

**VILLAGE OF HINSDALE  
VILLAGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF  
February 6, 2018**

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Hinsdale Village Board of Trustees was called to order by Village President Tom Cauley in Memorial Hall of the Memorial Building on Tuesday, February 6, 2018 at 7:30 p.m., roll call was taken.

Present: Trustees Christopher Elder, Michael Ripani, Luke Stifflear, Gerald J. Hughes, Matthew Posthuma, Neale Byrnes and President Tom Cauley

Absent: None

Also Present: Village Manager Kathleen A. Gargano, Assistant Village Manager/Finance Director Darrell Langlois, Assistant Village Manager/Director of Public Safety Brad Bloom, Police Chief Brian King, Fire Chief John Giannelli, Director of Public Services George Peluso, Director of Community Development/Building Commissioner Robb McGinnis, Superintendent of Parks & Recreation Heather Bereckis, Village Planner Chan Yu, Administration Manager Emily Wagner and Management Analyst Jean Bueche

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

President Cauley led those in attendance in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

a) **Special Meeting of January 23, 2018**

Trustee Hughes corrected a typographical error in the draft minutes. Trustee Elder moved to **approve the draft minutes of the Special Meeting of January 23, 2018, as amended.** Trustee Hughes seconded the motion.

**AYES:** Trustees Elder, Ripani, Stifflear, Hughes, Posthuma and Byrnes

**NAYS:** None

**ABSTAIN:** None

**ABSENT:** None

Motion carried.

**CITIZENS' PETITIONS**

None.

**VILLAGE PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

None.

## APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

### a) **Mr. William Haarlow to the Historic Preservation Commission**

President Cauley asked for a motion to approve the appointment of Mr. William Haarlow to the Historic Preservation Commission through April 30, 2019, to complete the unexpired term of Mr. Tom Willett.

Trustee Elder moved to **Approve the appointment to the Historic Preservation Commission, as recommended by the Village President.** Trustee Ripani seconded the motion.

**AYES:** Trustees Elder, Ripani, Stifflear, Hughes, Posthuma and Byrnes

**NAYS:** None

**ABSTAIN:** None

**ABSENT:** None

Motion carried.

## FIRST READINGS – INTRODUCTION\*\*

### Zoning & Public Safety (Chair Stifflear)

### a) **Approve a text amendment to Section 6-106 (“Special Uses”), to allow automobile driving instruction as a Special Use in O-2 Limited Office Zoning Districts, and concurrent Special Use Permit for Responsible Driver at 7. N. Grant Street, in the lower level** (*Discussion Item – October 3, 2017*)

Trustee Stifflear introduced the item stating that in November 2017, the Village Board referred this matter to the Plan Commission for public hearing, asking that one parking space be required for every 250’ square feet of office space, and be classified as a special use. At the January 10<sup>th</sup> Plan Commission public hearing, they requested a bike rack for students. The Plan Commission unanimously approved the matter. Trustee Stifflear noted this request is consistent with other special uses not captured in the code.

Mr. Bryan Kearney, owner of Responsible Driver, addressed the Board stating that six parking spots are guaranteed, there are 11 parking spaces total, but the owner may use some several hours a week. He added that State law requires classes be completed by 9:00 p.m.

The Board agreed to move this item forward for a second reading at their next meeting.

### b) **Approve a text amendment to Section 5-105 (“Special Uses”), to allow automobile driving instruction as a Special Use in B-1 Community Business Zoning Districts, but not on the first floor, and concurrent Special Use Permit for Responsible Driver at 1 Grant Square, on the second floor** (*Discussion Item - October 3, 2017*)

Trustee Stifflear introduced the item, stating it was essentially the same as the previous item, except this item excludes having this type of business on the first floor. This matter was reviewed with the same Plan Commission schedule as the previous item, the bike rack was included, and also received unanimous approval.

Mr. Peter Coules, attorney representing the applicant, addressed the Board adding there will be four dedicated parking spaces.

