



MINUTES OF THE PLAN COMMISSION

VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK, COOK AND WILL COUNTIES, ILLINOIS

JANUARY 7, 2016

The regular meeting of the Plan Commission was held in the Council Chambers of Village Hall on January 7, 2016 at 7:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Plan Commissioners: Tom Mahoney
Bob McClellan
Mark Moylan
Art Pierce
Bill Reidy
Tim Stanton
Rita Walker, Chairman

Absent Plan Commissioner(s): Jeff Ficaro
Gina Miller

Village Officials and Staff: Amy Connolly, Planning Director
Stephanie Kisler, Planner
Debra Kotas, Commission Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

Plan Commission Chairman Walker called to order the regular meeting of the Plan Commission for January 7, 2015 at 7:32 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the December 17, 2015 regular meeting of the Plan Commission were presented for approval. COMMISSIONER REIDY requested specific comments made at the last meeting of the Plan Commission be added to the Minutes as published. These were presented to Staff for inclusion. A motion was made by COMMISSIONER REIDY, seconded by COMMISSIONER STANTON to approve the Minutes, as amended. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY by voice call. PLAN COMMISSION CHAIRMAN WALKER declared the motion approved.

TO: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

FROM: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PLAN COMMISSION

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2016 MEETING

RE: PUBLIC HEARING

AMENDING THE VILLAGE ZONING ORDINANCE FOR THE PURPOSE OF MAKING CERTAIN CHANGES TO THE VILLAGE SIGN REGULATIONS AND ESTABLISHING A RICH TOWNSHIP ENTERTAINMENT OVERLAY DISTRICT. THE AMENDMENT PROPOSED INCLUDES, BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO THE FOLLOWING:

AMENDMENTS TO SECTION IX. (SIGN REGULATIONS) to address inconsistencies and administrative difficulties with the current sign regulations:

1. Section IX. B. 2. (APPLICABILITY OF SIGN REGULATIONS AND PERMITS REQUIRED): Minor revisions supplementing submittal requirements.

2. Section IX.C.11.k. (GENERAL PROVISIONS): Removes regulations for Institutional signs from the 'Exemption' section and incorporates them under the regulations for "Non-residential and Institutional uses" in "Residential Zoning Districts" (Section IX.D.2.a.& b.).

3. Section IX.D.1.a. (DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR SIGN BY ZONING DISTRICT, General Regulations): Reorganizes development standards for signs by categorizing regulations per zoning district and redefines the methodology for calculating sign area.

4. Section IX.D.1.b (DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR SIGN BY ZONING DISTRICT, General Regulations, WALL SIGNS): Provides general regulations for wall signs in all zoning districts including limiting wall signs to only two (2) rows of text; defines background color of a sign as part of the sign area; and clarifies location criteria for single and multi-tenant business wall signs.

5. Section IX.D.1.c. (DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR SIGN BY ZONING DISTRICT, General Regulations, FREESTANDING SIGNS): Provides general regulations for freestanding signs in all zoning districts including the prohibition of advertising on sign bases; clarifies the allowable sign area for freestanding signs and setback requirements; establishes a maximum sign height and method of measuring sign height; and requires individual panels in a freestanding sign to be consistent in color, method of illumination, material and design.

6. Section IX.D.2a.& b. (DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR SIGN BY ZONING DISTRICT, Residential Zoning Districts (R-1, R-2, R-3, R-4, R-5, R-6, and R-7)): Prohibits wall signs for residential uses or home occupations in residential districts; provides for freestanding signs at the entrance of a residential subdivision, residential community or project; and clarifies regulations for nonresidential and institutional uses.

7. Section IX.D.3a&b. (DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR SIGN BY ZONING DISTRICT, Business Zoning Districts (B-1, B-2, B-3, & B-5)): Clarifies the allowable area for freestanding signs; proposes a maximum lettering and sign height for wall signs; and provides for additional freestanding signs if the business has significant road frontage.

8. Section IX.D.4.a.&b. (DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR SIGN BY ZONING DISTRICT, Business Zoning Districts (B-4)), Section IX.D.5.a.&b. (DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR SIGN

BY ZONING DISTRICT, Office & Restricted Industrial (ORI), and Section IX.D.6.a.&b. (DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR SIGN BY ZONING DISTRICT, General Manufacturing (M-1)): Provides a maximum letter and sign height; and clarifies regulations for wall signs versus freestanding signs.

