

VILLAGE OF HUNTLEY
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
Monday, January 25, 2021
MINUTES

5

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Tom Kibort called to order the Village of Huntley Plan Commission meeting for January 25, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. *In light of the COVID-19 public health emergency and the prohibition of public gathering of 10 or more, the Plan Commission conducted the meeting remotely via an online video platform. Persons with public comments were asked to email written comments to staff by 5:00 pm on January 25, 2021 and the comments would be read into the public record. In addition, all interested parties were able to call in via telephone and listen to the meeting.*

10

PLEDGE OF

15

ALLEGIANCE Chairman Kibort led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

PLAN

20

COMMISSIONERS: Commissioners Darci Chandler, Terra DeBaltz, Lori Nichols, Ron Hahn, Robert Chandler, Vice Chair Dawn Ellison, and Chairman Tom Kibort.

COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: None

25

ALSO PRESENT: Director of Development Services Charles Nordman and Development Manager Margo Griffin

4. Public Comments

30

There were six (6) public comments emailed to the Village of Huntley. Manager Griffin read the written comments out loud and into the public record, as follows:

A. Glenn and Shirley Dau, 41W193 Cheryl Court, Huntley, IL

35

Our names are Glenn and Shirley Dau and we live at 41W193 Cheryl Ct. Huntley IL. We have received notice of what is being approved on the Stade farm. We have many concerns pertaining to the building site. Our subdivision has already been hampered with the annoying semi noise from Weber grill and their unusual use of parking in the middle of Freeman Road. Our biggest concerns with the new project are many:

40

1) The way the building and loading docks are positioned will definitely affect our neighborhood. Why can't the building be repositioned so the docks are facing West and not East.

45

2) The noise from semis is extremely bothersome to our quiet neighborhood. We moved in Prairie Oaks 25 years ago with the intention of enjoying the nature of the woods, wetlands, and quiet of the countryside. We understand the progress is always going to change things; however, we feel Huntley must be more considerate of the neighborhoods that progress is unsettling.

3) *We were told that berms would be installed however, berms were installed around Weber and they did nothing to control the noise of the semis.*

4) *We definitely do not want the existing woods not the wetlands disturbed.*

5) *Will this have any effect on Commonwealth Edison's easement properties on the east side of the proposed site.*

6) *All the existing drainage tiles that are on the existing farm will be destroyed – how is this development going to handle the run off of storm water?*

7) *Asphalt parking lots and building roofing does not absorb rain water!*

8) *Could you please confirm that only semi-trailers and not small delivery trucks will be used at this location. We are very concerned about how this would impact traffic.*

9) *Will this facility be operating 24 hours a day 7 days a week*

We will definitely be listening to tonight's meeting for any all info that the board can provide.

Thank you

15 *Glenn and Shirley Dau*

B. Mike and Pam Figolah, 41W092 Derby Court, Huntley, IL

Dear Village Board Members and Plan Commission Members,

20 *My name is Mike Figolah and my wife, Pam and I live at 41W092 Derby Court. We are residents of the Prairie Oaks subdivision located to the east of the subject property.*

25 *We and many of our neighbors have been aware that this Freeman Road property has been planned for industrial development even prior to when we purchased our homes. As such, we are not surprised to see a development such as this being proposed, and we do see positive benefits from such a development including a positive impact on the Kane County property tax base.*

30 *We been following the conceptual submittal of the proposed developments plans of the 41W368 Freeman Road property. We have had conversations with several of our neighbors and are writing these comments on their behalf as the consensus of our opinions.*

35 *We ask that these comments, all of which pertain to the conceptual review of Petition 21-01.22 which is Agenda Item 6.A, be read into the meeting record during Agenda Item 4: Public Comments.*

The comments and concerns that we have at this time, based upon a review of the concept documents included in the Plan Commission Agenda Packet, are as follows:

40 *1) Traffic Study - the agenda background information notes that the petitioner will be submitting a traffic study*

a) As nearby residents, we have noted recent traffic concerns which may be outside the limits of a typical traffic study, but we mention them here and ask that they be included also. A considerable increase in traffic on Freeman Road east of this subject area has been occurring within the last few years, both at the intersection of Freeman Road and Carriage Way, and also at the intersection of Freeman Road and Galligan Road. With the projected employment at this site we would expect a considerable portion of employee traffic to utilize Freeman Road from the east, thereby continuing to increase traffic and add to these concerns

