

MINUTES OF THE PLAN COMMISSION
July 22, 2013

The regular meeting of the Plan Commission was called to order by Chairman Mark Moore at 7:03 p.m. at the Village Hall.

Members present: Chairman Mark Moore, Scott Adams, William Cotey, Dan Donahue, Kurt Schultz, and David Semmelman.

Members absent: Walter Oakley.

Village Staff present: David Smith, Senior Planner.

Commissioner Cotey moved, seconded by Commissioner Schultz, to approve the May 20, 2013, Plan Commission meeting minutes.

Motion carried 6 - 0.

Commissioner Adams moved, seconded by Commissioner Schultz, to approve the June 24, 2013, Plan Commission meeting minutes.

Motion carried 6 - 0.

OLD BUSINESS:

**PC 13-15 Libertyville Cooperative Nursery School, Applicant
 1190 W. Winchester Road**

Request is for an Amendment to a Special Use Permit for Child Day Care Services located in the Trinity Community Church in an IB, Institutional Buildings District.

**PC 13-16 Libertyville Cooperative Nursery School, Applicant
 1190 W. Winchester Road**

Request is for a Site Plan Permit for Child Day Care Services located in the Trinity Community Church in an IB, Institutional Buildings District.

(Commissioner Adams recused himself.)

Mr. David Smith, Senior Planner, introduced the request of the petitioner to the Plan Commission. Mr. Smith stated that the applicant, Libertyville Cooperative Nursery School, (LCNS) appeared before the Plan Commission in 2011 requesting a Special Use Permit to allow a Day Care Center in an IB, Institutional Buildings District to be located in Trinity Community Church at 1190 W. Winchester Road. Mr. Smith stated that the Village Board granted approval for the Special Use Permit on May 25, 2011, with the condition that the Special Use is valid for two (2) years from the date that LCNS classes commence per Ordinance No. 11-O-35. Mr. Smith stated that this condition was stipulated with the understanding that LCNS would return to

Minutes of the July 22, 2013, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 2 of 12

its prior place of occupancy, the First Presbyterian Church located on Maple Avenue. Mr. Smith stated that since that time, LCNS has decided to make Trinity Community Church its permanent home and therefore, is requesting to amend their Special Use Permit by removing the two (2) year time limit.

Mr. Smith stated that in addition, the petitioner is proposing to install outdoor playground equipment enclosed with a Code compliant fence with latching gate that would serve the children attending LCNS on the Trinity Church grounds located on the west side of the church building more than 70 feet from the western property line and is therefore requesting Site Plan Permit.

Ms. Adrienne Johnson, President of the Board of Directors for LCNS, stated LCNS has been in existence since 1945. She stated that they are seeking the requested amendment as they intend to make Trinity Church their permanent home. She stated that they are seeking approval to add playground equipment, enclosed by Code compliant fence on the west side of the building, in order to help develop the gross motor skills of the children they serve. She stated that they will be before the Village Board tomorrow night seeking approval to move forward with the construction of the playground equipment as they have a deadline of August 1, 2013 with Home Depot who is giving LCNS consideration for a financial grant that once awarded, will be used to help financially support the construction of the playground equipment.

Mr. Gene Silos, 1004 Wellington, stated that he has lived next door to the church for over 30 years. He stated that the Village has been very dismissive of the neighborhood in favor of the church. He stated that Village residents pay taxes, but that the church contributes nothing. He stated that privacy fencing between the church and the residents would help. He stated that the Village approved an expansion of the church building and its parking lot in 1982. He stated that the church should talk to the neighbors and offer to install privacy fencing. He stated that the Village of Libertyville waived the fees for the church and that is a violation of assumed separation of church and state. He stated that he had to pay a \$30 permit fee to have his hot water heater inspected by the Village. He stated that the church is not required to pay taxes.

Commissioner Schultz asked why the request is being made by the petitioner. Ms. Johnson stated that the reason for the move from First Presbyterian Church to Trinity Church two years ago was because First Presbyterian was going to renovate their building and needed LCNS to temporarily move out with the intent of allowing them to move back. She stated that after moving to Trinity, First Presbyterian had to delay their intended church building improvements due to financial constraints and still have not yet completed their work. She stated that during the interim, the Trinity church location has worked out very well and the decision was made to make Trinity their permanent location therefore they were incumbent to request that the condition of the Special Use Permit to limit their approval to a two (2) year time limit be removed in order to allow LCNS to remain as a tenant of Trinity Church indefinitely.

