

Village of Bensenville  
Board Room  
12 South Center Street  
DuPage and Cook Counties  
Bensenville, IL, 60106

**MINUTES OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**

March 3, 2014

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Moruzzi at 6:30p.m.

**ROLL CALL :** Upon roll call the following Commissioners were present:  
Moruzzi, Janowiak, Pisano, Rowe, Weldon  
Absent: Caira, Rodriguez  
A quorum was present.

**STAFF PRESENT:** V. Kosman, Rysavy, Viger, Williamsen

**JOURNAL OF PROCEEDINGS:**

The minutes of the Community Development Commission Meeting of February 3, 2014 were presented.

**Motion:** Commissioner Rowe made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Commissioner Janowiak seconded the motion.

All were in favor. Motion carried.

**Public Hearing:** CDC Case Number 2013-39  
**Petitioner:** AT&T Mobility  
**Location:** 230 West Belmont Avenue  
**Request:** Conditional Use Permit Amendment to Allow Additional Antenna

**Motion:** Commissioner Weldon made a motion to continue CDC Case No. 2013-39 until March 17, 2014. Commissioner Rowe seconded the motion.

**ROLL CALL:** Ayes: Moruzzi, Janowiak, Pisano, Rowe, Weldon

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

*Commissioner Caira entered the meeting at 6:32 p.m.*

**Public Meeting:** CDC Case Number 2014-05  
**Location:** 13-105 West Grand Avenue  
**Request:** Master Sign Plan

**Motion:** Commissioner Pisano made a motion to open CDC Case No. 2014-05. Commissioner Weldon seconded the motion.

**ROLL CALL :** Upon roll call the following Commissioners were present:  
Moruzzi, Caira, Janowiak, Pisano, Rowe, Weldon  
Absent: Rodriguez  
A quorum was present.

Chairman Moruzzi opened the Public Hearing at 6:33 p.m.

*Commissioner Rodriguez entered the meeting at 6:34 p.m.*

Director of Community & Economic Development, Scott Viger, Mark Rysavy, Assistant Director of Community & Economic Development and Village Planner, Victoria Kosman, were all present and sworn in by Chairman Moruzzi.

Village Planner, Victoria Kosman, stated since there is no rezoning or variance necessary, the Municipal Code does not require a full Public Hearing for consideration of a Master Sign Plan, but rather a simple public meeting; therefore, no legal notice requirements (newspaper, posting of property or mailed notices to taxpayers of record) is required. Ms. Kosman stated the agenda including this item was posted on the Village website as well as in Village Hall in compliance with Statute.

Ms. Kosman stated the property in question is zoned C – 2 Highway Commercial District and is improved with a one story, multiple tenanted commercial complex. Ms. Kosman stated the Municipal Code Section 10-18-7I requires a Master Sign Plan be applied “when more than one wall, awning, canopy, and/or permanent window sign is proposed on any building with multiple tenants.” Ms. Kosman stated the applicant has worked with Village staff to develop a feasible Master Sign Plan for the conformance of any future signage.

There were no questions from the Commissioners.

**Public Comment:**

Chairman Moruzzi asked if there was any member of the Public that would like to give testimony for CDC Case No. 2013-37. There were none.

Ms. Kosman reviewed the Village Staff Report and stated Staff recommends approval of the Master Sign Plan.

**Motion:** Commissioner Rowe made a motion to close CDC Case No. 2014-05. Commissioner Weldon seconded the motion.

**ROLL CALL:** Ayes: Moruzzi, Caira, Janowiak, Pisano, Rodriguez, Rowe, Weldon

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Moruzzi closed the Public Hearing at 6:37 p.m.

**Motion:** Commissioner Weldon made a motion to approve the Master Sign Plan for CDC Case No. 2014-05 as presented. Commissioner Pisano seconded the motion.

**ROLL CALL:** Ayes: Moruzzi, Caira, Janowiak, Pisano, Rodriguez, Rowe, Weldon

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

**Public Hearing:** CDC Case Number 2013-4  
**Petitioner:** Village of Bensenville  
**Location:** 345 East Green Street  
**Request:** Conditional Use Permits to Allow a Police Station, Antennas and indoor Firing Range; Associated Variance

**Motion:** Commissioner Rowe made a motion to open CDC Case No. 2013-40. Commissioner Pisano seconded the motion.

**ROLL CALL :** Upon roll call the following Commissioners were present: Moruzzi, Caira, Janowiak, Pisano, Rodriguez, Rowe, Weldon  
Absent: None  
A quorum was present.

