

VILLAGE OF ORLAND PARK

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



Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

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

- Present:** 5 - Member Aubin; Member Dzierwa; Member Parisi; Member Paul, Member Murphy
- Absent:** 2 - Chairman Stephens, Member Jacobs

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2014-0463 Minutes of the November 11, 2014 Plan Commission Meeting

A motion was made by Commissioner Paul, seconded by Commissioner Dzierwa; to continue the minutes of the November 11, 2014 Plan Commission.

I move to continue the minutes of the November 11, 2014 Plan Commission Meeting to the next regularly scheduled meeting.

CONTINUED

- Aye:** 5 - Member Aubin, Member Dzierwa, Member Parisi, Member Paul and Member Murphy
- Nay:** 0
- Absent:** 2 - Chairman Stephens and Member Jacobs

2014-0277 Minutes of the December 9, 2014 Plan Commission Meeting

A motion was made by Commissioner Parisi, seconded by Commissioner Murphy; to approve the minutes of the December 9, 2014 Plan Commission.

APPROVED

- Aye:** 5 - Member Aubin, Member Dzierwa, Member Parisi, Member Paul and Member Murphy
- Nay:** 0
- Absent:** 2 - Chairman Stephens and Member Jacobs

2015-0067 Minutes of the January 27, 2015 Plan Commission Meeting

A motion was made by Commissioner Murphy, seconded by Commissioner Paul to approve the minutes of the January 13, 2015 Plan Commission.

APPROVED

- Aye:** 5 - Member Aubin, Member Dzierwa, Member Parisi, Member Paul and Member Murphy
- Nay:** 0
- Absent:** 2 - Chairman Stephens and Member Jacobs

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2014-0270 Hampton Court - RZ, SUB, SP, VAR

PITTOS: Staff presentation made in accordance with written staff report dated

January, 27, 2015.

AUBIN: Thank you. If the petitioner is here and would like to make comments regarding staff's report, please step forward.

DZIERWA: Swore in Ben Fieten, project manager, Merit Design Group, 15630 Park Station Boulevard, Orland Park.

FIETEN: I wanted to create and design a product that would fit in with the rest of the community. These are single family duplexes about 4,000 sq. ft. The smaller unit is about 1,800 and the bigger unit is 2,100 sq. ft. They are all ranch level. You saw the elevation and that is what we want to do.

AUBIN: Thank you.

DZIERWA: Swore in Randolph Given, attorney, 1755 S. Naperville Road, Suite 100, Wheaton.

GIVEN: Short presentation regarding the project.

AUBIN: Thank you.

DZIERWA: Swore in Bill Zalewski, 18311 North Creek Drive, Suite F, Tinley Park.

ZALEWSKI: We worked with staff to come up with a workable solution. The project is fairly straight forward. We have obvious constraints with the narrowness and the location of the property. We have been in contact with Cook County and we are allowed only a right in/right out onto 108th Avenue. The status of the location into the subdivision came about with working with staff to get the most feasible and easy access into the site. The utilities are also straight forward. We are going to tap the sewer line and bring it all the way into the cul-de-sac. Sanitary has already been stubbed out in the rear of lot 14 in the subdivision. Water currently is along 108th. It comes in to service the Somerglen subdivision and we will extend that into our subdivision. It will be stubbed out at the south end. We will be expanding the existing detention facility. We will be rerunning all of the calculations to make sure that everything is up to the latest MWRD requirements. Our storm sewer will be collected in a series of inlets and we will route the water over to the detention basin. The low area that is being filled and that will be handled so the area has positive drainage. This will be an improvement for all the residents in the area as well as the Hampton Court subdivision. The 45' right of way will be graded and try to put the trees in the appropriate places. Our goal is to be as less disruptive as possible. The variance that we are requesting, we are partially worked out with Vantage Point and staff. We had the wetland variances in order to extend the cul-de-sac. The road will most likely go to the south for access to 159th Street. It was a pleasure working with Terry and his staff. They are very proactive at thinking what is best for the entire site as well as the surrounding

areas.

AUBIN: Thank you. That is pretty consistent with what we have heard in the past.

DZIERWA: Swore in Joseph Abel, planning consultant, 200 Forest Avenue, Glen Ellyn.