Commissioner Donahue asked how many LCNS pre-school children belong to families that are Village of Libertyville residents. Ms. Johnson stated that approximately 90% of the LCNS pre-schoolers are residents of Libertyville.

Minutes of the July 22, 2013, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 3 of 12

Commissioner Donahue asked Mr. Silos if any of his other neighbors have the same opinion about Trinity Church as he does. Mr. Silos stated that most of his neighbors from the 1982 time period have either moved out or died. He stated that the church has not divulged long term plans for the property. He stated that the Village has not ascertained what the needs of the neighbors are. He stated that only the LCNS tenant is present for tonight's public hearing, but there is not a representative from Trinity Church present for tonight's public hearing.

Chairman Moore requested that Mr. Silos stay on point.

Mr. Silos stated that the church has not divulged long term plans for the property and that there is a need for privacy fencing between the church property and the neighboring residential properties.

Ms. Johnson stated that LCNS is only using existing classroom space within the existing church building with no intent to do a physical building expansion, nor is she aware of any plans by Trinity Church to do any expansions.

Commissioner Semmelman stated that he has no issues with the requested amendment to the Special Use Permit by the petitioner.

Commissioner Cotey stated that consideration could be given to any future expansion plans by the church to condition such approval with a requirement to install privacy fencing between the church property and the neighboring residential properties.

Mr. Silos stated that both the church and LCNS are non-tax paying entities. He stated that the Village should not ignore the needs of the neighbors. He stated that the rear portion of the church property should be converted back to grass.

Ms. Johnson stated that LCNS was compliant with the required public notice procedures for public hearing and had sent the public notice letters to the surrounding property owners per the requirements of the Zoning Code.

Chairman Moore asked the petitioner what they would like for the Plan Commissioner to do tonight. Ms. Johnson stated that she would like for the Plan Commission to give a positive recommendation for their requests to the Village Board.

In the matter of PC 13-15, Commissioner Cotey moved, seconded by Commissioner Schultz, to recommend the Village Board of Trustees approve an Amendment to the Special Use Permit for Child Day Care Services located in the Trinity Community Church in an IB, Institutional Buildings District, in accordance with the plans submitted.

Motion carried 5 - 0.

Ayes: Moore, Cotey, Donahue, Schultz, Semmelman
Nays: None
Absent: Oakley

Minutes of the July 22, 2013, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 4 of 12

In the matter of PC 13-16, Commissioner Schultz moved, seconded by Commissioner Cotey, to recommend the Village Board of Trustees approve a Site Plan Permit for Child Day Care Services located in the Trinity Community Church in an IB, Institutional Buildings District, in accordance with the plans submitted.

Motion carried 5 - 0.

Ayes: Moore, Cotey, Donahue, Schultz, Semmelman

Nays: None

Absent: Oakley

PC 13-17 Advocate Condell Medical Center, Applicant
801 S. Milwaukee Avenue

Update to the Planned Development Master Plan for the Advocate Condell Medical Center campus located in an IB, Institutional Buildings District.

Mr. David Smith, Senior Planner, stated that the petitioner, Advocate Condell Medical Center, was granted a Special Use Permit for a Planned Development Master Plan on June 25, 2008, by the Village Board of Trustees in order to further develop the approximately 76.9 acre Advocate Condell Medical Center campus in an IB, Institutional Buildings District located at 801 S. Milwaukee Avenue.

Mr. Smith stated that the construction of all elements of the Master Plan must be completed not later than twenty (20) years following approval of the Master Plan by the Board of Trustees. Mr. Smith stated that not later than five (5) years after such approval, the Plan Commission shall conduct a public hearing to review the progress and status of the Master Plan. Mr. Smith stated that at such public hearing, the applicant shall provide an update as to the status of the Master Plan and shall advise the Plan Commission of the construction which has been completed up until the date of such public hearing and the construction which the applicant reasonably believes will be completed within the five (5) year period following such public hearing. Mr. Smith stated that the applicant shall provide updates to the Plan Commission at additional public hearings to be conducted not later than every five (5) years thereafter.

Mr. Smith stated that in accordance with the Zoning Code, the petitioner is presenting its first five (5) year update of its Master Plan.

Mr. James Babowice, attorney for the petitioner, stated that shortly after the initial Master Plan approval in 2008, that ownership of Condell Medical Center transferred to Advocate Condell Medical Center. Mr. Babowice introduced Mr. Jim Kokaska from Advocate Condell.

