patiently to find out the outcome of this variance so they can get on with their fence building and get back to privacy.

STEPHENS: That would be 10720 right? 10720 is the lowest point and has a fence but no landscaping.

C. BEDAR: Yes, that is this one here.

STEPHENS: There is no landscaping and all the other six homes are extremely covered with a great deal of landscaping. You can hardly see those houses.

C. BEDAR: Right and this one especially you can look into their backyard at automobile height across the street. At 143rd Street that never exists. This is all 143rd Street. At 143rd Street you can never see into the yard.

STEPHENS: The one that you just held up, is that 143rd Street?

C. BEDAR: This is on 143rd Street. I thought I had something that showed the elevations. In any case it is different and they might have raised the elevation of 143rd Street 30 inches. From the point from which they raised it, the street was

below the property. Now it is a little above the property as you can see here but nowhere to the extent as it is here. This kind of shows the difficulty. The street was leveled off and the natural property dips. The top of the fence is only 13 inches above the pavement for these properties. This one is only 11 inches. It obviously gets better as it goes west and east.

STEPHENS: Excuse me, sir. Is that address 10720?

C. BEDAR: Yes, this address is 10720.

STEPHENS: That is the lowest point?

C. BEDAR: That is the lowest point, although 10710 and 10730, the very corner of my yard, and 10740 are also very bad. If you are standing in my backyard, you are looking up at the undercarriage of vehicles. So I guess the point is that a two foot addition of fence gives me basically a three foot fence which really isn't sufficient to block the view of traffic. Of course that wasn't there originally before this paving took place. So there is a distinct difference between 143rd Street, where I think the elevation is maybe 12 inches higher than the property line at this point or 16 inches. Here it is over five feet. So that is the first point. The second point is though this may be an arterial road, and I'm not sure when it was designated that. We have been living there since 1990.

STEPHENS: It is a minor arterial road.

C. BEDAR: Minor arterial, but what everyone needs to realize and we certainly realize living there; there is a bus company up the street. This is a main route for all the busses. So, twice a day we have busses lined up coming down 167th Street and coming back to the bus depot from all points west and north of our location. While it may not be a major arterial road, it is very disruptive and very noisy. The three foot fence hardly does anything for these people to mitigate the noise. We are looking at the undercarriages of busses barreling up the road to and fro. So you can see the challenge here for a vehicle that actually went through my neighbor's fence is that this is a pretty steep slope that the County created for us. I think there used to be a guardrail along this road and they removed it so hence a car barreled down this road and went into my neighbor's property. That fence is no longer there. When I took this picture, this is prior to the accident.

STEPHENS: That's 10710 with all the beautiful evergreens? They're about 25 feet high.

C. BEDAR: In the interest of brevity I am just trying to make these points. I did meet with Kim, whom was very gracious to meet with me and deliver the staff's recommendation. I just want to point out that this is a very different situation from 143rd Street. The elevation is severe and they were not like that before. Not only had that but the road became closer. I'm not sure if any of you are familiar with the

realignment of 167th Street when they did that in 2005. They moved the center line of the road 10 feet closer in addition to widening it. While it may be 30 feet, it used to be further apart and much lower so we have suffered very difficult repercussions from this road construction. The final point I want to make is that although the fence is characterized as 10 feet, it is actually 10 feet at its maximum height. The proposal in our variance is to create a fence that is level with 167th street. In which case, it starts off being 6' at either end and it gradually gets bigger and bigger in the middle where the properties are suffering the most. At the maximum height it is 9'10", which is basically 10'. But as you move away it is only 8' here and it goes down to 6'.

STEPHENS: You are referring to east and west?

C. BEDAR: Yes that is the west. It is the same either way. There will be a high point here and here. So the natural lay of the land does basically a curve and the road was made level. I'm not sure why they did that; it would be an issue with engineering. Nonetheless, we are not proposing a 10' fence along the entire property line. We are proposing a fence that is of a constant elevation above the property line that gives the people that have suffered the most from this road construction even at best they get 4'9" of fence. That is how bad the situation is as you can see here. The proposal would be for an unusual fence. I know that it is unprecedented in Orland Park but from a planning standpoint, from a visual aesthetic standpoint, the fence relates to the road and not to the properties. That is the reason the fence is there in the first place, to block the road from the properties. So those are the three points that I wanted to make. Any questions?

STEPHENS: We will let you know.

C. BEDAR: Ok.

STEPHENS: Thank you very much. Yes sir, this is a public hearing and at this point if you would like to come up and make a comment we would be glad to hear it.