ABEL: Presentation made regarding land use planning and variance standards.

AUBIN: Thank you. Your comments are most appreciated.

GIVEN: When you are looking at these duplexes, they are not really duplexes. They are attached single family. We intend for the ownership to be condominium which is the same ownership concept as the Eagle Ridge patio homes. We will be able to sell individual units. The price point on this is between \$450,000 - \$525,000. In terms of the height of the buildings, the maximum height is....

FIETEN: The maximum height will be 20'-24'.

GIVEN: I just wanted to clarify those points. It's important for the Board to understand what this concept is here. Thank you.

AUBIN: We have listened to staff's report and the petitioner. This is a public hearing. If there is anyone in the audience who would like to address this petition, please come up to the podium.

DZIERWA: Swore in Darlene James, 15717 Shire Drive, Orland Park.

JAMES: My concerns are about how close it is to my property. I was under the impression that it was Army Corp. wetlands and there wasn't going to be anything there.

AUBIN: The project does have preliminary engineering approval already. As the project goes on, they will look at it for final approval.

JAMES: So you can't tell me how close it is to my property?

PITTOS: Demonstrates on map the distance between Shire Drive & Hampton Court. In between you and Hampton Court, there will be more detention area than currently.

JAMES: Ok. So it won't really impact me. Thank you.

PITTOS: It should not impact you.

AUBIN: Thank you.

DZIERWA: Swore in Robert DeStefano, 6547 W Cermak, Berwyn.

DESTEFANO: I represent the property owners directly to the south that allegedly is going to have a road running through it. Our environmental experts do not see any wetlands on this property and any reference as a wetland damages the value of our property. We need to review whatever reports you are relying on because we have seen absolutely nothing that would show that there is a wetland. I was just contacted this Thursday by the developer's counsel and received an email today that basically infers that this road is going to come down our property and we don't understand that. When the previous development was going to happen on our property from Sunrise Retirement Home, there was no road coming down our property and that wasn't the plan that this Village had. Anyways, the last time I checked, from a Constitutional standpoint, I don't know how our property is being taken and that is the inference that is going on here. Being called a wetland, our property is being taken, and the further inference that this cul-de-sac is going to be able to spread out onto our property: I can't get my arms around this at this point in time, having just received this. We would like additional time to present our experts to show otherwise. Our investors are local. We are not some east coast company. We live in Orland as well. The development of 159th is supposed to be commercial and now we are going to have residential and a road coming right out onto 159th. You have the dealership, you have commercial up and down 159th. It was talked about when IDOT wanted to expand 159th. There was no mention of wetlands then as it relates to our property. It was in relation to a property to the west of us. Now all of a sudden we are a wetland. We heard this before after another developer came in. We bought this property in 1995. They bought this strip of land and now it has been passed on to these people by a further transaction. They have access. They are not land locked. They can get out at 108th. They don't need to come across to 159th and make our land valueless. I don't know what this board is looking at and what this preapproval is about.

AUBIN: Nothing has been approved.

DESTEFANO: I hear this expert, Mr. Abel, talking about courts and such. As I stated before, we have rights. The process hasn't even started as far as we are concerned. We are original investors in the ice rink. We bought this property because we had an understanding of what 159th Street was going to be developed as. Now we are talking about putting a road down a 5 acre parcel that is set for commercial. We don't agree that this cul-de-sac comes on to our property. We don't agree for them to come onto our property and do anything with an alleged wetland. In the past 20 years, we have never seen any water sitting on this land. I am wondering what is going on here.

AUBIN: Let's answer some of your questions. Mr. Pittos, this issue about the wetlands, can you comment on that?

PITTOS: The data that we have indicates that this is a local wetland. It is non jurisdictional. This wetland has been reviewed by the Army Corp. and they have confirmed that the other wetland is a jurisdictional wetland. The Village of Orland Park does have its own codes that determines what is a wetland and what isn't a wetland and how many feet you have to be away from a wetland, which is a 50' setback requirement. I do not recall how Sunrise Senior Living was handled. We would have to go back and take a look at that but I am almost certain that the north end of that site was low land area that could have been used as detention at the time. In terms of saying anything further, I would want to refer to engineering on wetlands and how they are determined to exist. Wetlands do grow and it is something that is a dynamic environment.