9. Section IX.F. (Prohibited Signs): Expands prohibited signs to include vehicle signs (when parked in a manner to function as additional advertising); door signs; and off-premise signs.

10. Section IX.I. (Electronic Message Centers and Signs): Amends existing regulations to include limitations on brightness levels, dimming requirements, audio, and the timing of electronic display.

11. Section IX.J. (Sign Regulations for Special Areas and Particular Uses): Creates a new section to address special considerations such as I-80 Corridor and Automobile Service Stations.

12. Definitions: Adds definitions for Area, Freestanding Sign; Area, Wall Sign; Box Sign, Building Frontage; Door Signs; Height, Freestanding Sign; Height, Wall Sign; Roof Sign; Sign, Electronic Message; Sign, Tri-vision.

AMENDMENTS TO SECTION V.D (OVERLAY DISTRICT REGULATIONS) to create a new overlay district called the “Rich Township Entertainment District” containing new use requirements and specific sign regulations within a new Section V.D.3.

1. Section V.D.3.A. RICH TOWNSHIP ENTERTAINMENT OVERLAY DISTRICT: Creates a new overlay district that is applicable to the commercially used and zoned properties (non-residential and nonindustrial properties) within Rich Township. The overlay district would apply a new set of commercial principal, special, and prohibited uses that are oriented toward the creation of tourism-based, entertainment district.

2. Section V.D.3.B. RICH TOWNSHIP ENTERTAINMENT OVERLAY DISTRICT: Allows the reuse of a non-conforming freestanding sign, located along the I-80 corridor, to be expanded in size and also changed to a static district-wide identification sign and a dynamic variable electronic message sign used to exclusively to promote the businesses and events within the Rich Township Entertainment District, Village-sponsored events, and emergency notices.

Present were the following:

Plan Commissioners: Tom Mahoney
Bob McClellan
Mark Moylan
Art Pierce
Bill Reidy
Tim Stanton
Rita Walker, Chairman

Absent Plan Commissioner(s): Jeff Ficaro
Gina Miller

Village Officials and Staff: Amy Connolly, Planning Director
Stephanie Kisler, Planner
Debra Kotas, Commission Secretary

CHAIRMAN WALKER opened the Public Hearing at 7:35 p.m. indicating that the audience was devoid of anyone needing to be sworn in who may have wanted to give testimony, comment, engage in cross-examination or ask questions during this Hearing.

Village Staff provided confirmation that appropriate notice regarding the Public Hearing was published in the local newspaper in accordance with State law and Village requirements and sent to all property owners within the proposed Rich Township Overlay District.

AMY CONNOLLY, Planning Director, began the Staff presentation regarding the aforementioned text amendment proposal that contains two (2) elements involving 1) Sign Regulations; and 2) adding a new overlay district, the Rich Township Entertainment District.

Using a Power Point presentation, MS. CONNOLLY summarized the following amendments to Section IX of the Sign Regulations:

Section IX.B.2. deals with minor revisions supplementing submittal requirements including asking for an email address, gross floor area, color elevations of sign, and a plat of survey. MS. CONNOLLY noted there were no significant changes with this Section; however, this would be a clarification within the Zoning Ordinance since these are currently requested in the Sign Permit Application packet.

MS. CONNOLLY reported Section IX.C.11.k. (General Provisions) removes regulations for institutional signs from the “Exemption” section and incorporates them under the regulations for “Non-Residential and Institutional Uses” in Residential Zoning Districts. She further explained institutional signs were previously exempt from needing a permit but had regulations. She noted this will incorporate institutional signage since they refer to institutions in residential zoning, including churches and schools, but have sign requirements that are different for single-family residential uses. She explained in the current Zoning Ordinance, signage regulations for institutional uses allow for small sign face areas, which has not always been enforced correctly and in turn has allowed some institutional uses to have signage in excess of the allowable sizes. She explained that these text amendments will ensure institutional uses do not have non-conforming signs by putting these institutional uses within the category of residential zoning districts and specifying non-residential institutional uses have certain sign regulations, including an increased amount of signage allowed.

Section IX.D.1.a. re-organizes development standards for signs by categorizing regulations by zoning district differentiating between wall vs. freestanding signs. MS. CONNOLLY showed tables that were created that makes the Zoning Ordinance more reader-friendly regarding gross floor area required for each sign, number of signs allowed, sign face area, and letter height. She also reported a major change to the Zoning Ordinance involves redefining the method of calculating sign face area, which would entail drawing a continual line around the sign, art and background color and using the area of the smallest geometric shape that encloses it.