AUBIN: Swore in John Giovinco, 16700 Muirfield, Orland Park, Illinois.

GIOVINCO: I think the proposal is problematic for a couple of reasons. There are some unique characteristics of the subdivision Victoria Place and the adjacent subdivision Muirfield. They are both contiguous and continuous and blend into each other seamlessly. So if someone were uninitiated they would not know when they were entering Victoria Place from Muirfield. There are entries but the center is not demarcated by any landmark as most subdivisions are when they change. The other issue is that Muirfield by its bylaws prohibits any type of perimeter fence so what you will get as a consequence of that is a 10' fence for example with a stark transition to no fence at all. I think that could be aesthetically challenging not to mention that I think it could raise the specter that there is something wrong if

one of us goes to sell our homes, including the people asking for the 10' fence. A 10' fence is unprecedented and something of that extraordinary height when you transition to no fence at all. All we have is natural landscaping and it's continuous. There is no separation between 10700 and 10660 Churchill, yet they are two different subdivisions.

STEPHENS: 10700 is where Victoria Place stops and Muirfield begins?

GIOVINCO: Yes and there is no transition. I would not be averse to an elevated height but I think 10' is extraordinary in its dimension.

STEPHENS: So, being a neighbor you are objecting to the height of a 10' fence. Is that basically your comment? Thank you very much Mr. Giovinco. Let me see if there is anyone else that wishes to comment before I bring you back up Mr. Bedar. Is there anyone else who wishes to comment?

AUBIN: Swore in Joanne Bedar, 10740 Churchill Drive, Orland Park, Illinois.

J. BEDAR: To address this gentleman, I wish I had what Muirfield has because in the back of their yards, they have a great big berm. So they are protected from a lot of the traffic noise that we hear. Clifford failed to say that we paid to have a sound study done. This sound study was done at a time when it was not even a busy day. Usually it is a busy day. It was found that the noise levels were against the noise levels of the Village, County and State laws. This was on a day that wasn't lousy. My house shakes just because a bus drives by it. I have been living here for a long time and you can't stop progress; however you can help us live with it a little better. So when they moved the road closer, raised it up, and took away all the brush we had nothing left. As far as someone saying, that's going to raise a red flag and your house isn't going to be worth that much, people might think it's a problem. It is a problem right now. It's a bad problem and no matter how much beautiful landscaping you have, and a lot of us have spent quite a bit of money on landscaping, all you see through that landscaping all night is headlights, headlights, headlights, all night long. What we have all tried to do is just not enough. The sound study that we paid to have came back and said we would need a 12' fence to mitigate the sound. I knew that would never happen but I just wanted you to know about that study.

STEPHENS: Thank you. Mr. Giovinco, please come back up.

AUBIN: I'm sorry, can I interrupt for just one second. Mrs. Flom, are we aware of that study?

FLOM: Yes.

GIOVINCO: Have you chosen a material for the fence? Will it be uniform? Currently it is dilapidated.

J. BEDAR: George and Linda, they are the ones that lost their fence. They are looking for a new fence. This happened and now is the time to put up a new fence. Their concern was that we want everyone to have the same fence. And that is how all of the neighbors feel on that side. Everyone wants the same fence. No one wants the rest of the world to drive by our area and say 'oh, that looks not nice'. So we are all on the same board, from the beginning of the block to the end.

STEPHENS: But I don't think you could speak for everyone there with regards to what they will buy or not buy. As far as I understand, pertaining to the fencing, there are codes regarding what types of fencing could be put in.

FLOM: There are, and our concern would be that we can not regulate these properties to the point where we are having them put in the same material at a varying height to achieve a uniform top height in relation to the road. That is not within the context of our codes. Regulatory wise it would be very difficult for us to do even if it was installed exactly per plan right now. It's not to say that someone wouldn't buy one of these houses in the future and take the fence down and put up something else. We couldn't prevent that. So we are kind of looking long term, very long term into the future in terms of our recommendation.

STEPHENS: So as far as the type of the fencing?

FLOM: Right, so I think it's great that they are coordinating with their neighbors. We do like uniform fencing but when it comes to single family homes we do not require you to put in a fence that is exactly like your neighbor's fencing.

STEPHENS: What types of fencing do we allow?

FLOM: Wood fences, aluminum fences, wrought iron style aluminum fences. So you could have a wood fence next to an aluminum fence.

STEPHENS: So all seven, in theory, could have different fencing.

FLOM: In different colors, as well.

STEPHENS: Different types of fencing. Alright, I think that answers Mr. Giovinco's question. I think that answers your question as to what type of fencing, Mr. Giovinco?