AUBIN: Thank you Mr. Pittos.

DESTEFANO: I don't know of any designation as such and I don't know of any testing that has been done to that soil that would reflect that it is a wetland.

AUBIN: The only thing that I can tell you is that our engineers have given creed to this project.

DESTEFANO: We will take a look at that at some point in time. We also have another investor here that would like to speak.

DZIERWA: Swore in Jim Pipolo, 13650 Mohawk Lane, Orland Park.

PIPOLO: I just wanted to make one brief comment about the property. Twenty years ago I was the principal investor that put together the partnership. Now people are talking about wetlands. I heard the testimony about wetlands and I am a little uneasy with the fact that we are talking about wetlands. If you go out there you don't even see any water. Furthermore, you're talking about putting a road right down the middle of our property. Twenty years ago we made an investment for a potential retirement plan and now you're talking about destroying the property. I am very uncomfortable with that. We have owned this for a lot of years and we have many other pieces of property in Orland. Just a little disappointed with how this has transpired and we feel like we are behind the eight ball as this thing has been progressing.

PITTOS: In terms of the actual road network, a consequence of development is to construct right of way no matter the type of development. If right of way is needed, it gets dedicated. I do not believe that the extension of Hampton Court necessarily requires that it goes directly south across and bisect the site. What I think could potentially happen is for these properties to develop into a senior living facility or a commercial retail strip, the additional 15' of right of way would be added to Hampton Court, which is no different than any other buffer yard or easement on the site. That would be a required dedication and that is the price of development of these two properties. Then in terms of the cul de sac, it could potentially finish the

cul de sac which would be another right of way dedication which would be the price of development; or you could extend the road slightly to the south and veer it off to the west so that this property is fully developable or potentially have cross access connection where the right of way terminates in this location and links up to the rear parking fields. It is not to say that this road will come straight down and I am not sure that would necessarily be a good idea. Mr. Abel did point out that it is aligning very well and that the site plan is very flexible. This is one of the merits of the flexibility. Ultimately, if there will be a signal between 108th and Wolf Road, it would be at this location and if you went to the aerial you can see that the school districts would abandon this point and link to a new road so they could access the signal. If Hampton Court were to be extended, it wouldn't go straight south; it would swerve and bypass toward BMW.

PARISI: Terry, the wetlands have been mentioned a number of times. As part of your presentation, wasn't that going to be eliminated?

PITTOS: Yes, the idea is for the wetland to be removed from the site, filled in so whatever wetland is supposedly there will be covered up anyway.

PARISI: It will be covered up and the drainage will be pushed to the west. Therefore any concerns about there being a wetland would be eliminated. In terms of that road continuing south and splitting the property, it has pretty much been a practice to close off the cul de sac because we don't want that continuation from commercial to residential property. I think your assessment is unlikely that it will happen.

PITTOS: Potentially. There is value here in extending the road in terms of connecting residential neighborhoods with the schools across 159th Street at a signalized point. One thing I should mention in terms of the grades, there would be a difference in grade between the right of way and the property to the south and regrading would help match the grades better to avoid any potential retaining walls along the road way or even along this property to the south.

AUBIN: A lot of what Mr. Pittos said is speculation. It may happen in the future. What I also get from his comments is that there is a lot of flexibility in this situation where we can accommodate people at another time if we need to.

DZIERWA: Swore in Leona Howard, 15800 108th Avenue, Orland Park.

HOWARD: Our biggest concern is the water drainage. We are still on septic and well and we want to be sure that the elevations shown on these maps are current. We have experienced a lot of erosion over the last few years. We certainly cannot take any more water. They have the luxury of having sewers and we don't. So for us, that is definitely a major concern. The other would be the road running along our property. There is only 2-3'. We could be cutting our grass and somebody is on their cell phone and runs through our fence and hits one of us. So safety for my

family is a major concern. I want to be sure that is addressed, not to remove my fence but to add something to afford us protection.

AUBIN: Thank you. Mr. Pittos, in regards to the safety aspect, does the police department or fire district have any concerns?