Chairman Moruzzi opened the Public Hearing at 6:38 p.m.

Village Planner, Victoria Kosman, stated a legal notice was published in the Daily Herald on February 15, 2014 and that a certified copy of the legal notice is maintained in the CDC file and available for viewing. Ms. Kosman also stated that Village Staff posted a notice of the Public Hearing sign on the property on February 14, 2014. Ms. Kosman stated on February 14, 2014 Village Staff mailed first class notice of the Public Hearing to taxpayers of record within 250 feet of the property in question.

Assistant Director of Community & Economic Development, Mark Rysavy, stated the property located at 345 East Green Street was purchased by the Village of Bensenville in 2013 for purposes of constructing a new Police and Emergency Management Facility (EMA). Mr. Rysavy stated the building is 47,000 square feet. Mr. Rysavy stated the Village is requesting three conditional use permits and an associated variance. Mr. Rysavy reviewed the approval criteria for all requests.

Commissioner Rodriguez asked if there will be proper signage in the area. Mr. Rysavy stated Staff is currently working with Public Works regarding signage and that all requirements will be met.

Chairman Moruzzi asked if there will be an electronic message center sign. Mr. Rysavy stated Staff has discussed the possibility of an EMC sign but with the EMC sign being planned for the corner of York Road and Green Street, Staff does not see a desire for an EMC sign at the new Police/EMC facility.

**Public Comment:**

Chairman Moruzzi asked if there was any member of the Public that would like to give testimony for CDC Case No. 2013-37. There were none.

Ms. Kosman reviewed the Village Staff Report and stated Staff recommends approval of the request with the following condition:

1. The Conditional Use Permit be granted solely to the Village of Bensenville and shall be transferred only after a review by the Community Development Commission (CDC) and approval of the Village Board. In the event of change in tenancy of this property, the proprietors shall appear before a public meeting of the CDC. The CDC shall review the request and in its sole discretion, shall either; recommend that the Village Board approve of the transfer of the lease and / or ownership to the new proprietor without amendment to the Conditional Use Permit, or if the CDC deems that the new proprietor contemplates a change in use which is inconsistent with the Conditional Use Permit, the new proprietor shall be required to petition for a new public hearing before the CDC for a new Conditional Use Permit, and
2. The property shall be developed and utilized in conformance to the plans submitted as part of this application prepared for the Village of Bensenville dated 01.24.14 produced by FGM Architects.

Motion: Commissioner Weldon made a motion to close CDC Case No. 2013-40. Commissioner Rowe seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Moruzzi, Cairra, Janowiak, Pisano, Rodriguez, Rowe, Weldon

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Moruzzi closed the Public Hearing at 7:05 p.m.

Motion: Commissioner Weldon made a motion to approve the findings of facts for the conditional use permit request for a Police Station for CDC Case No. 2013-40 consisting of:

- **Traffic:** The proposed use will not create any adverse impact of types or volumes of traffic flow not otherwise typical of permitted uses in the zoning district has been minimized.
  - *Police Station:* No increase in traffic flow atypical of permitted industrial uses is anticipated.

- **Environmental Nuisance:** The proposed use will not have negative effects of noise, glare, odor, dust, waste disposal, blockage of light or air or other adverse environmental effects of a type or degree not characteristic of the historic use of the property or permitted uses in the district.
  - *Police Station:* No negative effects are anticipated from the use of the property in question as a police station. The development proposed includes a multitude of “green” initiatives and has been constructed to meet LEED Silver standards.
- **Neighborhood Character:** The proposed use will fit harmoniously with the existing character of existing permitted uses in its environs. Any adverse effects on environmental quality, property values or neighborhood character beyond those normally associated with permitted uses in the district have been minimized.
  - *Police Station:* The proposed use will fit harmoniously with the existing character. As the property was an abandoned industrial building, the adaptive reuse of the site as a police station will not generate any adverse effects on the neighboring properties. The adjacent Post Office has been operating for a number of years making a governmental use such as a Police Station similar to existing uses.
- **Use Of Public Services And Facilities:** The proposed use will not require existing community facilities or services to a degree disproportionate to that normally expected of permitted uses in the district, nor generate disproportionate demand for new services or facilities in such a way as to place undue burdens upon existing development in the area.
  - *Police Station:* The proposed use will not require a disproportionate demand for new services.