Section IX.D.1.b. refers to changes in General Regulations for wall signs in all zoning districts including limiting wall signs to only two (2) rows of text, regulating letter height based on gross floor area, and including a background color as part of sign face area. MS. CONNOLLY reported another part of this text amendment is the location requirement for single vs. multi-tenant spaces. She showed a single-tenant building with only one (1) business the sign must be centered over the door, and multi-tenant spaces with varying sizes will be required to use the same center line on the facade.

STEPHANIE KISLER, Planner, explained the number of wall signs depends on the tenant frontage with a tenant having an entrance door and that also faces a public right-of-way will be allowed two (2) signs where as a tenant in the same building having a single entrance door and not facing a public right-of-way will be limited to one (1) sign. She further clarified that any business will be limited to a maximum of two (2) wall signs.

MS. CONNOLLY reviewed the significant amount of General Regulations that have been added to Section IX.D.1.c. (Freestanding Signs) including:

1. Prohibition of advertising on a sign base;
2. Number of freestanding signs allowed is dependent on amount of frontage, with a maximum of two (2);
3. 10' height limitation;
4. Allowable sign face area shall be one (1) square foot (SF) per 2.5 linear foot (LF) of lot frontage, but also determined upon gross floor area;
5. Measuring sign height using the definition for average natural grade;
6. Requiring individual panels on multi-panel signs be consistent in color, method of illumination, material, and design as businesses change;
7. Architectural compatibility in terms of building materials, colors, and size; and
8. Landscape requirements for the base of the sign are more clearly quantified as 2 SF per 1 SF of sign face area, with a minimum of 20 SF of landscape and maximum of 200 SF.

Using photographs, MS. CONNOLLY showed how the base of a freestanding sign must be fully enclosed with no pole or post visible. She added that advertising will not be permitted on the base of freestanding signs.

MS. CONNOLLY added that the proposed 5' setback requirement has been removed from the draft ordinance due to the number of non-conforming signs it would create.

Section IX.D.2.a.&b. clarifies that wall signs are not permitted for residential uses or home occupations, but does allow for a freestanding sign at the entrance of a subdivision, residential community, or housing project with a maximum of two (2) freestanding signs. MS. CONNOLLY added these regulations have now been placed in an easy-to-read table.

Another change within the Sign Regulations of the Zoning Ordinance refers to all signs within Business Zoning Districts in Section IX.D.3.a.&b., except for B-4, relative to gross floor area. MS. CONNOLLY reported as the gross floor area increases, the Zoning Ordinance now allows for a larger letter height and sign face area. Freestanding signs were changed to allow more freestanding signs if the building lot frontage exceeds 500 LF.

MS. CONNOLLY referred to Section IX.D.4.a.&b., addressing the B-4 Business Zoning District, stating that this District has typically been treated differently within the Zoning Ordinance due to the nature of the uses within this district. She reported within the amended Sign Regulations, the B-4 Zoning District continues to have only half the amount of signage allowed in other business districts for both freestanding and wall signs; however, a new table has been created showing freestanding signs are now based on gross floor area and wall signs now have letter height and maximum sign height requirements.

MS. CONNOLLY briefly reviewed Section IX.D.5., referring to signage in the ORI and M-1 Districts that was previously under the approval of the Plan Commission or Zoning Administrator without specific guidelines for size or height of signs. She reported these are now consistent with signage in the Business Districts and a table with guidelines has been created for both wall and freestanding signs within this district.

MS. CONNOLLY proceeded to discuss changes within Section IX.F., referring to Prohibited Signs, which has been expanded to include off-premise signs, including directional signs, and vehicle signs including signs attached, affixed or painted on vehicles or trailers that are parked in a public right-of-way, public property or private property, during non-business hours, when parked in a manner for the purpose of advertising or creating a billboard. For safety issues, she explained certain door signs will be prohibited in order to provide a "clear zone" with only the business name, address and hours of operation being allowed on the door. She clarified that letters must be of one (1) consistent color, maximum of four inches (4"), and may only be affixed to the door at a height 4' and below or 6.5' and above.