GIOVINCO: I'm not sure.

STEPHENS: The answer is that they could put any type of fencing that is allowed per the code, which would be wrought iron, vinyl, wood, etc. It would not necessarily need to be uniform.

FLOM: These types of fencing are very common.

J. BEDAR: It does. Victoria Place is supposed to have all the same fences. So, originally the fence that we have right now is the same fence that started at 167th Street to the end. The five properties all bought their fences together so many years ago and we will be doing it again.

PARISI: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for Kim. Is there anything in our Codes that precludes them from achieving the same results at the lower sections from including a berm and a fence?

FLOM: No it was mentioned in your staff report if the 10' height, especially in these low areas, were desired and an 8' variance for the fence were granted, you could put the fence on a berm and it wouldn't affect the height of your fence. We look at the height of the fence from the grade. So if you are able to pop up your grade, you could put the fence on top of that.

PARISI: So arguably, you can achieve that without setting the precedent of a 10' fence and yet getting the visual height that you would like.

FLOM: It would take some landscape work.

PARISI: Thank you.

STEPHENS: Mr. Bedar, would you like to speak again? Please come up to the microphone?

C. BEDAR: In response to my neighbor's concerns, our subdivision has been there since 1989, long before Muirfield was a twinkle in anybody's eye. Our fence is older than any house in Muirfield. They exist there and that difference exists now. Lucky for Muirfield, their grade at the back of their property is level with the street and the renovation of 167th Street had no impact on them. The other thing I would like to say is that there is a problem, and I know it is not the only criteria on which a variance is granted but it is certainly considered, is our property values. We have been told during refinancing and our neighbors as well that our property values are less than people across the street because our properties back up to 167th Street. So it actually has had an impact on the value of our homes and quite frankly that is a condition that is specific to our properties and this is a solution that is specific to our properties. This has nothing to do with Muirfield or anything else on 167th Street.

STEPHENS: Well wouldn't that condition have existed when you bought your property? It backed up to 167th Street at that time?

C. BEDAR: Yes but 167th Street was raised by the County.

STEPHENS: Yes but it still backed up to 167th Street.

C. BEDAR: Yes but the traffic and the lack of visual and acoustic privacy was not a problem then. The fact that 167th Street was reconstructed, realigned closer to our properties and raised and widened into three lanes to accommodate a turning lane for the commercial property, Winterset, across the street has created an untenable situation since 2005. Prior to 2005 there really was not a problem. So its really these specific properties that have suffered as a direct result of 167th Street reconstruction.

STEPHENS: Ok, thank you Mr. Bedar. Is there anybody else who has a comment? Seeing no one else, we will go to our Commissioners and see what our Commissioners think. Commissioner Parisi?

PARISI: First of all, I have been to a lot of these meetings and I just would like to commend everyone who came up here. You were all very articulate and respectful of one another, very intelligent on both ends. We do appreciate that. You mentioned a number of times acoustic privacy. One of the things is by your own petition, to achieve the acoustics that you wanted, it was recommended as you said to put up a 12' fence. However, to be more specific, it said to achieve the acoustics you wanted you would need a 12' concrete fence, which is unrealistic. You wouldn't want that either. I don't think this fence will achieve the acoustic privacy you want. So from an aesthetic standpoint, not acoustic aesthetics, simply a visual standpoint, I think it would be a lot more pleasing to the eye to see a shorter fence with a berm than a massive wall next to the sidewalk. I concur with staff's recommendation in that looking at the bigger picture, longer term, and setting precedent in this way. And the houses are set back substantially more, almost twice as far back as the houses on 143rd Street. So that is all I have to say Mr. Chairman.

STEPHENS: Thank you Commissioner Parisi, Commissioner Murphy?

MURPHY: Well I would like to say that I am certainly sympathetic to the issue. I imagine that gets difficult. But I do agree with staff's conclusion; partly because I too would be concerned with the future homeowners and the fact that we can not regulate a 10' fence. I think some positive things could come of this. For instance, this guard rail should happen and that will be a welcome addition along there. I think that the 8' variance just makes more sense going forward. I too agree with staff's conclusions.

STEPHENS: Thank you Commissioner Murphy. Commissioner Aubin?