- **Public Necessity:** The proposed use at the particular location requested is necessary to provide a service or a facility which is in the interest of public convenience, and will contribute to the general welfare of the neighborhood or community.
  - *Police Station:* The proposed use as a police station will contribute to the general welfare of the neighborhood and community as it will provide a state of the art facility from which the Bensenville Police Department can operate more efficiently from.
- **Other Factors:** The use is in harmony with any other elements of compatibility pertinent in the judgment of the commission to the conditional use in its proposed location. At CDC's discretion to include and discuss other factors.

Commissioner Pisano seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL:

Ayes: Moruzzi, Cairra, Janowiak, Pisano, Rodriguez, Rowe, Weldon

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

Motion:

Commissioner Cairra made a motion to approve the findings of facts for the conditional use permit request for a firing range for CDC Case No. 2013-40 consisting of:

- **Traffic:** The proposed use will not create any adverse impact of types or volumes of traffic flow not otherwise typical of permitted uses in the zoning district has been minimized.
  - *Indoor Firing Range:* The indoor firing range will not generate traffic or adverse traffic flow volumes atypical of permitted uses as the firing range will be open only to qualifying police officers.
- **Environmental Nuisance:** The proposed use will not have negative effects of noise, glare, odor, dust, waste disposal, blockage of light or air or other adverse environmental effects of a type or degree not characteristic of the historic use of the property or permitted uses in the district.

- *Indoor Firing Range:* The indoor firing range as proposed meets federal guidelines which mitigate environmental nuisances associated with indoor gun ranges such as ventilation and sound.
- **Neighborhood Character:** The proposed use will fit harmoniously with the existing character of existing permitted uses in its environs. Any adverse effects on environmental quality, property values or neighborhood character beyond those normally associated with permitted uses in the district have been minimized.
  - *Indoor Firing Range:* The firing range will not alter the neighborhood character as it will be used by the police department for training. It will not generate any adverse effects on the neighborhood character as it is entirely enclosed.
- **Use Of Public Services And Facilities:** The proposed use will not require existing community facilities or services to a degree disproportionate to that normally expected of permitted uses in the district, nor generate disproportionate demand for new services or facilities in such a way as to place undue burdens upon existing development in the area.
  - *Indoor Firing Range:* The proposed use will not require a disproportionate demand for new services.
- **Public Necessity:** The proposed use at the particular location requested is necessary to provide a service or a facility which is in the interest of public convenience, and will contribute to the general welfare of the neighborhood or community.
  - *Indoor Firing Range:* The use of an indoor firing range is in the interest of general welfare as it will ensure that the police staff have the ability to adequately train for their firearms.
- **Other Factors:** The use is in harmony with any other elements of compatibility pertinent in the judgment of the commission to the conditional use in its proposed location. At CDC's discretion to include and discuss other factors.

Commissioner Weldon seconded the motion.



ROLL CALL: Ayes: Moruzzi, Caira, Janowiak, Pisano, Rodriguez, Rowe, Weldon

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

Motion: Commissioner Rowe made a motion to approve the findings of facts for the conditional use permit request for antennas for CDC Case No. 2013-40 consisting of:

- **Traffic:** The proposed use will not create any adverse impact of types or volumes of traffic flow not otherwise typical of permitted uses in the zoning district has been minimized.
  - *Antennas:* No additional traffic due to the installation of the tower and antennas is anticipated.
- **Environmental Nuisance:** The proposed use will not have negative effects of noise, glare, odor, dust, waste disposal, blockage of light or air or other adverse environmental effects of a type or degree not characteristic of the historic use of the property or permitted uses in the district.
  - *Antennas:* There will be no negative effects due to the construction of a tower containing antennas.
- **Neighborhood Character:** The proposed use will fit harmoniously with the existing character of existing permitted uses in its environs. Any adverse effects on environmental quality, property values or neighborhood character beyond those normally associated with permitted uses in the district have been minimized.
  - *Antennas:* The use of the antennas will fit harmoniously in the existing character as the adjacent property to the east and north has historically been used for utility and transportation.
- **Use Of Public Services And Facilities:** The proposed use will not require existing community facilities or services to a degree disproportionate to that normally expected of permitted uses in the district, nor generate disproportionate demand for new services or facilities in such a way as to place undue burdens upon existing development in the area.

- *Antennas*: The proposed use will not require a disproportionate demand for new services.
- **Public Necessity**: The proposed use at the particular location requested is necessary to provide a service or a facility which is in the interest of public convenience, and will contribute to the general welfare of the neighborhood or community.
  - *Antennas*: The antennas will contribute to the general welfare of the neighborhood or community as it will provide the ability of unencumbered emergency communications.
- **Other Factors**: The use is in harmony with any other elements of compatibility pertinent in the judgment of the commission to the conditional use in its proposed location. At CDC's discretion to include and discuss other factors.