COMMISSIONER REIDY commented that while these proposed amendments to the Ordinance will apply to new signage, he inquired if this particular change referring to door signs would apply to existing businesses not in compliance. MS. CONNOLLY indicated there are businesses that have been identified as having a significant amount of signage on their door and will be requested to comply with the new Sign Regulations. COMMISSIONER REIDY

suggested the possibility of a grace period be given to those businesses with a date to become in compliance. MS. CONNOLLY reported Staff recommends educating those businesses and assisting them with coming into compliance; however, the Village Board will determine the manner of enforcement.

Section IX.I. addresses Electronic Message Centers and any electronic sign erected along a highway interstate. Consistent with Federal Highway Administration standards, regulations have been recommended, including:

1. Instantaneous images only, no blinking, flashing, rolling shading or dissolving;
2. Amount of electronic messaging allowed increased to 50% of sign face area;
3. Eight-second change intervals with 2-second transition;
4. Dimmer control;
5. Brightness; and
6. Must allow the Village of Tinley Park to advertise emergency messages and public/community events at no cost to the Village.

MS. CONNOLLY reported Section IX.J. refers to sign regulations for Special Areas and Particular Uses that have been moved from another place within the Sign Regulations section and grants a wall signage bonus for those businesses with frontage along I-80. She added that Automobile Service Station regulations were also moved to this section.

MS. CONNOLLY reported that several new Definitions have also been added to the Sign Regulations that will assist with the understanding and administering of the Sign Regulations, including but not limited to:

1. Sign Face Area;
2. Freestanding Sign;
3. Box Sign;
4. Building Frontage;
5. Sign Height;
6. Dynamic Variable Electronic Message;
7. Vehicle Sign; and
8. Roof Sign.

In addition to the aforementioned, MS. CONNOLLY reported there were also some regulations added to the Zoning Ordinance regarding roof signs not extending above the top line of the face of the building and removal of obsolete signs that includes removal of the old sign and replacing it with a new sign or clear panel. COMMISSIONER MOYLAN inquired who will be responsible for enforcement of this. MS. CONNOLLY stated it will be the property owner's responsibility to ensure that their tenants abide by these regulations.

COMMISSIONER REIDY noted in the lists of signs, "Wayfinding Signage" was not defined. MS. CONNOLLY stated that Staff would work on a definition for Wayfinding Signage.

MS. CONNOLLY reported within the same text amendment a change is proposed to Section V.D., creating a Rich Township Entertainment Overlay District in order to encourage development in Rich Township within Tinley Park and further promote those existing businesses within that township. She reviewed a map of the proposed Overlay District, which includes incorporated properties zoned that are commercially, but not those zoned residential or industrial. She explained the proposed overlay district has new list of permitted, special, and prohibited uses that are tourism-based and written to ensure no non-conformities. These uses are also roughly based on the Brookside Marketplace Planned Unit Development just west of Harlem Avenue.

Along with the proposed overlay district is a proposed district-wide sign that would benefit businesses within the overlay district only, by re-using the existing non-conforming sign along I-80 that was previously occupied by First Midwest Bank Amphitheater. She explained the sign has a large impact on tourism in the community and is currently not in use by the owner, Intercontinental, the majority property owner in Rich Township, who wishes to re-use the sign more effectively since it has been sitting vacant for some time. She reiterated only those businesses within the proposed

overlay district would be allowed to advertise on the sign; however, the sign would include messages with Village-sponsored events and emergency, traffic, or weather notices, with no cost to the Village.

MS. CONNOLLY showed a rendering of the proposed sign explained the existing sign would become an electronic, changeable message sign, increasing in height from 70' to 80', width that doubles from 29' to 48' and having a sign face area of 1,300 SF per side comprised entirely in LED. She reported the sign will become a legal, non-conforming sign that will continue to be owned by the current property owner, Intercontinental, adding they will be responsible for the expense of all changes to the sign. She used the LED signs located in Country Club Hills and the Pipefitters Union sign located in Mokena for comparison in understanding the size of the conceptual design proposed.

COMMISSIONER REIDY requested clarification that the existing sign is on property owned by Intercontinental but is not located on any properties that would use it for advertising making it a standalone lot. In her research, MS. CONNOLLY reported the existing sign was created when the amphitheater was built by obtaining an off-premise sign approved by the Zoning Administrator and modified with each amphitheater name change. She stated it does not meet current Zoning Ordinance regulations, has no special Variance, no Special Use Permit to include the sign, or any other kind of special permit. She explained it is currently a non-conforming sign and the only way to reuse the sign is to legitimize the sign by this proposed text amendment to create the proposed overlay district.