The Board agreed to move this item forward for a second reading at their next meeting.

## CONSENT AGENDA

### Administration & Community Affairs (Chair Hughes)

- a) Trustee Stifflear moved **Approval and payment of the accounts payable for the period of January 24, 2018 to February 6, 2018, in the aggregate amount of \$947,107.35 as set forth on the list provided by the Village Treasurer, of which a permanent copy is on file with the Village Clerk.** Trustee Posthuma seconded the motion.

**AYES:** Trustees Elder, Ripani, Stifflear, Hughes, Posthuma and Byrnes

**NAYS:** None

**ABSTAIN:** None

**ABSENT:** None

Motion carried.

## SECOND READINGS / NON-CONSENT AGENDA – ADOPTION

### Zoning & Public Safety (Chair Stifflear)

- a) **Approve an Ordinance approving Lot Size and Lot Width Variations from Section 3-110 of the Village of Hinsdale Zoning Ordinance at 640 Mills Street, Hinsdale, IL – Case Number V-07-17 (First Reading – January 23, 2018)**

President Cauley introduced the item and reviewed the requested variation which is to subdivide the subject property into two non-conforming lots of 7,500 square feet instead of 10,000' square feet and a 60' foot frontage instead of a 70' foot frontage. The Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) unanimously approved the request, but it is beyond their authority to grant final approval, therefore the matter comes to the Village Board for final approval.

Mr. Norman Chimenti, attorney representing Paul & Vida Chenier, addressed the Board. He explained that President Cauley had asked him to address why the Mills case is different than the recent 435 Woodside request, and to specifically address how the facts relevant to granting this variance differ from that matter. Mr. Chimenti said he will limit his remarks to this request, but he and Ms. Chenier will be happy to answer any questions the Board may have. He also explained that he would not comment on the ZBA conclusions regarding 435 Woodside, as it is not his place. Of course, regarding this case, the findings of ZBA are correct, and they believe the standards for granting the variance were properly applied by the ZBA and they reached the proper conclusion.

Mr. Chimenti presented the factual differences between these matters as follows:

*Number 1:* He believes 640 Mills fully complies with the legal non-conforming standards of Village Code §10-105 as it exists with no further action on their part. By contrast, the Woodside property would require re-platting to consolidate two parcels into a 'new' south lot. The rear lot line would need to be redrawn to add an additional 3,000' square feet to the south lot, and a portion of the structure located on the south lot must be relocated or demolished. All of these actions must be taken before the property can be granted a

variance as a legal non-conforming lot. The property at 640 Mills already meets the standards of a legal non-conforming lot as it was platted in 1929. Trustee Stifflear pointed out that there was a house that straddled the lot, similar to Woodside, but that it had been demolished. Mr. Chimenti said the standards permit removal of the structure, but no structure has to be removed at the present time. The effect of the house straddling the lot line puts the house in the category of a single zoning lot, even though the house is gone. This analysis is also found in the Village Attorney's memo that is part of the record.

President Cauley commented this was not a consideration for denial for the Board, to which Mr. Chimenti responded he is just pointing this out because there is no longer a structure on the property, and a bare bones reading of the criteria for a legal non-conforming lot are met. This is not the case with the Woodside south lot; it can be remedied, but it is not currently a legal non-conforming lot.

*Number 2:* Mr. Chimenti pointed out that in the R1 District there is a 30,000' square foot lot size minimum. The proposed Woodside south lot would be 17,000' square feet, adding the 3,000' square feet borrowed from the north lot, results in a 10,000' square foot deficit to the required lot size. The Mills property is located in the R4 District and they are asking for a 2,500' square foot variance. The request of the variance on Woodside is larger than the entire size of the Mills lot.