Chairman Moruzzi seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL:

Ayes: Moruzzi, Caira, Janowiak, Pisano, Rodriguez, Rowe, Weldon

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

Motion:

Commissioner Weldon made a motion to approve the findings of facts for the variance request for CDC Case No. 2013-40 consisting of:

- **Special Circumstances**: Special circumstances exist that are peculiar to the property for which the variances are sought and that do not apply generally to other properties in the same zoning district. Also, these circumstances are not of so general or recurrent a nature as to make it reasonable and practical to provide a general amendment to this Title to cover them. The special circumstances are peculiar to the property in that the curbcut as depicted provides the optimal access for both emergency management and police vehicles entering and exiting the site.

- **Hardship Or Practical Difficulties:** For reasons set forth in the findings, the literal application of the provisions of this Title would result in unnecessary and undue hardship or practical difficulties for the applicant as distinguished from mere inconvenience. The curbcut variance is necessary for the on and off-site maneuvers expected with use as a police department/emergency management headquarters.
- **Circumstances Relate To Property:** The special circumstances and hardship relate only to the physical character of the land or buildings, such as dimensions, topography or soil conditions. They do not concern any business or activity of present or prospective owner or occupant carries on, or seeks to carry on, therein, nor to the personal, business or financial circumstances of any party with interest in the property. The circumstances relate to the property in that the vehicles operating on the site are unusually large due to the use.
- **Not Resulting From Applicant Action:** The special circumstances and practical difficulties or hardship that are the basis for the variance have not resulted from any act, undertaken subsequent to the adoption of this Title or any applicable amendment thereto, of the applicant or of any other party with a present interest in the property. Knowingly authorizing or proceeding with construction, or development requiring any variance, permit, certificate, or approval hereunder prior to its approval shall be considered such an act. The variance request is not due to applicant action.
- **Preserve Rights Conferred By District:** A variance is necessary for the applicant to enjoy a substantial property right possessed by other properties in the same zoning district and does not confer a special privilege ordinarily denied to such other properties. The variance is necessary for operational traffic flow of the site.
- **Necessary For Use Of Property:** The grant of a variance is necessary not because it will increase the applicant's economic return, although it may have this effect, but because without a variance the applicant will be deprived of reasonable use or enjoyment of, or reasonable economic return from, the property. The variance is necessary for adequate traffic flow of the site.

- **Not Alter Local Character:** The granting of the variance will not alter the essential character of the locality nor substantially impair environmental quality, property values or public safety or welfare in the vicinity. The variance does not alter local character nor impair environmental quality.
- **Consistent With Title And Plan:** The granting of a variance will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this Title and of the general development plan and other applicable adopted plans of the Village, as viewed in light of any changed conditions since their adoption, and will not serve in effect to substantially invalidate or nullify any part thereof. Granting the variance to reduce the required parking is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the corridor along Green Street.
- **Minimum Variance Needed:** The variance approved is the minimum required to provide the applicant with relief from undue hardship or practical difficulties and with reasonable use and enjoyment of the property. The minimum variance has been requested.

Commissioner Pisano seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL:

Ayes: Moruzzi, Caira, Janowiak, Pisano, Rodriguez, Rowe, Weldon

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

Motion:

Commissioner Rowe made a motion to approve the conditional use permit request for a Police Station for CDC Case No. 2013-40 with Staff recommendations consisting of:

- The Conditional Use Permit be granted solely to the Village of Bensenville and shall be transferred only after a review by the Community Development Commission (CDC) and approval of the Village Board. In the event of change in tenancy of this property, the proprietors shall appear before a public meeting of the CDC. The CDC shall review the request and in its sole discretion, shall either; recommend that the Village Board approve of the transfer of the lease and / or ownership to the new proprietor without amendment to the Conditional Use Permit, or if the CDC deems that the new proprietor contemplates a change in use which is inconsistent with the Conditional Use Permit, the new proprietor shall be required to petition for a new public hearing before the CDC for a new Conditional Use Permit, and
- The property shall be developed and utilized in conformance to the plans submitted as part of this application prepared for the Village of Bensenville dated 01.24.14 produced by FGM Architects.