AUBIN: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I concur with my fellow Commissioners. To set a precedent using the term 10' fencing means that anybody in the Village could put a 10' fence up once you set the precedent. The comparison that Mrs. Flom was making for 143rd Street to 167th Street was that if there is anywhere in the world

that we should allow 10' fences, it would be 143rd Street because the number of cars, traffic, so on and so forth as compared to 167th Street which is 1/3 of what goes on at 143rd Street. The Village compromising by saying lets meet half way at 8', we are talking about a Village wide precedent for 2'. I think if you were to put the berm in with the 8' fence on top of it you would solve most of the problems. But as me and everybody sitting on this board that lives in Orland Park, when you bought your property next to the tanning factory and then the tanning factory didn't come until 20 years later, you see what I'm trying to say. Everyone has had that problem. With the staff compromising at 8', I think that will be sufficient to take care of your problem.

STEPHENS: Thank you Commissioner Aubin, Commissioner Dzierwa?

DZIERWA: Thank you Mr. Chairman. My fellow Commissioners make some very good points and folks, you make valid points, too. It is a tough decision to make. Traveling by there many times in the past and since we received our packets, and along 143rd Street, I have tried to do a comparison and 143rd Street is really busy. I agree with your point about the buses that come along a couple times a day. That can be a nuisance; I wouldn't want that in my back yard either. The distance from the roadways is a big difference, yours is double compared to 143rd Street; not to mention 143rd Street is four lanes and yours is just two. They both have center turn lanes. I do have a question for staff and maybe you can recall Mrs. Flom. Down 108th Avenue by the train station, there is a big brick wall. Does anyone recall that? Ok, perhaps along time ago when Dr. Krad came in to develop his property and we were going to make him put the wall on the other side of the street too.

STEPHENS: Oh, on 108th. Yes.

DZIERWA: What is that wall there for? Is it a landscaping type of wall? Is it a sound barrier? I was just curious because this just lit a fire in me and I had to go check it out.

STEPHENS: Is that a retaining wall? That is a retaining wall.

DZIERWA: It's a retaining wall. So it is not basically screening homes. Ok, I just had to check on that. I could not figure out why that wall was there. I wanted to get that clear. As far as construction of the type of fences, Mr. Bedar, what type of fence would you put up?

C. BEDAR: You know all of our neighbors have agreed to use a consistent design of a wood fence. Part of the reason is to address the acoustic issue, which is a real issue. There are products made that have mass and absorption qualities that are made. The one product is called Acousti-fence. It is used in areas where you can't get the big brick or concrete wall, but it still does abate quite a bit of the noise. So the height of the fence above the property line is extremely important

because we plan, as well as some of our neighbors, to mount this Acousti-fence product on the fence and it is only successful if it is up high at the height of the car and not the low. So anyways we all plan on using a wood fence.

DZIERWA: Well I'm sure that you are going to put up what you would like to put up. I don't know that I would like to look at a 10' fence but that's your opinion. I have to agree with staff and my fellow Commissioners, I think if you want to do something and you want to get the height, play the game. Put the berm in, put the fence up, put the great fence up, and get your peace and quiet. I don't know that you will get the acoustic privacy but if you get the headlights out of your face that will be a good thing too. I must compliment you, you all have great landscaping. I think landscaping is the way I would go but that is my own personal opinion. If you want to put up the fence, then you should put up an 8' fence with a berm. That is all I have Mr. Chairman.

STEPHENS: Thank you, Commissioner Dzierwa. Commissioner Jacobs?

JACOBS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I was going to say what Mr. Dzierwa just said. The solution is to install the berm and put up the fence. Make it consistent. My only concern, and I do like wood, is the maintenance factor. If you are all going to maintain at the same level; some will, some won't, will it be the same color? Who is going to paint? Who is not going to stain? Maybe it needs to be something other than wood. That is really all I have to say.

STEPHENS: So you are talking about an issue of aesthetic uniformity. Ok, thank you Commissioner Jacobs. Commissioner Paul?

PAUL: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I think that the 8' is a good compromise here. Standing on 167th Street I could look right into some of your homes. The one home that does not have any landscaping, you could see everything there. I think putting a 10' fence would probably solve some of the problems, but I think it also creates a precedent. It also creates a situation where ten years from now, a new neighbor might decide something different. He might decide to put up a 6' fence now you have fences going up and down with 4' between them. 8' is a little bit more consistent. If somebody does decide to go with a smaller fence later it is not going to be that obvious. You mentioned about the headlights, if your fence is 1' off the street elevation, yeah you're going to get the headlights in your eyes all the time. You go 2' higher than that, the vast majority of vehicles are lower so you're not going to get the headlights coming in with just 2' of additional fence. Like you said, when you use the berm, do some other things, you add more height to it that way as well. This way you get most of what you wanted, we don't have a precedent on the books for something to go wrong later and I think it's a win for everyone across the board on this. That's all I have Mr. Chairman.