Mr. Kokaska stated that upon approval of the Master Plan, the medical center commenced construction of the now complete West Patient Bed Tower which is comprised of 178,000 square feet in floor area with 72 private patient rooms. He stated that subsequently, the medical center

Minutes of the July 22, 2013, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 5 of 12

has been able to transition all remaining semi-private patient rooms into 100% private patient rooms.

Ms. Katrina Laflin, architect on record for the Master Plan, stated that since completion and approval of the Master Plan Landscape Plan, the medical center has successfully removed up to 143 infected Ash trees and had undergone a campus wide replacement tree program that is comprised of Red Oak, Honey Locust, Lindens and other approved hard wood tree species.

Mr. Kevin Camino, civil engineer on record for the Master Plan, presented the Storm Water Management Program for the medical center campus.

Mr. Roberto Orozco, sign company representative for the Master Plan, stated that Advocate came back before the Plan Commission and Village Board in 2010 to request an amendment to the Master Plan in order to gain approval for a Unified Sign Program that was medical center campus wide that included building identifiers, entrance signs and way finding signage. He stated that the intent behind the design of the sign program was to help reduce anxiety of arriving patients.

Mr. Scott Nelson, Director of Planning for Advocate Condell Medical Center, stated that they are currently planning a 2,500 square foot cancer center addition. He stated that they anticipate completion of their in-house strategic planning by Spring of 2014.

Commissioner Adams stated that the petitioner appreciates their presentation and that Advocate Condell has done a good job.

Commissioner Cotey stated that consideration should be given to notifying the Plan Commission if Advocate Condell acquires additional land in the future.

Chairman Moore asked about the level of trauma care that the medical center is currently at. Mr. Nelson stated the medical center has been upgraded to a Level One Trauma Care which is the highest level of trauma care.

Chairman Moore stated that he appreciates the update from the applicant and looks forward to hearing about further developments as they evolve.

NEW BUSINESS:

PC 13-18 Village of Libertyville, Applicant

Request is for a Text Amendment to Section 10-1.3 of the Libertyville Zoning Code relating to the parking requirements for existing uses.

Mr. David Smith, Senior Planner, stated that Village Staff is proposing a Text Amendment to Section 10 of the Libertyville Zoning Code relating to the parking requirements for existing structures in the C-1, Downtown Core Commercial District. Mr. Smith stated that under the current Code, existing structures in the C-1 District are not required to provide additional parking

Minutes of the July 22, 2013, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 6 of 12

when there is a change of use unless all or portions of an existing structure are removed or rebuilt with new construction thereby adding new floor area.

Mr. Smith stated that after further review of the Zoning Code text, it was determined that the removal of a roof of an existing building in the C-1 District should not constitute a change of the definition of an existing structure provided that the remaining exterior vertical walls remain intact, therefore in order to provide some leniency to the otherwise restrictive parking requirements while allowing certain improvements within the C-1 District, the proposed amendment will enable the redevelopment of existing facilities in the C-1, Downtown Core Commercial District that may involve the removal of building roofs while protecting the integrity of existing exterior walls.

Mr. Pardys stated that the Zoning Code provisions are unchanged as it relates to the definition of an existing structure in the downtown C-1 District except for the removal of the roof over a building. He stated that with this proposed text amendment, what remains as part of the definition for an existing structure is the exterior walls that make up the building with the term roof excluded. He stated that a roof could then be removed or rebuilt without the requirement for additional parking.

Commissioner Cotey asked if this proposed change is to accommodate roof top dining. Mr. Pardys stated that it would accommodate the re-design of a building in the C-1 District if the roof were to be removed and re-developed for roof top dining. He stated that it could be applied in other contexts as well. He stated that it could ease the standards to a certain degree for the existing building restriction.

Commissioner Adams stated that he is concerned that if a use changes from a low volume retail to a higher volume restaurant use how that will impact the current problem of congested parking in the downtown area of Libertyville.

Mr. Pardys stated that the Zoning Code does not require additional parking in the C-1 District when the use changes provided that the existing building remains intact.

Commissioner Adams stated that it is difficult to justify the change in use when there is an increase in the use's intensity.

Mr. Smith stated that the current Zoning Code parking regulations as they apply to the C-1 District have been in place for a substantial amount of time and it is intended to promote continued existence of the buildings in the downtown.