50 *i) At Carriage Way, through traffic on Freeman Road is already causing delays both in safely exiting our subdivision, and also in entering our subdivision*

travelling from the west. There is no left turn lane for eastbound traffic from Freeman Road entering our subdivision, nor is there a westbound right turn lane for traffic to enter our subdivision from that direction. In addition, there is a hill on Freeman Road west of Carriage Way that affects sight distance when we are attempting exit our subdivision

(1) We are aware that this section of Freeman Road is Village of Huntley jurisdiction, and we ask that the traffic study be extended at least to the eastern Village limits to evaluate the need for turn lanes at the Carriage Way intersection.

(2) We do note that turn lanes were recently constructed at Freeman Road and Hannah Pearl Drive (which we do know is outside Village limits), even though the current (and future) number of residents using that entrance will be less than the current number of residents which access our subdivision at the Carriage Way intersection

ii) At the Freeman Road and Galligan Road intersection, traffic congestion issues and close calls continue to increase, and with an anticipation of some percentage of employee traffic coming from this direction, the need for turn lanes and traffic signals will only become more apparent. We are aware that the Kane County DOT has this intersection improvement included within their current Comprehensive Road Improvement Program, and we ask that the petitioner and the Village extend the traffic study eastward to include this intersection to determine if these intersection improvements should be expedited for the safety of the motoring public

b) Will the traffic study and development agreement require that all truck traffic can only access the site to and from RT 47?

c) Also, will the traffic study document whether this is simply a distribution warehouse or will home-delivery box van type vehicles also utilize this facility? If so, will those also be restricted only to access to/from RT 47, or will those be allowed to travel east of Freeman Road beyond the project site?

2) Construction noise and dust concerns

a) We ask that information be provided regarding allowable hours of construction, and that due to the proximity to a residential area that no exceptions to Village ordinances regarding working hours be allowed

b) We would expect that a very extensive amount of earthwork is going to be required for the redevelopment of this site, and that measures be implemented to ensure all appropriate dust control requirements are met

3) Site lines and screening

a) The concept site plan shows the eastern 760 feet or more of the property will consist of wetland protection and stormwater detention, thereby placing the development a considerable distance away from our residences

b) With that said, there are open field areas around the southern wetland and stormwater detention facilities that lend themselves to placement of additional landscaping plantings that over time will provide visual screening of the proposed development from the residences

c) Can the Village request the petitioner to provide scaled renderings from the rear yard perspective of a couple of the more exposed residences so that we have a better understanding of these site lines?

4) Stormwater Drainage and wetland protection

a) *The concept plan shows wetland protection areas east of the development, along with stormwater detention facilities throughout the site*

b) *There appears to be a buffer area around the wetlands, and we would request that the majority of existing trees located within that buffer remain so as to preserve the buffer and to preserve the majority of existing screening*

c) *In regards to stormwater detention, we have no doubts that this development will comply with all requirements of the Village of Huntley Stormwater Ordinance and the Kane County Stormwater Ordinance.*

d) *Due to the extent of nuisance goose problems which currently plague the area due to other stormwater detention basins that have mowed turfgrass to the waters edge, we strongly urge the Village to require the petitioner/developer to utilize naturalized buffers around the proposed detention facilities to minimize additional attractive nuisances to geese.*

5) *Hours of Operation*

a) *With the massive amounts of truck parking proposed at this site, we have concerns about noise and lights related to late hours of operations*

i) *What anti-idling measures and restrictions will be implemented?*

ii) *What measures will be implemented to limit late hours of operation?*

iii) *Can any necessary late hours of operation be limited to truck docks along the west face of the building, at the further locations away from residences*

6) *Lighting*

a) *We understand that typical municipal lighting requirements restrict the allowable light spillage beyond the development property line*

b) *Given how far to the west the proposed building and parking are planned, can those light spillage requirements become more restrictive? After all, what is the point of allowing light spillage over wetlands and stormwater detention areas east of the development?*

7) *Communication*

a) *A few residents have voiced their concerns was the first they heard about this project was through reading local newspapers or seeing comments on social media.*

b) *What types of notifications will be provided to area residents in advance of the next steps in the annexation and public hearing process?*