STEPHENS: Thank you Commissioner Paul. I echo the same comments that the rest of the Commissioners made. I just want to go to an issue of uniformity, we

talked about buses, and buses don't run on Saturday and Sunday. I look at number nine here and it says that the variance granted is the minimum adjustment necessary for the reasonable use of the land. It would seem to me that the minimum adjustment necessary for the reasonable use of the land would be a reasonable compromise to raise it to 8' not to 10'. I think 10' sets a precedent that we don't want to be dealing with in the entire Village. If we start saying that 10' fencing is ok, we will have 10' fences where they do not belong and it is too high of a fence. Additionally, you have the issue of uniformity here. I do not know that you have seven homes here and if one sold and they do not like the fence that high they could put a 6' fence up; if another one sold and they could put no fence up. There is no guarantee that all seven people will say "yes, I'm going to put a 10' fence up". Even if that does happen, if someone sells the house and the new buyer takes it down and puts a 6' fence up. Now you have a 6' fence up in the middle of 10' fences. That's an issue of uniformity that no one here could guarantee that will not take place. I think the compromise and to go along with the minimum adjustment necessary, it is reasonable to say we will give you the variance to the 8' fence. I live on 108th Avenue. They did the same thing to me. They lowered the street; they raised the street. I put up a berm. I put up the kind of trees that these seven houses have. I looked at these this afternoon. The one on the corner, it has 25' high trees for screening. You can't even see that house from either street. 10750 looks like they have about 12' trees behind the fence. 10740, you have 20' evergreen trees for screening. I can see the roof of your house; 10730, again the same situation; real high trees and a fence. Go to 10720, I didn't see a fence or any landscaping blockage. 10710, you have 30' evergreens and no fence. 10700, there's a fence and extensive tree blockage; I can't even see the house. As far as the headlights shining into your houses; the backyards of your houses face north and the cars run east and west. So it is not a situation where they are aiming directly at the houses. So I can't accept that as a reasonable complaint for headlights. I have to agree with my fellow Commissioners, that a 8' variance is a very reasonable compromise under the circumstances. Again, whoever made the comparison with 143rd Street, which staff brought up to us, it's a 70' wide street, and you have a 42' street. They have 18' from the curb and you have 30' from the curb to your backyard. The amount of traffic: they have over 21,000 cars; you have 11,000 cars, half the traffic. As far as the busses go, the busses run once in the morning and once at 3 o'clock, and not on the weekends. I can not accept that as reasonable argument either. So I agree with my Commissioners that an 8' fence is the most reasonable compromise to work with your problem and still keep some conformity with the Village as well and not to set a precedent to go up to 10' high. Those are my comments. I think at this point, having all the discussion that we are going to have on both sides the Chair will entertain a motion to move forward one way or the other.

AUBIN: Mr. Chairman, just so the petitioner knows, once this motion is made those said properties will be able to take advantage of what is going to be read here. It will go to Committee and then to the Village Board for approval.

I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission the findings of fact set forth in this staff report, dated April 24, 2012.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of a variance to allow a eight foot (8') rear yard fence for the residences located at 16700 Chaucer, 10750, 10740, 10730, 10720 ,10710 and 10700 Churchill Drive, subject to the following condition:

1) All required building permits are acquired prior to fence construction.

APPROVED

Aye: 7 - Jacobs, Dzierwa, Aubin, Stephens, Parisi, Paul and Murphy

Nay: 0

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

2012-0035 CMAP LTA Water Use Conservation Strategic Plan & Ordinance

FLOM: It is not a public hearing. The draft report will be discussed at the May 8, 2012 meeting. There is no formal requirement for a continuance motion.

OTHER BUSINESS

FLOM: I do have one other piece of business. The Development Services Department has been working with the Police Department and the Public Works Department to look at road improvements for Wheeler Avenue. I'm sure you are all familiar with Wheeler. It is a big east west connection street on the east side of town. It is very wide and it is very low speed. It is a key bike route for us in our Comprehensive Plan. We are looking at potentially on street bike paths, striped parking, landscape improvements, pedestrian improvements, and traffic calming improvements. It is a pretty big project and we have invited all of the residents who live along Wheeler to come to an Open House for a presentation to see what we've found. We've also invited the Village Board and we wanted to extend the invitation to the Plan Commissioners. It is not required but if you are interested, I do have the information. I put it in each of your packets.

STEPHENS: Thank you. Is there any additional business from any of the Commissioners?

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Plan Commission, the Chairman adjourned the meeting.

STEPHENS: This meeting is adjourned at 7:54 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Rosignolo
Recording Secretary