Commissioner Adams stated that there are buildings in the downtown that provide no parking at all. He stated that there are times on a Friday or Saturday night and parking is very difficult to find. He stated that there should be some kind of contribution to address the parking situation in the downtown.

Mr. Smith stated that there is still a "Pay-in-Lieu" regulation. He stated that a parking study was done a few years ago to help identify the parking needs in the downtown area. He stated that

Minutes of the July 22, 2013, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 7 of 12

Libertyville's parking problem is not too dissimilar from most urban cores in other communities. He stated that this is why the Village built the parking deck and is why the Village is exploring opportunities for a second parking deck. He stated that the Code is written in such a way to encourage the exchange of uses in the downtown and is intended to be pliable in response the changes in the market, it helps to keep vacancies filled in the downtown. He stated that the text amendment before the Plan Commission tonight is intended to offer a little more leniency in the parking regulations while allowing some opportunities for downtown rehabilitation of structures while maintaining existing square footages of these structures.

Commissioner Cotey asked for clarification that the proposed text amendment is only for the downtown C-1 District. Mr. Smith stated that the proposed amendment is only for the C-1 District.

Commissioner Cotey stated that he is reminded of the demolition of the Frank's Nursery to make way for the Fresh Food's grocer and that there was a portion of the older structure left remaining and wondered if there was a credit in the parking requirement for the Fresh Food's.

Mr. Smith stated that the parking waiver for an existing building only applies to the C-1 District with the intent of protecting the quality of the community's urban core. He stated that if a building is demolished, then parking is required for a new building in the C-1 District.

Commissioner Cotey asked if further examination should be given to how the parking regulations may impact potential transit-oriented development and the use of bicycle racks, taxi stands, and so on.

Mr. Pardys stated the origin of the current Zoning Code regulation came from the development of the Manchester Square building located at the southwest corner of Lake Street and Milwaukee Avenue. He stated that the Manchester Square developer was able to interpret that the remnant portion of a building left standing, that being a portion of an exterior wall, after demolishing the majority of the existing structure, permitted him to have required parking spaces credited to his overall parking requirement without having to actually construct them. Mr. Pardys stated that he was able to make that interpretation because the Zoning Code did not sufficiently define what an existing structure was and therefore no new parking was required, except for the new floor area constructed beyond the foot print of the older building structure. He stated that after the development of the Manchester Square building, the Zoning Code was modified to better define an existing structure to be enclosed by walls and roof. He stated that the text amendment before the Plan Commission tonight is intended to ease that definition by removing the roof requirement.

Mr. Pardys stated that in response to Commissioner Adams concern about the increase in the intensity when a use changes without doing anything to an existing building would not require additional parking spaces. He stated that the intent is to keep the downtown building spaces occupied and it has been that way for a number of years.

Commissioner Adams stated that before the developer built Manchester Square, they had shown interest in the property located at 545 N. Milwaukee Avenue, but became disinterested when

Minutes of the July 22, 2013, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 8 of 12

confronted with the parking requirements triggered by their proposal that included a certain amount of redevelopment that included new floor area. He stated that they abandoned that project because they couldn't get a waiver on the parking requirement.

Commissioner Adams stated that his concern is that if more high volume uses continue to come into the downtown then the parking congestion will escalate.

Chairman Moore stated that from a planning perspective, he agrees with Commissioner Adams. He stated that the feedback provided tonight should be given consideration relative to how the Zoning Code text should be amended relative to the intensity of the use and the requirement for parking. He stated that if planning for these circumstances isn't done now, it will have an impact on the success of the businesses in the downtown and an opportunity for growth could be curtailed.

Mr. Smith asked for clarification if it is the intent of the Plan Commission that further study be done regarding the requirement for higher intensity uses, such as restaurants, to provide their own parking on site in the downtown.

Commissioner Adams stated that there should be a parking ratio built into the Zoning Code. He stated that he is wondering what the saturation point is for downtown Libertyville for bars and restaurants. He stated that the parking requirement issue is relative to the types of uses that are permitted in the downtown. He stated that when Mickey Finn's first opened, the owner used a valet parking service. He stated that as more restaurants come in, they will go back to valet parking service and he is concerned that people will park further out into the residential areas.

Commissioner Adams stated that the Code changes should protect the residents, helps to substantiate the growth and provides adequate parking. He stated that the proposed amendment tonight can have a profound impact on the parking issue if a new restaurant were to open and is not fair to the other businesses.