PITTOS: The width of the roadway is pretty standard. It is 30' from curb to curb. That is typical of any residential road in the Village. These types of elbow bends in the road along the backside of properties are common but not standard in the developments to the north of this site. It is typical around town. It is not the only location where this is happening but there have been discussions between Mrs. Howard, the developer and the Village to accommodate some of these safety concerns and some of the proximity concerns. There is already a guard rail at the end of Southview Drive currently so people are used to seeing it there and we are just moving it 165' directly to the south.

AUBIN: Thank you. As far as the water is concerned, Mrs. Howard you had something in regards to water getting to your property. Bill is the expert witness from the petitioner. Maybe he can answer your question for you.

HOWARD: I just want to be sure that the elevations are current and that the drainage does in fact head north and west. We can't take any more water on our property.

ZALEWSKI: Currently I believe all of the water is coming toward your property. However, when we get done, 90% of the water will go to the west. That one little arrow to the right side of that building, that area is all that will be left. It will significantly reduce the amount of water that comes onto your property.

HOWARD: When you get to the subdivision, it is like 6' higher than us.

ZALEWSKI: Oh yes. It is actually 8'.

PARISI: There was also a concern about someone coming down that road and crossing the property line. I believe that is where you are moving the guard rail, correct?

PITTOS: Yes.

PARISI: There is going to be a guard rail right where that road turns. It will turn west.

HOWARDS: But as you turn and come by our property, that isn't even a secondary road. It's not going to be one of the first to be salted. If someone drives intoxicated they can slide into the fence and I don't want to be killed. Thank you.

DZIERWA: Swore in Gene Esposito, 10911Glen Lake Drive, Orland Park.

ESPOSITO: I like the project. I think this will fit in better than the townhouses they were going to build last time. I do have a couple questions. My concern is the wetland area. I know they did wetland delineation. Did they submit that to the Village?

PITTOS: Yes.

ESPOSITO: Because when I look at the drawings of the wetlands and how it fits on the property there, that wetland area comes out much farther almost to the complete extent of that last duplex. So the wetland goes all the way to the corner of the property. My concern is, I know they talked about how they are going to re-engineer everything, and I know that property very well, since they built the BMW dealership that property floods a lot more than it had in the past. At one point, the pond would dry up in the summer time based upon the weather and it doesn't dry up at all anymore. There is a lot of water back there now. One of my concerns is that you are displacing a lot of property now. I don't know what the development will be to the south but you are going to have a lot of water going that way. What concerns me is how high is the elevation built up on that property? Right where property 4 is at, there is a big drop off like 4-5'. Again my concern is where is that water going to go? And again wondering how high they will be building that up?

ZALEWSKI: Nowadays with wetlands you have to go out and do delineations that extend 100' off the site of properties because of the wetland buffers. If you have a high quality wetland that is within 100' of your property, we have to inspect it. So say for instance we have the existing lake, when we delineated the wetlands, it was determined that the wetland, where the lake is, is jurisdictional. But the other one, where the cul de sac is, is non jurisdictional. So we are allowed to fill that one in and we are going to work with Orland Park so that we can mitigate that somewhere else. We don't have to follow the Army Corp. rules for that. Going off site to find a wetland is the responsibility of the petitioner. In this situation we are following all of the rules for wetlands and the Village's engineering firm agrees with us that everything has been done according to ordinance. As far as grading, Somerglen sits high. Everything from Somerglen falls into our site. We are not going to be building up anything. We are taking all of the water off the back yards and we are going to create a swale and actually alleviate any of the water problems. We couldn't build up high enough to affect Somerglen. We would have to build a retaining wall 8' just to get even. That is not what we are going to do. We are going to stick with the grades that we have and try to have the least amount of impact. One of the requirements we had was to eliminate the retaining wall. When we first came in we had a retaining wall along the south property line and the north property line. Since we've been able to regrade this, we have been able to eliminate the walls and basically route the water through the subdivision to the detention facility.

ESPOSITO: Again in regards to the wetlands, whether it's jurisdictional or nonjurisdictional, it is still up to the Village to decide what they want to do with that. The Army Corp. only gives you a layout of what they feel a wetland is. Isn't that correct? Orland Park has the final say so not the Army Corp. of Engineers.

