

**MINUTES**  
**FLOSSMOOR PLAN COMMISSION**  
**REGULAR APRIL MEETING**  
**APRIL 15, 2021**

Chair Curran called the April 15, 2021 regular Meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:35 PM

**1. ROLL CALL**

**PRESENT:**

Chair Curran (remote), Commissioners Matthys, Mitchell and Yast.

**ABSENT:** Commissioners Maddox, Martin, McCarthy

**ALSO PRESENT:**

Scott Bugner, Zoning Administrator; Aretus Smith, Petitioner; Robert Kirk, Petitioner; Pearl Smith, Petitioner; Brad Hensley, Engineer; Residents William Mustafa; Herman Weaver (remote); Aneesha Sergeant (remote); Anthony Scrementi; Dorothy Scrementi; Monique Smith; Angie Smith

**2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF MARCH 18, 2021**

Chair Curran asked the Commissioners if they had any changes or comments. Hearing no changes, Acting Chair McCarthy asked for a motion to approve the minutes as submitted.

**Commissioner Matthys motioned to accept the minutes of the March 18, 2021 meeting as submitted. Commissioner Mitchell seconded the motion which passed by roll call vote.**

**AYES:** Chair Curran, Commissioners, Matthys, Mitchell and Yast

**NAYS:** None

**3. CONSIDERATION OF A REQUEST FOR RECOMMENDATION OF A CONCEPT PLAN FOR A PLAT OF SUBDIVISION.**

Chair Curran introduced the item and asked Mr. Bugner to provide a review of the request.

Mr. Bugner read the staff memo into the record as follows:

“During the previous meeting held on March 18, 2021 the Plan Commission considered a request for a conceptual plan for a plat of subdivision and a variation from Section VIII E. of the Flossmoor Subdivision Ordinance. The request had been submitted by Robert Kirk of Group A Architecture on behalf of the property owner Aretus Smith of ACPS Developers.

The petitioner had proposed seven new detached single-family dwellings with three facing Flossmoor Road and four facing Hamlin Avenue. The petitioner was seeking a zoning designation of R-6 Single Family Residential which is the same classification as the Flossmoor Hills and Highlands Subdivisions on the north side of Flossmoor Road. The petitioner was also requesting a variance from the Village’s Subdivision Ordinance for a reduction in the minimum lot width in new subdivisions from 75 feet in width to approximately 63.3 feet.

Following discussion and public comments during the hearing, a motion to recommend that a variance be granted failed on the lack of a second.

Commission members had voiced concerns about the density of the proposed subdivision, stormwater detention as well as potential impact to neighboring properties.

The petitioner has subsequently submitted a revised concept plan which would reduce the number of buildable lots from seven to six with the addition of a separate lot dedicated to stormwater detention of 27,809 square feet in area. Each of the buildable lots (three facing Flossmoor Road and three facing Hamlin Avenue) would be approximately 12,500 square feet in area with lot widths of approximately 85 feet. This concept plan would conform with the site requirements for the R-5 Single-Family Residential District where the minimum lot width is 75 feet and the minimum lot area is 12,500 square feet.

The subject properties are located at the southeast corner of Flossmoor Road and Hamlin Avenue in unincorporated Cook County. The unimproved vacant parcels include an area of approximately 256’ wide by 400’ deep.

Public Works Director John Brunke offered the following comments regarding the proposed subdivision request:

1. An 8” sanitary sewer extension will be needed from the northeast corner of Flossmoor Road and Hamlin Avenue, south to the south line of the proposed development to serve

- lots 1,4,5 and 6. Another sanitary sewer extension will be needed along the south side of Flossmoor Road to the east line of the development to serve lots 2 and 3.
2. An 8" water main extension will be needed from the north side of Flossmoor Road, south to the existing 8" water main at the southeast corner of Hamlin Avenue and 192<sup>nd</sup> Street to serve lots 1,4,5 and 6. Lots 2 and 3 can be served by a water service installed under Flossmoor Road to the existing water main on the northside of Flossmoor Road.
  3. With the annexation of this property, the right-of-way of Hamlin Avenue will need to be dedicated to the Village via plat. Further, Hamlin Avenue will also need to be improved to the Village standard (27 ft. back-of-curb to back-of-curb) roadway with curb and gutter and storm sewer infrastructure along the frontage of the development.
  4. Sidewalk will be required on the east side of Hamlin Avenue from the corner of Flossmoor Road to the south lot line of the development and on Flossmoor Road from Hamlin Avenue to the east lot line of the development.
  5. Stormwater Detention will be required for this development in accordance with the Village's Stormwater Management Ordinance. The site naturally drains to the northeast corner of the site to the County right-of-way ditch and this pattern will need to be maintained for the discharge of stormwater from this development.
  6. In addition to the permits and approvals that will be required from the Village, permits or approvals will also be required from the MWRD, IEPA, Cook County Department of Transportation and Highways, and the Rich Township Highway Department.