Chairman Moore stated that it doesn't make sense to allow a higher intense use to occupy a space in the downtown where a lower intense use used to be without requiring more parking from a practical stand point.

Commissioner Semmelman stated that it would be difficult to require additional parking in the downtown if it is not available.

Chairman Moore stated that it would either be provided as additional parking or compensation paid into the Village.

Commissioner Semmelman stated that compensation may be able to address the current lack of parking.

Chairman Moore stated that everyone recognizes the current parking situation, but that it is important to plan for the future relative to the higher intense users.

Minutes of the July 22, 2013, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 9 of 12

Commissioner Adams stated that the east side of Milwaukee Avenue in the 500 block is owned by multiple users. He stated that a pay-in-lieu account could be used to pay for the next parking deck. He stated that it is better to either require the parking or a compensation program to address the downtown parking problem. He stated that it would attract better development in the long term. He stated that the proposed text amendment creates a circumstance for a quick and easy change to structures in the downtown without requiring parking.

Commissioner Schultz asked Staff to clarify how the parking regulations are impacting property in the C-1 District if additional floor area is added as a mezzanine within an existing structure or if a roof top becomes occupy-able space. Mr. Smith stated that the addition of a mezzanine would require parking. He stated that roof tops would not fit the definition of floor area and therefore be exempt from the parking regulation.

Chairman Moore asked if a rooftop garden/restaurant is allowed. Mr. Smith stated that rooftop occupancies are not restricted by the Zoning Code.

Mr. Pardys stated that they may not be restricted by Zoning Code, but the Building Code would have to regulate how such occupancies would be developed.

Commissioner Schultz stated that a restaurant's occupancy could virtually double if it were to utilize roof top dining. He stated that this increase in the occupancy load for a restaurant without the requirement to provide parking should be examined closely and given proper consideration as part of any text amendment that affects the parking regulation for the C-1, Downtown Core Commercial District.

Commissioner Donahue asked if roof top dining could be tented. Mr. Smith stated that any proposal to tent in roof top dining would be regulated in the same way as ground mounted tents would be provided that all other codes and regulations were complied with.

Commissioner Donahue asked if the roof top dining would require parking if it was tented. Mr. Smith stated that outdoor dining at any level does not require parking per the Zoning Code.

Commissioner Adams asked if a restaurant's occupancy is increased by adding roof top dining. Mr. Smith stated that the Zoning Code would not restrict roof top dining, but that the Building Code would regulate roof top dining relative to how it is accessed and constructed.

Commissioner Schultz stated that the occupancy would increase in that situation.

Chairman Moore stated that it may be worthwhile to take proactive approach relative to the parking requirement and roof top dining as consideration is given to amending the Zoning Code.

Commissioner Schultz stated that he does not usually have a problem finding an available parking space on most evenings in the downtown area.

Commissioner Donahue stated that the east side has a bigger problem than the west side.

Minutes of the July 22, 2013, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 10 of 12

Commissioner Schultz asked if Staff is going to commence further study on the issue or is Staff requesting that the Plan Commission give a recommendation for approval as it is presented.

Chairman Moore asked Staff what action he would like for the Plan Commission to do regarding the proposed text amendment. Mr. Smith stated that he would like for the Plan Commission to render their recommendation to the Village Board tonight.

In the matter of PC 13-18, Commissioner Semmelman moved, seconded by Commissioner Donahue, to recommend the Village Board of Trustees approve a Text Amendment to Section 10-1.3 of the Libertyville Zoning Code relating to the parking requirements for existing uses.

Motion failed 0 - 6.

Ayes: None

Nays: Moore, Adams, Cotey, Donahue, Schultz, Semmelman

Absent: Oakley

Workshop Discussion - Article 11 of the Libertyville Zoning Code

Mr. David Smith, Senior Planner, stated that Staff wishes to extend their appreciation for the Plan Commission work completed to date on the proposed sign ordinance. Mr. Smith stated that prior to the public hearing on the proposed ordinance, Staff recommends that the Plan Commission form an Ad Hoc Committee to review and report back on the changes. Mr. Smith stated that this would allow for business, property owners, and other Commission input prior to the hearing. Mr. Smith stated that members could be chosen from a number of stakeholder's groups to assure that various opinions are heard. Mr. Smith stated that this would be a similar process to the 2005 ordinance regulating office and financial institutions along Milwaukee Avenue downtown.