PITTOS: On the jurisdictional, it is Army Corp. rules. On the nonjurisdictional, the Land Development Code applies and also codes from the MWRD also apply. I think our codes have been stricter. The Village does decide which wetlands to preserve and which ones to mitigate.

ESPOSITO: From my understanding, it doesn't matter if it's jurisdictional or nonjurisdictional, Orland would have the final determination because it is their community and the Army Corp. of Engineers kind of tells you how they feel about it.

AUBIN: We are going by the code and we would have to change the codes if we were going to do something different.

PITTOS: I guess the simple answer is if you disturb Army Corp. jurisdictional wetlands; there are a whole slew of regulations that you would have to go through. If you disturb nonjurisdictional wetlands then you have to go through the local regulations as opposed to the federal. Generally, it is cost prohibitive to impact the federal wetlands. That is not to say that this is cheap what is being proposed but there is a difference for why the jurisdictional wetlands are left alone and why nonjurisdictional wetlands are mitigated.

ESPOSITO: But Orland can change that if they wanted to as long as they wanted to pay for the expense?

PITTOS: With great difficulty.

ESPOSITO: I do have one other question in regards to the fence that goes along the side of that property. What is going to happen to the property that lies just to the north of our fence? To my understanding part of the subject property is actually a little bit north of that fence. The fence lies 3' within that property.

ZALEWSKI: I wasn't aware that their fence was on our property. Two things can happen and this will be up to the owner. He can leave the fence in place at the top of the berm or we can remove the fence and do heavy landscaping. The owners of the fence can move it onto their own property. It sounds like somebody put the fence in the wrong place and now it is going to be up to us to decide how we want to deal with the landscaping and privacy. It is one of those issues where it will have to be talked about. I'm not sure.

AUBIN: We will put that in as a condition to take care of that one way or the other.

ABEL: Just wanted to make sure Mr. DeStefano didn't misunderstand what I was saying. Looking at the Comprehensive Plan, it is a concept. We were trying to get across that there is a tremendous amount of flexibility. There are a number of mixed use developments. You could have commercial in the front and Mr. DeStefano could decide that there should be residential in the back. They can tie into the road. If they don't, they don't have to. The important thing is that the 30' right of way is there and we are not asking in any variation in that. It was not my intent to dictate the future and that the road had to go through this property. You have complete flexibility if you look at the Comprehensive Plan.

AUBIN: Thank you for your comments. We will now go to the Commissioners for any comments.

PARISI: A lot of the issues that I would have touched upon we have discussed. One thing is clear that the designation of E-1 is outdated. The continuation as a buffer going from single family to attached is a sensible continuation on that property. I understand that the petitioners have read all of the conditions and they are agreeable to them to this point. I do have some concern for the homeowners and I don't have the answer to this. The cul de sac is 112'. Will that hinder fire equipment?

PITTOS: Not likely.

PARISI: Actually, future development is not before us tonight otherwise I would be wondering. I am not going to speculate whether we're going to continue the cul de sac or just close it off. That's all I had.

MURPHY: I am in agreement with Commissioner Parisi. He made great points. Personally, I am a resident of Somerglen so this is a special interest for me. But I think that the use makes sense and it's along the lines of our Comprehensive Plan in Orland Park. I agree that it would be my concern that the cul de sac would continue directly south to 159th Street. At some point it might make its way around but that is for a later date. It is a positive change and I know my own personal experiences because I have lived in Equestrian when we did the BMW. The entire Village and Planning Commission worked with the residents and the neighbors. I know that this will happen with this project as well. Thank you.

PAUL: I appreciate the work that everyone has put into this. That is a difficult piece of land to develop. I am impressed with what every side has done to make this work. That is about as good as you can do with that piece of property. I don't have any problems with it. I think the homeowner's concerns have been properly addressed. As far as the future stuff, that is not something that we are going to deal with here and now. But I have no objection to this.

DZIERWA: First of all, I like planning but I don't like planning too far ahead. That is staff's job and the developer to think about what could happen in the future.