COMMISSIONER MCCLELLAN expressed concerns with limiting other Village businesses, including those on Oak Park Avenue, who may want to advertise on the sign. For clarity and transparency, he requested financial information including cost, rental rates and expense to the Village. MS. CONNOLLY stated it is a privately erected sign on private property, with no Village expenditures. As with any tenant signage, she reported Staff is not privy to lease rates or cost.

MS. CONNOLLY again referenced the sign is a tool to encourage development within Rich Township which has one of the high property tax rates for commercial development in the State and that is not seeing the same growth as in other areas of the Village. She stressed that rather than have the sign remain abandoned, it could benefit this section of the Village. She reported Staff has concerns on how to develop that part of the community and continue its investment. She stated Staff does not typically promote large electronic signs; however, for purposes of economic development and promote tourism in any part of the Village, this could be a benefit.

CHAIRMAN WALKER referenced Village promotion of Oak Park Avenues businesses; however, believes this is another section of the Village that is very much in need of assistance in promotion and marketing.

Due to high visibility on I-80, COMMISSIONER MCCLELLAN suggested broadening its use by allowing businesses along Oak Park Avenue to also advertise on the sign. CHAIRMAN WALKER believes further limiting it to Oak Park Avenue businesses would then create problems with other Village commercial businesses to also advertise on the sign. She believes in restricting it to only the proposed overlay district. COMMISSIONER REIDY concurred with limiting to only one (1) district and that all four (4) townships in Tinley Park must then be considered.

COMMISSIONER REIDY quoted the proposed section of the Zoning Ordinance regarding "wayfinding". He referenced the study prepared by Roger Brooks, an international expert on tourism. He noted the study was conducted for benefit of the Village, not Rich Township. He expressed concerns regarding the cost of a wayfinding program. MS. CONNOLLY reported a municipal wayfinding program would be paid for by the Village and that Rich Township will focus prominently in the program due to the amphitheater, which brings more traffic to the Village than any other Tinley Park use.

COMMISSIONER STANTON expressed concerns regarding the Village's image with the use of a large electronic billboard. Using photographs, MS. CONNOLLY explained these types of signs are not uncommon and used to promote tourist destinations within a district.

COMMISSIONER STANTON concurred that the sign would be a great way of advertising the businesses in Rich Township; however, he expressed concerns regarding limiting it to only that township. He believes other Village businesses would also pay to advertise on the sign. He suggested having the Ordinance encompass all townships within the Village.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE agreed that this District is in need of assistance and the sign will generate more business and tourism. He referenced when Oak Park Avenue was once a blighted area that ultimately benefited from parades, street fairs, advertising, incentives, a façade improvement program from the automobile dealers, incentives, and a tax increment finance district with funds being paid up to a certain amount, for development of that area. He further noted the Village attempts to help each commercial area. He stressed it is the duty of the Plan Commission to address land-use only.

COMMISSIONER MCCLELLAN also had concerns with this being called the Rich Township Entertainment Overlay District stating this could be construed a discriminating against other “entertainment” businesses in the Village such as restaurants, bars, and microbreweries.

COMMISSIONER MAHONEY suggested renaming it the Rich Township Development District. MS. CONNOLLY stated the name will likely change for branding purposes and most likely not called the Rich Township Entertainment District. She explained a section of the sign will be dedicated to the name of the district, along with electronic message board, so it will be branded as a district sign.

MS. CONNOLLY stated the existing sign is an off-premise sign and in order to legitimize the sign that would meet Village Code, the geographic reach of the sign needed to be limited to a specific narrow area. Both Village Staff and the Village Attorney felt Rich Township would be ideal since the sign is at the center of that area and would benefit the businesses where it sits that are in need of economic development. She explained it was not the intent to exclude any other areas. She further explained if this particular proposal is not acceptable to the Plan Commission, they can make further stipulations for consideration by the Village Board and these will be presented to the Board along with any thoughts, opinions or recommendations. She did clarify that another formal proposal will not be presented by Staff to the Plan Commission, unless directed by the Board.

COMMISSIONER MCCLELLAN suggested applying a “sunset-type clause” whereby if the signage proves to be successful, within a three-year period for example, allow other Village businesses to advertise on it.