8) *Notice of Future additional comments*

a) *We do note that that all of these comments have been generated from reviewing only a few pages of concept submittals, and we do expect that many of these questions/comments will be addressed during the typical Village plan and annexation agreement review process.*

b) *We do however expect that as additional documents are provided for the public as part of the development and public hearing process, we will likely have additional comments that we request be considered by the Plan Commission and Village Board.*

c) *Please note that these comments are not on behalf of all residents of the Prairie Oaks subdivisions, as due to the expedited schedule of this project we have not yet had the opportunity to obtain input from all residents.*

d) *We do expect that additional comments will be provided by other residents of our subdivision as additional development information is made available*

We thank you for your consideration of our comments and concerns, and we look forward to working cooperatively with the Village of Huntley as this development process moves forward.

Please feel free to contact either of us if you have any questions or are looking for any clarification of these comments.

Sincerely,

Mike Figolah

Pam Figolah

C. Lynn and Richard Nowinski, 41W198 Charles Lane, Huntley, IL

I am a resident of Prairie Oaks and would like to request permission to speak at tonight's meeting. My husband and I totally support the letter submitted by Mike and Pam Figolah. In addition, we live on Charles Lane and worked with Kane County and spent in excess of \$20,000 to fix the flooding problem in our yard. We are very concerned about the drainage plans for this project.

Thank you,

Lynn Nowinski (Richard)

41W198 Charles Lane

D. Patricia and Harold Mierisch, 18N527 Carriage Way Lane, Huntley, IL

Topics/concerns:

Harold and I both agree with the content of the letter dated January 24,2021 sent by Mike and Pam Figolah.

Not only to voice concern regarding traffic study but I wanted to make sure that everyone is aware that directly to the east of our subdivision entrance there are wetlands on both sides of the road. The area of road in between these two wetlands collapsed last year and had to have the road reinforced and repaired. If this is what is occurring with this road with current traffic we are very concerned with the road collapsing again with additional traffic.

We are also very concerned that residents had to find about of this development via a Daily Herald newspaper article dated Jan. 21,2021. It was my belief that properties adjacent to development/rezoning parcels have to legally receive a certified letter notifying of any meetings or that a billboard has to be erected with notification of any hearings. Thank you.

E. Paul Arnone, no address provided

Hello,

The area west of the Prairie Oaks subdivision is home to an Illinois Protected species: Swainson's Hawk.

<https://www2.illinois.gov/dnr/conservation/NaturalHeritage/Pages/Birds.aspx>

Is the committee aware of this? Any comment?

Thank you,

-Paul

F. Carol Dyrek, Prairie Oaks Subdivision, Huntley, IL

Before reading the email from Carol Dyrek, Manager Griffin stated the following email made assumptions on the name of the end user for the Project Pumpkin development. Manager Griffin stated the end user has not been announced yet and reminded the listeners to take this into account while the letter is read into the public record.

5

I am writing to express serious concerns about the Amazon facility going up off of Freeman Road. I am a 22 year resident of Prairie Oaks subdivision and fear my way of life is about to change along with all the other residents here. Among my concerns are: noise, lighting, truck fumes, crime, storm drainage and traffic problems. I don't expect Amazon to listen to the concerns of the little people but I do hope you and others on the board of Huntley will. Why is bringing this major company into Huntley necessary? This is the village with "rural charm". I don't think so... not anymore. Between Weber Grill and now Amazon residents are being forced out of here. The biggest tax base here has to be Sun City yet Huntley doesn't take them into consideration when it comes to crime, traffic and congestion. I hope to attend a village meeting in person to speak to these concerns. Please inform me if and when I can do this.
Carol Dyrek

10

15

Manager Griffin announced she had completed reading the letters emailed to the Village and this was the conclusion of the Public Comments. She then turned the meeting back to Chairman Kibort.

20

5. Approval of Minutes

A. Approval of the January 11, 2021 Plan Commission Meeting Minutes

25

No additions or corrections were noted.

A MOTION was made to approve the January 11, 2021 Plan Commission Meeting Minutes.