Chairman Moruzzi seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL:

Ayes: Moruzzi, Caira, Janowiak, Pisano, Rodriguez, Rowe, Weldon

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

Motion:

Commissioner Weldon made a motion to approve the conditional use permit request for a firing range for CDC Case No. 2013-40 with Staff recommendations consisting of:

- The Conditional Use Permit be granted solely to the Village of Bensenville and shall be transferred only after a review by the Community Development Commission (CDC) and approval of the Village Board. In the event of change in tenancy of this property, the proprietors shall appear before a public meeting of the CDC. The CDC shall review the request and in its sole discretion, shall either; recommend that the Village Board approve of the transfer of the lease and / or ownership to the new proprietor without amendment to the Conditional Use Permit, or if the CDC deems that the new proprietor contemplates a change in use which is inconsistent with the Conditional Use Permit, the new proprietor shall be required to petition for a new public hearing before the CDC for a new Conditional Use Permit, and
- The property shall be developed and utilized in conformance to the plans submitted as part of this application prepared for the Village of Bensenville dated 01.24.14 produced by FGM Architects.

Commissioner Rowe seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL:

Ayes: Moruzzi, Caira, Janowiak, Pisano, Rodriguez, Rowe, Weldon

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

Motion:

Commissioner Pisano made a motion to approve the conditional use permit request for antennas for CDC Case No. 2013-40 with Staff recommendations consisting of:

- The Conditional Use Permit be granted solely to the Village of Bensenville and shall be transferred only after a review by the Community Development Commission (CDC) and approval of the Village Board. In the event of change in tenancy of this property, the proprietors shall appear before a public meeting of the CDC. The CDC shall review the request and in its sole discretion, shall either; recommend that the Village Board approve of the transfer of the lease and / or ownership to the new proprietor without amendment to the Conditional Use Permit, or if the CDC deems that the new proprietor contemplates a change in use which is inconsistent with the Conditional Use Permit, the new proprietor shall be required to petition for a new public hearing before the CDC for a new Conditional Use Permit, and
- The property shall be developed and utilized in conformance to the plans submitted as part of this application prepared for the Village of Bensenville dated 01.24.14 produced by FGM Architects.

Commissioner Weldon seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL:

Ayes: Moruzzi, Caira, Janowiak, Pisano, Rodriguez, Rowe, Weldon

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

Motion:

Commissioner Rowe made a motion to approve the variance request for CDC Case No. 2013-40 with Staff recommendations consisting of:

- The Conditional Use Permit be granted solely to the Village of Bensenville and shall be transferred only after a review by the Community Development Commission (CDC) and approval of the Village Board. In the event of change in tenancy of this property, the proprietors shall appear before a public meeting of the CDC. The CDC shall review the request and in its sole discretion, shall either; recommend that the Village Board approve of the transfer of the lease and / or ownership to the new proprietor without amendment to the Conditional Use Permit, or if the CDC deems that the new proprietor contemplates a change in use which is inconsistent with the Conditional Use Permit, the new proprietor shall be required to petition for a new public hearing before the CDC for a new Conditional Use Permit, and
- The property shall be developed and utilized in conformance to the plans submitted as part of this application prepared for the Village of Bensenville dated 01.24.14 produced by FGM Architects.

Chairman Moruzzi seconded the motion.

**ROLL CALL:** Ayes: Moruzzi, Caira, Janowiak, Pisano, Rodriguez, Rowe, Weldon

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

**Public Meeting:** CDC Case Number 2014-04  
**Petitioner:** Village of Bensenville  
**Request:** Text Amendments to Motor Vehicle Repair, Major and Minor and Parking Requirements

**Motion:** Commissioner Rowe made a motion to open CDC Case No. 2014-04. Commissioner Weldon seconded the motion.

**ROLL CALL :** Upon roll call the following Commissioners were present:  
Moruzzi, Caira, Janowiak, Pisano, Rodriguez, Rowe, Weldon  
Absent: None  
A quorum was present.

Chairman Moruzzi opened the Public Meeting at 7:11 p.m.



Village Planner, Victoria Kosman, stated a Legal Notice was published in the Daily Herald on Saturday February 15, 2014. A Certified copy of the Legal Notice is maintained in the CDC file and is available for viewing and inspection at the Community & Economic Development Department during regular business hours.