Mr. Smith stated that Staff would coordinate meetings of the committee who would be charged with reporting back to the Plan Commission on the proposed ordinance.

Chairman Moore stated consideration could be given to allowing the members of the Plan Commission to have some discourse on Staff's proposal to form an Ad Hoc Committee.

Mr. Smith stated that the Plan Commission should be able to discuss any aspect of the proposal to form the Ad Hoc Committee or of the sign ordinance itself tonight. He stated that Staff has substantial insight as to who might best serve on the proposed Ad Hoc Committee as Staff is in continuous dialogue with various stakeholders on a regular basis and therefore, may be in an advantageous position to make such a recommendation.

Commissioner Cotey stated that the proposed approach with an Ad Hoc Committee appears to resemble how the Comprehensive Plan update was undertaken.

Minutes of the July 22, 2013, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 11 of 12

Mr. Smith stated that the workshops would function as open public meetings, not public hearings. He stated that the committee would conduct the workshops to discuss changes to the Sign Code and then report up to the Plan Commission.

Commissioner Cotey stated that the only problem that he has with this approach is that it appears to be open ended without an end date to the workshop process. He stated that there should be a pre-determined start and end date.

Chairman Moore asked if having only one member from each of the existing Boards and Commissions is problematic. Mr. David Pardys, Village Attorney, stated he didn't see a problem with having only one member from the existing Boards and Commissions serve on the Ad Hoc Committee.

Chairman Moore stated that the public may object to having only one representative from each of the existing Boards and Commissions.

Mr. Pardys stated that he did not see a problem of having only one member from each of the existing Boards and Commissions. He stated that feedback does not have to be limited to coming only from the representatives of existing Boards and Commissions, but the proposal appears to also include property owners and Libertyville MainStreet to serve on the Ad Hoc Committee.

Mr. Smith stated that previous attempts to amend the Sign Code have been contentious. He stated that the proposed approach to incorporate a more inclusive process with the Ad Hoc Committee workshops may help to alleviate what might otherwise be a combative process with the risk of any Sign Code changes not receiving approval.

Commissioner Adams stated that he agrees with the intent of the Ad Hoc Committee to solicit membership from a diversified representation.

Commissioner Donahue stated that he supports Staff's proposal for the formation of an Ad Hoc Committee.

Chairman Moore stated that any determination as to how long the workshop process will take may partly depend upon the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Pardys stated that it should be the Plan Commission who will send their recommendation up to the Village Board for the proposed formation of the Ad Hoc Committee. He stated that he was not certain that the Plan Commission has the authority to establish a committee.

Chairman Moore stated that the Ad Hoc Committee will be set up to conduct their work and then they will make recommendations regarding changes to the Sign Ordinance to the Plan Commission for public hearing. Mr. Smith stated that that is the intended proposal by Staff.

Chairman Moore stated that in order to address the update to the Sign Ordinance, he will entertain a motion recommending that the Village of Libertyville establish an Ad Hoc

Minutes of the July 22, 2013, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 12 of 12

Committee consisting of members as outlined in the July 11, 2013 memorandum from Planning Division Staff. The Ad Hoc Committee would develop recommend changes to the Sign Ordinance and presented to the Plan Commission as part of a public hearing process.

Mr. Pardys stated that if the Ad Hoc Committee does not have an official capacity, then it may not be necessary to request approval of the Village Board to form the committee.

Mr. Smith stated that the formation of the Ad Hoc Committee does have a certain level of being formal and may merit the Village Board's involvement if the Village Attorney is concerned about its legality.

Mr. Pardys stated that his concern of the establishment of a committee and the yet determined frequency of their workshop meetings may be an infringement of the Open Meetings Act. He stated that his preference is that the Village Board provide their approval for the formation of this Ad Hoc Committee.

Commissioner Semmelman made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Adams, recommending that the Village Board establish an Ad Hoc Committee consisting of members as outlined in the July 11, 2013 memorandum from Planning Division Staff. The Ad Hoc Committee would develop recommended changes to the Sign Ordinance and present these changes to the Plan Commission as part of a public hearing process.

Motion carried 6 - 0.

COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCUSSION: None.

Commissioner Donahue moved, seconded by Commissioner Adams, to adjourn the Plan Commission meeting.

Motion carried 6 - 0.

Meeting adjourned at 8:52 p.m.