COMMISSIONER MOYLAN inquired as to ownership of the Convention Center. MS. CONNOLLY reported the Convention Center is owned by the Village, who would be allowed to advertise on the new sign but as a business entity, would need to pay to advertise, except if it is a public Village-sponsored event.

COMMISSIONER STANTON inquired if there was any Village-owned property on I-80 for placement of a sign. MS. CONNOLLY reported the Village does not own any property along I-80; however, there is a parcel adjacent to I-80 that the Village could purchase. COMMISSIONER REIDY also inquired if there was any property within Orland Township or Frankfort Township available for purchase for such a purpose should this prove to be successful.

COMMISSIONER REIDY suggested separating the text amendment presented this evening into two (2) propositions since it appears the majority of the Plan Commission is in favor of the amendments to the Sign Regulations. MS. CONNOLLY agreed that separate motions for each part of the text amendment can be made, with the Plan Commission voting for or against each motion. She added that the vote can be accompanied by recommendations reflected in the Minutes that will be presented to the Village Board.

COMMISSIONER MAHONEY and CHAIRMAN WALKER concurred with making two separate motions and voting on each one, therefore allowing each Commissioner to provide stipulations or any dissenting opinions.

COMMISSIONER MAHONEY made a motion recommending the Village Board approve an ordinance making certain text amendments to Section IX (Sign Regulations) and Section II (Rules and Definitions) of the Tinley Park Zoning Ordinance as presented at this meeting and outlined in the Legal Notice for the Public Hearing.
The Motion was seconded by COMMISSIONER REIDY.

AYE: Plan Commissioners Tom Mahoney, Bob McClellan, Mark Moylan, Art Pierce, Bill Reidy, Tim Stanton, and Chairman Rita Walker

NAY: None

ABSENT: Plan Commissioners Jeff Ficaro and Gina Miller

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote. PLAN COMMISSION CHAIRMAN WALKER declared the Motion approved.

COMMISSIONER MAHONEY made a motion recommending the Village Board approve an ordinance making certain text amendments to Section V.D. (Rich Township Entertainment Overlay District) of the Tinley Park Zoning Ordinance, as presented at this meeting and as outlined in legal notice for Public Hearing.

The Motion was seconded by COMMISSIONER REIDY.

AYE: Plan Commissioner Tom Mahoney and Chairman Rita Walker

NAY: Plan Commissioners Bob McClellan, Mark Moylan, Art Pierce, Bill Reidy, and Tim Stanton

ABSENT: Plan Commissioners Jeff Ficaro and Gina Miller

THE MOTION WAS DENIED by voice vote. PLAN COMMISSION CHAIRMAN WALKER declared the Motion approved.

MS. CONNOLLY requested each Commissioner summarize their thoughts, ideas or suggestions specific to Section V.D. (Rich Township Entertainment Overlay District) for Village Board consideration:

COMMISSIONER MCCLELLAN agrees with re-gentrifying the proposed overlay district. He expressed concerns with not allowing other Village businesses to advertise. He recommended a “sunset clause” of 36 months once the sign becomes functional and at that time open it to other Village businesses. Limit opportunities for other businesses, geographic area within Legacy Code.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE agrees with a “sunset clause”; however, does not agree with the time limit. He emphasized the need for economic development for that area and placing a time limit where it expires where it becomes open to other businesses may defeat its initial purpose. He believes that should be determined by Staff or the Village Board. He suggested a set of standards be determined, including establishment of a time period, to measure growth or activity generated by the sign.

COMMISSIONER STANTON believes every Village business should be allowed to advertise but also agrees with the 36-month “sunset clause” discussed.

COMMISSIONER REIDY stated he would entertain the idea of a sign for each individual township.

COMMISSIONER MOYLAN believes the sign will be a billboard and recommends it be a Village-owned, Village-controlled billboard with the opportunity for the Village to take in revenue.

COMMISSIONER MAHONEY commented the sign should be established as presented in the text amendment for only the Rich Township Overlay District; however, he believes that business will regulate itself and other businesses will be allowed to advertise at a later.

A Motion was made by COMMISSIONER PIERCE, seconded by COMMISSIONER REIDY to close the Public Hearing at 9:50 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, a motion was made by COMMISSIONER REIDY seconded by COMMISSIONER PIERCE to adjourn the regular meeting of the Plan Commission of January 7, 2016 at 9:52 p.m. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED by voice call. PLAN COMMISSION CHAIRMAN WALKER declared the meeting ADJOURNED.