Should the Plan Commission recommend approval of the newly proposed concept plan the petitioner would then proceed with annexation and submittal of preliminary/final plans for the subdivision which would be presented at a future hearing before the Plan Commission."

Chair Curran asked the petitioner provide a summary of the petition.

Robert Kirk of Group A Architecture started to provide a detail of the proposed changes to concept plan and as requested by Commissioner Matthys discussed the types of building materials such to be used until technical audio issues with the remote participants became apparent and the meeting was temporarily halted until those issues were corrected.

Upon resuming the meeting Mr. Kirk re-started his presentation. Mr. Kirk stated that at the last meeting there was some major opposition because they were seeking an R-6 zoning which had smaller lots so they went back and changed the lot sizes to meet the subdivision ordinance and the R-5 zoning. Mr. Kirk stated that there was also concern about not having a separate lot dedicated to stormwater detention and that there is now a separate lot which would be jointly owned by the 6 different homeowners. He advised that the parcel was approximately half an acre in area located on the site where the topography indicates. Mr. Kirk stated that Landmark

April 15, 2021

Page 4 of 13

Engineering was available at the meeting whom he would introduce. Mr. Kirk added that neighbors and members of the Commission had concerns about water drainage from the site and that they would like to address that as well as the infrastructure improvements required by Public Works.

Mr. Kirk stated that they have 6 separate unique floor plans and elevations but that have some common elements among them. He stated that they felt that a subdivision of 6 homes is the perfect size for this kind of mix of unique architecture. He stated that the homes were of a mid-century style which Flossmoor has a strong history of and has some great examples. He advised that they wanted to bring it back fresh not just in an old style but something that would fit into this area with a fresh new look for Flossmoor. Mr. Kirk advised that they did address the issues brought up at the previous meeting and that he had provided all 6 floor plans and elevations.

Mr. Kirk stated that in looking at the site plan you will note that the distance between each home has nearly double from the previous submittal because of the increase in lot width and would also allow for keeping more of the mature trees on site. He advised that the area dedicated for detention is an area that is devoid of trees and that most of the trees are around the lot areas. He stated that the intention is retain as many of the trees as possible and that the area for detention will have minimal impact on the mature trees.

Mr. Kirk asked to bring up Landmark Engineering to further discuss the site.

Chair Curran asked if there would still be a requirement for an easement and that none was indicated on the site plan. Mr. Bugner advised that an easement would still be required but that the details would still have to be worked out prior to the preliminary/final plan.

Chair Curran asked if the road improvements would end at the end of the development. Mr. Bugner advised that was correct.

Chair Curran asked what the width of the existing road was. Mr. Bugner was unsure of the exact width but indicated that it was in the area of 18 feet. Chair Curran asked if the petitioner has taken the extra area that would be needed for the road had been taken into account.

Mr. Kirk advised that was a civil engineering question.

Brad Hensley with Landmark Engineering who be doing the civil engineering on the project introduced himself. He stated the question regarding the road, the Village requirement is for the road width to be 27 feet back to back with curb and gutter as opposed to the existing ditch or swale that is there now. He stated the given the drawings he has, there is plenty of room,

April 15, 2021

Page 5 of 13

advising that the public right of way is 66 feet which is more than enough room for a 27-foot roadway.

Commissioner Mitchell asked about the easement. Mr. Hensley asked whether he was asking about access to the pond. Commissioner Yast stated to and from the pond because the water has to go out from the pond also. Mr. Hensley advised that the drainage from the pond is done typically underground where the pond is released through pipes in this case to the ditch on Flossmoor Road in the northeast corner of the subdivision which is the low spot. He stated there would be an access easement for maintenance but they have only briefly discussed this to date. He advised that it would likely be on lot 3 which is the far northeast lot with a 10-foot easement along the east side of lot 3. He advised that this would be owned by the homeowner's association and would not be a public easement. Commissioner Yast advised that if the homeowners failed to maintain the detention and Public Works needed to access the site there would need to be an easement. Mr. Hensley agreed. Commissioner Yast stated that at the last meeting the detention was referred to more as a dry swale rather than a pond. Mr. Hensley stated that pond is a common name but that this would be a dry pond explaining that it would fill up when it rains and drain after the storm is over.