Ms. Kosman stated the Village Code currently does not distinguish between the different intensities of use associated with Motor Vehicle Repair, Major based on vehicle size. Ms. Kosman stated the intent of the proposed text amendment is to prevent site congestion issues in the future based on the type of vehicles typically serviced by a repair facility. Ms. Kosman stated the separation between Major and Minor Motor Vehicle Repair is segregated by type of services performed and also by the weight of vehicles. Ms. Kosman stated the definition of Major Motor Vehicle Repair includes any vehicle size from small passenger vehicles to large commercial semi-tractor trailers. Ms. Kosman stated the distinction has not been made by the Municipal Code for Motor Vehicle Repair Major, the Village has run into instances in which the site size and parking did not meet the needs of the use. Subsequent outdoor repair and an excess parking of commercial vehicles occurred. Mr. Kosman stated the instances limited the maneuverability of other vehicles on site including fire safety vehicles. Ms. Kosman highlighted the following facts:

1. The existing 8,000 pound separation between Motor Vehicle Repair Major and Minor is due to Illinois state licensing divisions for commercial vehicles.
2. For the clarification on site requirements for Major Motor Vehicle Repair Use in the I-2, I-3 and I-4 Zoning Districts, staff proposes minimum property size requirements based on the intensity of the use:
  - a. If the vehicles to be serviced exceed 8,000 lbs the site will need to be a minimum of 1 acre.
  - b. If the vehicles are less than 8,000 lbs, such as passenger vehicles, the minimum area is ½ an acre.
3. The attached map indicates which parcels would be restricted from the operation of motor vehicle repair services for vehicles exceeding 8,000 pounds as well as the properties which would not accommodate any major motor vehicle repair as they are under a ½ acre.

4. The 1 acre and ½ acre requirements are based on the special needs associated with larger vehicles such as a semi-tractor trailer. A semi-tractor trailer will require approximately 1,000 SF of space taking into account both the parking requirements, turning radius and building size. Staff estimates the respective site size requirements would accommodate the repair of the commercial vehicles without overflow.
5. In addition to the size of the vehicles not being differentiated in lot size, staff also finds that the parking requirements currently do not accommodate for larger vehicles.
6. To improve this aspect of the code, staff proposes a parking stall size for tractor-trailer parking.
7. Staff proposes a 12 foot in width and 60 foot in length tractor-trailer parking stall dimensions. Historically, the Village has utilized “Loading Space” requirements outlined in the Municipal Code. This text amendment will provide a concise reference point for future truck parking requirements.
8. A survey of local communities yielded the following:

| <b>Town</b>   | <b>Loading/Truck Stall Width</b> |
|---------------|----------------------------------|
| Addison       | 10 feet                          |
| Elk Grove     | 12 feet                          |
| Elmhurst      | 12 feet                          |
| Schiller Park | 12 feet                          |
| Wood Dale     | 10 feet                          |

9. Staff also proposes that the parking requirement for “Repair Shops” be amended to include text indicating that if truck repair is to be performed on the premises, that parking stalls corresponding with the largest vehicles be provided.
10. For each service bay provided indoors, staff proposes that two parking spaces equivalent to the size of the motor vehicles to be serviced be provided. In addition to the two spaces, one standard parking stall will be required for each employee.
11. In the definition of Motor Vehicle Repair, Minor, staff proposes to eliminate one aspect of the service included: “not involving removal of the head, crankcase or racing motor.” Staff finds that this portion of the definition does not realistically reflect the use of minor motor vehicle repair.

Commissioner Rodriguez asked if the proposed text amendment would affect current operations at current facilities. Ms. Kosman stated the current businesses that are operating would become legal non-conforming under the proposed text amendment.

Commissioner Weldon expressed his concern with the lot size requirement and stated he believed it would be too restrictive to future businesses.

**Public Comment:**

Chairman Moruzzi asked if there was any member of the Public that would like to give testimony for CDC Case No. 2013-37. There were none.

Ms. Kosman reviewed the Village Staff Report and stated Staff recommends approval of the text amendment.

Motion: Commissioner Rowe made a motion to close CDC Case No. 2014-04. Chairman Moruzzi seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Moruzzi, Caira, Janowiak, Pisano, Rodriguez, Rowe, Weldon

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Moruzzi closed the Public Hearing at 7:32 p.m.

Motion: Commissioner Pisano made a motion to approve the text amendment as presented for CDC Case No. 2014-04. Chairman Moruzzi seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Moruzzi, Caira, Janowiak, Pisano, Rodriguez, Rowe, Weldon

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

**Report from Community Development**

Ms. Kosman reviewed both recent CDC cases along with upcoming cases.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business before the Community Development Commission, Commissioner Rowe made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Janowiak seconded the motion.

All were in favor

Motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:37 p.m.