30

MOVED: Commissioner Ron Hahn
SECONDED: Commissioner Terra DeBaltz
AYES: Commissioners Ron Hahn, Darci Chandler, Lori Nichols, Terra DeBaltz, Robert Chandler, Vice Chair Dawn Ellison, and Chairman Tom Kibort

35

NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: None
MOTION CARRIED 7:0:0

40

6. Petitions:

A. Petition No. 21-01.02, Venture One Acquisitions, LLC, as petitioner, and 92131 LLC, as owner, 41W368 Freeman Road, Conceptual Review of the Proposed Annexation and Development of Approximately 260 Acres Commonly known as 41W368 Freeman Road, Huntley, IL.

45

Chairman Kibort announced Director Nordman would be giving a PowerPoint presentation to review the

petition.

Director Nordman reviewed a PowerPoint presentation and referenced the staff report.

5 *Development Summary*

Director Nordman stated Venture One Acquisitions (Venture One) has approached the Village to annex and develop property commonly known as the Stade Farm, 41W368 Freeman Road. The property is currently located in unincorporated Kane County and is approximately 260 acres with ±2,780 feet of frontage on Freeman Road. Venture One is a real estate private equity fund manager, developer and operating company specializing in the industrial property sector. Venture One is proposing to annex the entire 260-acre property and immediately develop the southern 152 acres with a building of approximately 629,186 square feet for a distribution center with an office component (approximately 44,186 square feet) and up to 1,000 jobs, for an investment of approximately \$100 million. Director Nordman stated the end user wants to be in the building by the second quarter of 2022, which will require Venture One to complete the entitlement process and begin site work by March of this year.

Director Nordman reviewed the entitlement process which requires the annexation of the property and zoning it for industrial development. Director Nordman stated the developer is requesting that special use permits for warehouse/distribution are granted up front through the annexation and zoning process. With exception to Lot 1, a specific user would not be identified for the remaining property as part of the entitlement process. Director Nordman stated the developer is also requesting that a set of design criteria is established and memorialized through the Planned Unit Development approval process. The design criteria would establish bulk regulations (setbacks, building height, lot coverage, etc.) and design standards for building, landscaping and signage. With these criteria in place, the developer would be able to submit a building permit and site plan that would be reviewed by staff; there would be no site plan review by the Plan Commission and Village Board. If the building and site plan meet the approved criteria/standards, as determined by staff review, a permit would be issued after going through the building permit review process.

Director Nordman continued with his review of the entitlement process. He stated the formal entitlement process will include the annexation of the property and approval of an annexation agreement by the Village Board in addition to the following:

- Amend the Zoning Ordinance to create a new ORI-1 zoning district. The ORI-1 district would have limited permitted uses, but it would allow all of the uses proposed by developer as special uses and incorporate basic bulk, setback, height, and other development standards. A Planned Unit Development (PUD) would also be allowed as a special use and could include approval of deviations from the general standards for the ORI-1 district and/or the general standards for PUDs under Section 156.070 of the Zoning Ordinance. This would be done by ordinance (the form of which would be an exhibit to the annexation agreement) immediately after the property is annexed.
- Amend the I-90/IL 47 Gateway Plan to identify the property for Light Industrial. It is currently shown as Business Park and Flex Space.

- Re-zone the property into the new ORI-1 district. This would be done by ordinance (the form of which would be an exhibit to the annexation agreement) immediately after the property is annexed.
- 5
- Approve a special use permit, PUD, and preliminary/final plat of subdivision for the property that:
 - Divides the 260-acre property into Lots 1 and 2.
 - Authorizes all of the desired special uses for the entire property.
 - Grants preliminary and final PUD approval for Lot 1 based on the specific plans for immediate development.
 - Grants preliminary and final PUD approval for Lot 2 as a second phase of the development. This approval would allow Lot 2 to be developed for any of the approved uses in accordance with certain development and design standards and all other applicable codes and ordinances, but would not approve detailed plans. To undertake any future development on Lot 2 that is within the PUD parameters, the owner would just come in for administrative approvals (e.g. building permit, stormwater permit, access permit, etc.) and the detailed plans would be reviewed in that context.
 - This would be done by ordinance (the form of which would be an exhibit to the annexation agreement) immediately after the property is annexed.
- 10
- 15
- Any further subdivision of Lot 2 would require subdivision plat approval in accordance with the Subdivision Code, but the discretionary zoning approvals would be in place.
- 20

Director Nordman stated that prior to the annexation, all zoning actions must be considered at a public hearing before the Plan Commission and the Village Board must also hold a public hearing on the annexation agreement.