Chair Curran asked if the easement would be from Flossmoor Road south on lot 3. Mr. Hensley stated that while it isn't currently shown that would appear to be the logical location but stated that it could be on any of the lots such as lot 6 at the south end.

Chair Curran asked if there was anything else Mr. Hensley would like to add. Mr. Hensley stated that typically the biggest concern of neighbors in an area that is being developed like this is stormwater and what is going to happen when 6 new homes with driveways is going to get built. He advised that he has been designing systems for over 30 years to address those issues and keeping the water from the site, on the site. He stated that if there were a heavy rain there today, the property to the east would see some of the water from this site and that would go way following the development. He stated that we route everything through pipes, swales and grading to the pond to get it collected there and the pond itself allows for the collection of water quickly but get out quickly because it is throttled down with a smaller restrictor pipe. He stated that all the water that hits this property would now go to the pond and then trickle out a very slow rate adding that the Village has a pretty restrictive stormwater ordinance which is more restrictive than many villages, Cook County and MWRD and that this a plus for residents around this area.

Chair Curran stated that there was a lot of testimony at the previous meeting about the flooding in the surrounding area and asked if Mr. Hensley had a chance to evaluate whether there would be any impact on this development from rainwater coming from other parts of the area. Mr. Hensley stated that they do have a topographic survey of the property which extends a little bit beyond and from what he could see the southwest corner is the high spot of the

April 15, 2021

Page 6 of 13

property and it drains to the northeast. He stated that it also looks like the property has a small crest or ridge in that southwest corner so he isn't sure how much water is coming into the property from the south and that it doesn't appear that anything is coming in from the east. He stated that there is a ditch on the north and west sides. He advised that the bottom line is that they will be taking care of all of the water that hits this property and anything else by the nature of design any water that does come from outside of the site would have to be handled and get through the property safely and that would be done by the design that we come up with and by working with Village staff hand in hand. He stated there are other checks and balances as well because Cook County and MWRD are also involved, and that he believes when this project is done it would be an improvement in the area from a stormwater standpoint.

Chair Curran asked the Commissioners for any questions.

Commissioner Yast asked whether the lot depths were net of the widening of Hamlin Avenue. Mr. Hensley stated that they were.

Commissioner Yast stated that the depth of the lots indicated were what the homeowner would actually own. Mr. Hensley advised that was correct and that area to the west of the lots would be the 66 foot right of way owned by the Village.

Commissioner Mitchell stated that he liked the architecture and that he had looked into other subdivisions but that there weren't any with only 6 homes. He asked what would the price point be for these homes because that would impact the area significantly given the larger size of the homes in the nearby Ballantrae subdivision.

Aretus Smith, one of the owners of ACPS Developers stated that they tried to look at the market trends and that when looking at new suburban development with 3-4 bedrooms, mid to high end are selling anywhere from \$300-600 thousand and depending on the integrity of the community can go even higher. He advised that older homes from 20-40 years old that have been fairly remodeled in Flossmoor have been priced in the range of \$400-500 thousand dollars. He stated that their goal was to keep the price point below \$500 thousand dollars but that they did not have a firm number yet. Mr. Smith stated that what they are trying to do in Flossmoor is to create a small community that will be an impact and a name talker. He advised that they were trying to stay somewhere that a working family could afford but yet unique and different. He stated that he conducted a survey where he found that age groups 20-40 don't want traditional homes and that other home builders in the area have said the same. He stated that modern contemporary design is what attracts the younger generation.

Chair Curran asked if there would be a profit in selling a house for \$425,000 stating that a 2,400 square foot home would be selling at approximately \$180 per square foot.

Mr. Smith advised that they have to look at all of the costs involved such as the road and infrastructure improvements that are required. He stated that all of that needs to be factored in and if the plan doesn't work you don't change the goal you change the plan.