Property owners get really nervous when you start telling them you are going to put a roadway through their property and they haven't sold yet or even thought about selling it yet and might want to keep it until the day that they die and leave it to their family and tell them not to sell it. Let's not think too far ahead but staff is doing their job and saying it's possible that could happen. I am very comfortable with that because we have seen it happen. As far as this particular development goes, I really like the way it is laid out. At first I thought we should move Hampton Court a little farther south and switch the first building but it works either way. As long as the water drainage issues are taken care of it doesn't matter to me. It matters most to what works for the developer and what works for the adjacent home owners. Mr. Esposito, you talked about getting more water and seeing more flooding since the BMW dealership was built and I've noticed that too. But I've also noticed that we've had about 5, 100-year rains in the last couple years. I've noticed it even in my own backyard and I've been developed for quite a few years and I live on the east side of Orland. What the developer is doing here is a significant improvement and should help with water drainage. There is a swale that the County handles. As far as everything else is concerned, I really like the fact that this is falling into what we call a transitional piece of property. We just updated our Land Development Code and we just changed our Comprehensive Plan. This is a piece of property that you can separate larger single family homes from a commercial development by putting in something like this. This is a good fit for something like this. Mr. Pittos, did we stress nonjurisdictional wetlands during the last Land Development Code changes?

PITTOS: The codes have not changed regarding wetlands in a number of years.

DZIERWA: Ok. I thought that we might have talked about it more recently. I agree with everything else.

AUBIN: My comments are brief. I agree with my other plan commissioners. I have a lot of confidence in the Village of Orland Park staff and engineering staff. It would not come in front of us unless it met numerous requirements that are good for the petitioner, neighbors and Orland Park. At this point we will move forward with a motion.

PARISI:

I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission the findings of fact set forth in this staff report, dated January 27, 2015

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board to approve the rezoning of 15760 108th Avenue from E-1 Estate Residential District to R-4 Residential District subject to the conditions outlined below;

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board to approve the preliminary site plan titled "Preliminary Site Plan Hampton Court Orland Park, Illinois", prepared by VantagePoint Engineering, dated received January 8, 2015, job number 14-12, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Add a guard rail at the south property line where Southview Drive turns west to Hampton Court;
- 2) Install off-site landscaping on the south side of Hampton Court and generally plant the new trees as the future parkway trees;
- 3) Appropriately grade the area adjacent to the southwest corner of Lot 1 (in the public right-of-way) to manage storm water and direct it west to the detention pond;
- 4) Add crosswalks at both corners of Hampton Lane and Southview Drive to connect the east and west sides of the Southview Drive sidewalk network;
- 5) Submit a final landscape plan, meeting all Village Codes, for separate review and approval within 60 days of final engineering approval;
- 6) Work with the Village to determine appropriate offsite wetland mitigation via the Development Agreement;
- 7) Shift the building on Lot 1 north five (5) feet to meet the south 25 foot side setback requirement; and
- 8) Meet all final engineering and building code related items.
- 9) Petitioner will work with staff and adjacent homeowners to determine the final position of the fence to the north of the property.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board to approve the Elevations titled "Hampton Court Concept", dated January 22, 2015, subject to the same above conditions and the following:

- 10) Avoid color monotony on the proposed single family attached duplex buildings while keeping within the same color palette.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board to approve the Hampton Court subdivision for six (6) lots subject to the same above conditions and the following:

- 11) Submit a Record Plat of Subdivision to the Village for recording.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board to approve the following Variances for

Hampton Court:

- 1) Reduce the wetland setback from 50 feet to zero (0) feet;
- 2) Reduce the width of the future public right-of-way for partial construction from 60 feet to 45 feet;
- 3) Reduce the diameter of the cul-de-sac bulb from 120 feet to 112 feet;
- 4) Reduce the pond maintenance area from 25 feet to not less than fifteen (15) feet;
- 5) Reduce the detention pond setback from 25 feet to not less than eighteen (18) feet.

All changes must be made prior to the Board meeting.

MURPHY: Second.

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL

Aye: 5 - Member Aubin, Member Dzierwa, Member Parisi, Member Paul and Member Murphy

Nay: 0

Absent: 2 - Chairman Stephens and Member Jacobs

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

OTHER BUSINESS

2015-0040 Memo: New Petitions & Appearance Review

None.

ADJOURNMENT

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

AUBIN: This meeting is adjourned at 8:33 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Zorena
Recording Secretary