25

Site Plan

Director Nordman reviewed the major components of the site plan. Director Nordman stated Venture One is proposing to immediately construct a ±629,186 square foot warehouse/distribution building on the southernmost lot, fronting Freeman Road, for a specific user that has yet to be named. The site will also include 1,046 parking spaces for employees to the south of the building and 720 semi-trailer parking spaces to the east and west of the building. The semi-trailer parking would be located within a secured fenced area. The existing wetlands and proposed stormwater detention will be located on the east side of the site where they will create a buffer of approximately 760 feet from the unincorporated residential to the east.

30

35

Director Nordman reviewed the site access for the project. Access to the site would be provided from the existing signalized intersection on Freeman Road which will include a new roadway extending north onto the property. The new roadway will provide access to the subject site and future development further to the north. A second signalized intersection is also proposed, subject to meeting warrants, further to the east at Weber Drive and will serve as the primary access point for trucks entering the site. Trucks would leave the site utilizing the new roadway at the existing traffic signal on Freeman Road. Employee parking would be accessible using the new roadway. Director Nordman stated the petitioner will be submitting a traffic study with their development application to demonstrate warrants are met for the new signal and determine the Freeman Road improvements necessary to accommodate the proposed development of the site.

40

45

Building Elevations

Director Nordman reviewed the building elevations. The proposed building elevations primarily consist of precast concrete panels painted various shades of gray with blue accents on all elevations of the building. The south elevation, facing Freeman Road, includes the building's office space and main entrance for employees. The entrances will be accented with blue steel frame entry canopies and windows will run the length of the office space which extends the majority of the south elevation. The east, west and north building elevations will be lined with a total of 132 loading docks (52 on the east elevation, 32 on the north elevation, and 48 on the west elevation).

Conceptual Review

Director Nordman concluded his PowerPoint presentation, and began to review the instructions regarding conceptual reviews of plans. Director Nordman stated the petitioner has requested the Plan Commission to conceptually review the proposed annexation and development of the subject site. The Plan Commission is not required to provide a formal position statement on the proposal, and the petitioner shall not be required to comply with any position statements which are offered. The concept review shall provide the petitioner with initial comments and concerns that should be considered as they proceed in the formal review process. The Plan Commission and its individual members are not bound by any comments made during the discussion and the petitioner acknowledges that it cannot claim in the future any reliance whatsoever on those comments.

Director Nordman concluded his presentation and introduced Ryan Stoller from Venture One.

Ryan Stoller, Principal at Venture One, stated they are a developer and investor of industrial and distribution type facilities. He stated he was very excited to be making this investment in the community of Huntley.

Mr. Stoller explained that there are substantial wetlands exist on the site that they intend to maintain. Mr. Stoller explained the wetlands create an approximately 2000 feet wide of natural buffer between the east property line and where the building will be constructed.

Mr. Stoller further explained that Venture One will be conducting the traffic study and storm water management studies with our civil engineers and will be conforming all of it to the Village and Kane County standards.

Mr. Stoller stated their engineer Matthew Kramer of Jacob and Hefner was on the line to answer questions.

Chairman Kibort asked for questions from the Commission.

Vice Chair Ellison inquired about the runoff of the water. She stated there was a lot of pavement on the site and asked whether there was any reason to be concerned about runoff into the neighboring community.

Mr. Stoller responded stating there is substantial new detention that is included in the plans. This is in addition to the existing wetlands that will remain in place. Ryan Stoller introduced Mr. Kramer to respond further.

5 Mr. Kramer responded regarding the stormwater management. He restated the plans will meet the Kane County Storm Water Management regulations and any modifications set forth by the Village of Huntley. Mr. Kramer stated the site is accepting a flow from the wetlands to the east, and they are replacing any
10 the new imperviousness of the overall site. He explained that at the end of their engineering analysis, they will be required to prove they will reduce the peak runoff leaving the site during all storm events, including, and up, to the 100-year storm event.

Vice Chair Ellison asked about the distance from the proposed building to the east lot line.

15 Mr. Stoller stated it was about 700 feet from the eastern edge of pavement, and approximately 2000 feet from the east wall of the building.

Vice Chair Ellison asked about the truck docks and whether one side of the building was for unloading trucks and the other was for loading.

20

Ryan Stoller stated that was likely how the user would utilize the truck docks.