Commissioner Mitchell advised that the reason that the question was asked was because Commissioner Matthys had asked about the types of building materials earlier and in looking at this subdivision itself given the size and location and the fact that the original proposal was for 7 houses as opposed to 6, would the development even be feasible to get the kind of quality houses that would warrant that. Mr. Smith stated that if there is any reason to make modifications then they would make those and that they are vested in the property. Commissioner Mitchell advised that his issue is that the planned development is so small that it feels like a pop-up as opposed to a larger planned development though he commended the proposed architecture. He added that other planned developments had been larger he was concerned that a development with only 6 homes instead of 7 would require a different price point to maintain the type of quality that is proposed. Mr. Smith stated that going from 7 to 6 homes wouldn't affect the quality, but would affect his profit margin. He stated that if built 20 homes he would make more profit however he advised that while he would not gain as much profit, the quality and integrity would remain. Mr. Smith advised that being a small corporation there are not as many hands in the pot which would allow them build a smaller development and still profit as opposed to a larger corporation that requires a larger development to profit. He stated that they are a family owned business that is vested in the community and that they were even considering taking one of the houses there. Commissioner Mitchell advised that he had seen one the homes that were built that resembles the design of the homes that are proposed in Flossmoor. Mr. Smith advised that Robert Kirk was the architect for a house on Springfield. Commissioner Mitchell asked if that lot was bigger than these lots. Mr. Bugner advised that they were about the same. Mr. Smith stated that the Village would be trailblazers in ushering in the modern era that is going to take place which he said is already happening in a lot of areas.

Chair Curran asked Mr. Kirk what the estimated cost would be to build a home based on the design proposed. Mr. Kirk advised that architects are the worst to ask that question as they are typically optimistic but that one of the nice things about 6 homes as opposed to 20 homes is that they are able to hit a market trend and when you get above 6 and 20 you hit high and low points in the market. He also stated that with 6 homes they are able to get pricing for 6 at a time and that you really can't do that with more than 6 because of price fluctuations in materials. He stated that one of the advantages of doing this subdivision is that they would be buying in quantity with one sub-contractor for each trade doing all of the homes so they feel comfortable that they can keep a handle on cost. He did state that it is fairly tight with the cost

April 15, 2021

Page 8 of 13

of the land and the required infrastructure improvements but feels that the size and scope of the development is manageable.

Chair Curran asked if they were expecting all 6 homes to be built at once. Mr. Kirk advised that they hoped the sales would dictate that and that they would probably end up building one on spec or they would setup an area at the site to draw attraction. He stated that even before they start they would have their pricing together and lock in their subs so that they know what the sale price would be. He stated that as they have done before, they lock prices in for subcontractors and materials and hope that the sales will follow. Mr. Kirk stated that they also feel comfortable with the market that is on an uptick.

Chair Curran asked if there was financing in place. Mr. Smith stated that they would not build anything without the commitment to build. He stated that one of the mistakes that a lot of builders did was to go and build 30-40 homes without having a buyer and end up with vacant property. He stated that right now there is vacant land there which doesn't look pretty and that they want to change the landscape of that corner, put something there that looks nice to market the property, the plans and all that they are bringing.

Chair Curran asked if there would be any performance guarantee requirements by the Village. Mr. Bugner advised that there would be performance guarantee requirements for the infrastructure and that any additional performance requirements would be included in an annexation agreement.

Commissioner Matthys asked if there would be any construction requirements for the infrastructure requirements and that if only 2 homes are built and the other lots remain unbuilt for a couple of years would all of the infrastructure be required to be built first. Mr. Bugner advised that his understanding is that infrastructure would be required first.

Commissioner Mitchell asked if what was being considered tonight was whether to recommend the conceptual plan for the proposed subdivision as proposed to move forward. Mr. Bugner advised that was correct and that if it isn't recommended would the project be feasible at all.

Commissioner Matthys asked if there would be public comment allowed tonight. Mr. Bugner advised that the Commission that although it was not a public hearing the Commission could allow public comment.

Chair Curran advised that he wanted to put all of the issues on the table for discussion so that everybody understands what the process is and what the requirements are. Chair Curran asked if there were any additional comments from the Commissioners.



April 15, 2021

Page 9 of 13

Commissioner Matthys asked if there was flexibility to architectural style as the petition moves forward to further discuss the use of materials such as EIFS shown in the elevations and the percentage that may be allowed adding that EIFS is probably the least desirable material. He stated that the other finish materials looked great including the stone, glass and wood elements. Mr. Kirk advised that the white finishes would actually be real stucco as opposed to EIFS.

Chair Curran asked for any public comment but also asked that those who commented at the last hearing to keep those comments to a minimum and that if they have new comments he would appreciate hearing the new comments.

Dorothy Scrementi of 19177 Hamlin Avenue stated that her and her husband have lived there for 22 years and that their property abuts the subject property on the south. She stated that 11 years ago the property south of her on 192<sup>nd</sup> Street and Hamlin Avenue was purchased with the idea of rezoning. She stated the owner first wanted to annex the property into Flossmoor and subdivide into smaller parcels and that nobody received any communication and that it was all by word of mouth but that the opposition to that was so amazing. She stated that a petition had been circulated at that time which had over 41 signatures and she had a copy of that here tonight. She stated that the petition was denied and that the Village of Flossmoor at the time had issued a resolution of protest to Cook County. She stated that the resolution stated that the proposed plan would not be consistent with the recommendations of the Village's Comprehensive Plan and that the Comprehensive Plan recommends that the semi-rural character of Sunnycrest be preserved through support of the existing county R-3 zoning. She stated that back with the very beginnings of this area it was the Grover C. Elmore Companies Crawford Avenue farm and that the whole tract that is now Sunnycrest that was transformed from farms into Sunnycrest was done in a kneejerk reaction. She said that the development of the area at that time was amazingly rapid. She stated this was forethought that this was planned and the reason why a lot of the residents in the area moved there and made this area their home so that they have the semi-rural feel of having an acre. She stated that she had left a copy of the previous petition and the Village resolution with Mr. Bugner prior to the last meeting. She recalled that at the last meeting one of the trustees that used the term shoehorned and that she feels that this is too much and that for the record her and her husband are not only opposed to 6 homes but 5, 4 or 3. She stated that they would like to keep Sunnycrest as is with no transition. She stated that this is not fitting with the surrounding neighborhood to put it lightly.

Herman Weaver of 1053 Hamlin Avenue stated that he is directly across the street from where the development would be. Mr. Weaver stated that he is not necessarily against developing the land but said that the characterization by the owner of the property that it was currently bad looking or an eyesore was not correct. He advised that it is a wooded area around the

April 15, 2021

Page 10 of 13

community which adds to the greenery and stated that we don't look at it as an eyesore and that we appreciate having the green space around our living spaces. Mr. weaver also stated that he agreed with the previous speaker about the number of homes proposed and that in his mind he couldn't picture 6 homes on that site. He stated that he drives by the site everyday and was looking at the site out his window and that he cannot imagine 6 homes on those 2 lots. He stated that he friends in that area and that the acre size lots is the benefit of being over there. He stated that he is not against the development in general but just number of homes in the development. Mr. Weaver asked if there were any properties in the area that were developed with this style of architecture. He advised that there was a home being built behind Ingalls and wondered if that was a similar style.

Mr. Smith advised that the one being built by Ingalls was similar and that there was one that was built two blocks away from the proposed site on Springfield though that one has a completely white exterior. Commissioner Mitchell advised that home was located at 189<sup>th</sup> and Springfield.

Monique Smith of 19232 Kedzie Avenue stated the she didn't have any questions but dialed in to hear some of the commentary and thought that bringing new homes into the community is a good idea.

**Angie Smith of 19232 Kedzie Avenue stated that she called in to hear the comments and to see what this project has to offer.**

Hearing of no additional callers Chair Curran closed public comment and asked the Commissioners for discussion.

Commissioner Mitchell advised that his first 25 years in Flossmoor in the Flossmoor Hills area and that when the white new contemporary house was built he was impressed that it was being built there and that it is a beautiful piece in Flossmoor Hills. He stated that he understands that we have a Comprehensive Plan and that the zoning plan identifies R-3 as being residential property and that the comment was that it should stay as R-3 which has larger lots and the like, but stated there is no plan or requirement that it stays in that regard. He stated that he personally liked the new development and thinks that development along Flossmoor Hills and Flossmoor Road would be great and that the developer is right with respect to young families looking for newer structures and that as a conceptual matter. He stated that while he would like to see a bigger development plan, when looking at the map there are pockets of smaller development throughout Flossmoor which satisfies the different diversities of families, sizes and to keep the families here in Flossmoor. He stated that in looking at everything as a conceptual matter he would be in favor of the petition.