Mr. Mark Goode of Venture One added they anticipate inbound trucks to enter the site at the east entrance and leave the site on the west side of the site.

25

Vice Chair Ellison asked about the hours of business and whether they anticipate 24 hour operations.

Mr. Stoller stated it will be a 24-hour operation; however, there will be peak times and off-peak times.

30 Chairman Kibort called upon Commissioner Hahn for questions.

Commissioner Hahn began with a statement regarding the need to look at the entire project now, including the north piece which they have not seen plans for as of yet. He cited the landscaping plans as an example.

35

Mr. Stoller responded Venture One is working closely with the Village to create landscaping standards that they would need to adhere to for the entire project. This includes very detailed plans for the caliper of trees, types of species, landscape berms, and more.

40 Commissioner Hahn asked if both entrances would have signalization.

Mr. Stoller stated there is already a signal at the west entrance and they are proposing to install a signal at the east entrance.

Commissioner Hahn stated he thought this project could bring a large increase in traffic. He was interested in traffic studies and how far east of the property they would be reviewing. He explained that he thought it could be beneficial to go as far as the intersection of Freeman Road/Galligan Road.

5 Mr. Stoller stated they have engaged two firms to work on the traffic studies. They both will be addressing the regional flow of traffic in addition to the two new access roads for the property.

10 Commissioner Hahn noted that the wetlands offer a significant separation from the development to the east; however, they do not always screen the line of sight. He explained that some taller growing tree or evergreens could be added at the property line to provide additional screening where needed.

Chairman Kibort called on Commissioner Darci Chandler for comments.

15 Commissioner Darci Chandler stated Commissioners Ellison and Hahn stated most of her concerns, which centered upon the wetlands. She had no further comments.

20 Chairman Kibort stated he had a few comments regarding the wetlands. He discussed the history of the wetlands in the area, including previous issues at the Prairie Oaks subdivision. He asked about the site plan and if the uneven yellow border around the site represented the area where earthwork would occur.

Director Nordman confirmed that was the case and the actual property line was shown as black dashed line. He added the area to the east includes the wetland area.

25 Chairman Kibort stated the Huntley ordinance requires native plantings around the detention areas to restrict to impact of geese and that the final landscaping must be monitored for 5 years. He also discussed utilizing vegetated swales for improving conservation design.

Chairman Kibort is also in favor of looking out to Galligan Road with the traffic study.

30 Chairman Kibort explained that he will be interested in the following items when the petitioner returns with their formal request:

- Studying drainage, including the subdivision to the east (Prairie Oaks)
- Turn lanes at Prairie Oaks
- The height of plant materials for screening
- 35 • High quality native plantings
- Lighting and light pollution
- He will be looking at the site design standards for the northern lot

40 Chairman Kibort called on Commissioner Nichols.

Commissioner Nichols stated she is interested in the drainage impact on the subdivision. She is also in favor of sufficient buffers to reduce noise levels.

Chairman Kibort called on Commissioner DeBaltz.

Commissioner DeBaltz had nothing to add.

Chairman Kibort called on Commissioner Robert Chandler.

5

Commissioner Robert Chandler stated he agreed with previous comments on landscaping, buffers, and stormwater runoff. He added that he was interested to see what will be presented on noise and lights, including a review of the site photometric plan.

10

Chairman Kibort requested that all light fixtures in parking lots to point downward, and include shields. He summarized his major points, including:

- Traffic
- Light
- Sound
- Screening and buffering
- Improving any impacted wetlands
- Project Design standards
- Conservation design elements
- The design of the northern lot for future development

15

20

Mr. Stoller thanked the Commission, staff, and neighboring residents for their comments.

6. Discussion

25

Director Nordman stated the public hearing for Venture One is targeted for February 22, 2021, and the public notices will be going out in early February.

7. Adjournment

30

At 7:35 pm, a MOTION was made to adjourn the January 25, 2021 Plan Commission meeting.

MOVED:	Commissioner Lori Nichols
SECONDED:	Commissioner Terra DeBaltz
AYES:	Commissioners Lori Nichols, Darci Chandler, Robert Chandler, Ron Hahn, Terra DeBaltz, Vice Chair Dawn Ellison, and Chairman Tom Kibort
NAYS:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
MOTION CARRIED	7:0:0

35

Respectfully submitted,
Margo Griffin
Development Manager
Village of Huntley

40