Commissioner Matthys stated he came into the meeting tonight thinking of pushing for R-4 zoning to get a little more space and something more related to the bigger lots similar to Ballantrae but understanding the challenges that the developer is going to have to go through to improve the street. He advised that he feels that the improvement of the road would be a nice thing for the community and

April 15, 2021

Page 11 of 13

an improvement. He stated that when you look at Flossmoor Park where there is a mix of R-4 and R-5 zoning it brings a great light to the community to have that variety of zoning with some smaller lots that are little more affordable along with the bigger lots. He stated that while he would have liked to see 5 lots instead of 6 with maybe only 2 lots fronting Flossmoor Road, he would support this in concept.

Commissioner Yast stated that we went into great detail at the last meeting on the various aspects and that essentially the developer has come back with everything we asked. He stated that we wanted fewer lots and a homeowner's association to manage the drainage and that they provided that. He stated the designs were nice though he wasn't sure about the flat roofs but that's not his decision to make. He advised that he was inclined to approve this. He stated that they have done what the Commission has asked and that it's a nice development. He stated that he knows there are larger lots to the south and to the east but there are also much smaller lots to the north and that this kind of a nice buffer between them.

Chair Curran appreciated what the petitioner has done to conform to the current Village regulations but that he has concerns with the size of the subdivision being rather small but that larger subdivisions may not be in the cards these days. He stated that the petitioner has done a nice job with the development but that he hopes that they understand what the requirements of the Village will be as they move forward and that they understand the costs required for the improvements as discussed. He asked Mr. Bugner if they had a copy of staff requirements. Mr. Bugner advised that they do have a copy of those requirements. Chair Curran stated that all of those requirements would be a condition of making the zoning change as has been requested.

Chair Curran asked if there were any additional comments from the Commissioners or staff. There were none however there was a Zoom caller that wanted to comment during the public hearing portion who did not unmute and wished to speak.

Aneesa Sergeant of 19150 Hamlin stated that she was fairly new to the community living there for the last 2 years and that she just wanted to voice and emphasize that we are not in support of the building of 6 homes. She stated that she understands that the land has been purchased and that one way or the other it will be developed but that it be considered that a smaller number of homes be built such as 2 or 3 and possibly 4 on the high end would be much more manageable for this area and consistent with the community. She stated that it is still unclear how the water situation would be handled as well as the increase in traffic and that it hasn't been clear to her in this call and as new residents in to the community we moved here for a reason but now the community is changing and it is a little disheartening.

Chair Curran asked for a motion to consider the matter and asked Mr. Bugner to confirm what is being considered for motion. Mr. Bugner advised that this only consideration of the concept plan which would allow the petitioner to proceed further in their preliminary plan and then approach the Village board for annexation.

Chair Curran advised that the zoning requested was for R-5. Mr. Bugner confirmed that is what the petitioner is requesting.

Chair Curran asked the Commissioners if there were any questions or comments as to the request for R-5 zoning.

**Commissioner Mitchell motioned to recommend the revised concept plan that has reduced the number of buildable lots from 7 to 6 with the addition of a separate lot dedicated to the stormwater detention of 27,809 square feet in area and an R-5 Single-Family Residential District where the minimum lot width is 75 feet and the minimum lot size is 12,500 square feet and conditional to providing the required infrastructure improvements be approved. Commissioner Yast seconded the motion which passed by roll call vote.**

**AYES:** Chair Curran, Commissioners Matthys, Mitchell and Yast.

**NAYS:** None

**ABSENT:** Commissioners Maddox, Martin and McCarthy.

Chair Curran asked Mr. Bugner to advise the petitioner of their next steps. Mr. Bugner advised that staff would contact them for follow up and that an annexation agreement would be required before proceeding and that the petition would proceed to preliminary/final plan would be back before to the Plan Commission either before or following the annexation.

#### **4. OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Bugner advised the Cook County and MWRD permits for the Dunkin' – Baskin Robbins restaurant and that they would be proceeding with an anticipated preliminary/final plan at the May meeting. He also advised that there may be a couple of additional petitions at that meeting.

#### **5. OLD BUSINESS**

None

#### **6. STAFF REPORTS**

None

**7. MEMBERS CONCERNS AND IDEAS**

None

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

**Commissioner Matthys motioned to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Yast seconded the motion which passed by roll call vote.**

**AYES:** Chair Curran, Commissioners Matthys, Mitchell and Yast

**NAYS:** None