*Number 3:* Mr. Chimenti believes many of the lots in the Woodside area are significantly larger than the 435 Woodside property, as it presently exists. The Chenier's lot is exactly the same size as every other interior lot in their neighborhood; by allowing a comparable smaller lot at 435 Woodside, it would not be in character with the neighborhood. On Mills, an approval would put that lot in exact conformity with all the other lots in the neighborhood. If you do not permit the Mills variance, the property will be twice the size of any other, and not in conformity with the neighborhood.

*Number 4:* Mr. Chimenti stated that 100% of Chenier's neighbors support granting the variance. There was substantial neighbor opposition to the Woodside variance. Rather than questioning the motives of the neighbor in either case, Mr. Chimenti hopes the Board finds this difference significant. Trustee Elder believes there is a neighbor who does not consent, but they are not present this evening. Mr. Chimenti withdraws the 100%, adding they were not aware of any objection. Nevertheless, they believe this is a relevant consideration for the Mills case as it was for Woodside.

*Number 5:* Mr. Chimenti reminded the Board of the applicant and neighbors debate of the market value of the Woodside property, and related issues, were prominent in the discussion of that variance. On the other hand, the Mills property faces a tollway acoustical wall, and there is a chance the tollway will expand to the west. This results in a significant difference in the two applications. There is no debate about the worth of the Mills property.

*Number 6:* Mr. Chimenti asked the Board to assume for the sake of discussion, none of the rationale for seeking a variation on Woodside was economically motivated. We know an application for variance cannot be granted for personal gain, nevertheless, the grant of a variation at 435 Woodside would have resulted in a beneficial economic impact for the applicant. Contrast this with Mills property. Granting the variance would have zero economic benefit to the applicant. President Cauley suggested two homes on Mills would likely be worth more than one. However, Mr. Chimenti said at that location and under these circumstances, he would not draw that conclusion. He believes the likelihood of anyone putting a house on the second lot other than Chenier's son may be nil, and the granting of the variance is not likely to create any greater market value.

President Cauley said the Woodside applicant said it was to his economic detriment to subdivide, it was not a foregone conclusion from the applicant's point of view, that to subdivide would be economically advantageous. Mr. Chimenti responded he is not questioning the argument, or the conclusions, simply pointing out a significant difference of economic circumstances as a material difference in the applications.

*Number 7:* With respect to timing, Mr. Chimenti said when the ZBA made the Mills decision, it was fully aware of the Board action regarding Woodside, and the reason for that action. Mr. Chimenti referred to in the ZBA Findings and Recommendations in the 640 Mills case, wherein they distinguish between the facts in each case, and conclude the Cheniers met all standards, notwithstanding the Village Board rejection on Woodside.

*Number 8:* Following the public hearing for Woodside, Mr. Chimenti stated the Board was informed of another remedy for the applicant other than a zoning variation, because a group of buyers would acquire the lot as is and preserve the Zook house. That option doesn't exist for the Cheniers; they have no buyer, their only remedy is for the Village to allow their son to build on the property. President Cauley suggested a possible remedy might be to add on to the existing house for the son. Mr. Chimenti does not believe it is a fair or realistic alternative to require the son's family to share a home instead of having their own residence; and concludes there is no buyer for this property.

In response to a question from the Board, Ms. Chenier addressed the Board and stated that she purchased the property as two lots, and the former owner had some interest in building on the second lot, but she and her husband did not want to do this. Discussion followed regarding the federal court appeal of Mr. Bernard, the former owner, filed in 2006 regarding the subdividing of the property which followed the Chenier's purchase of the property from him. Mr. Chimenti said they can't explain that, and there are no records, but it is reasonable to assume the Cheniers would have no knowledge of this activity. He added that as far as the County recorder's office is concerned, these are still two lots, and no amendment to the record exists that a title company or anyone could see to indicate otherwise.

*Number 9:* Mr. Chimenti pointed out that as it was stated to the ZBA, that because of Mrs. Chenier's health issues, which her physician has certified to the ZBA, it would be extremely beneficial if her family were close by to watch her and help her on a daily basis. The Village has long honored the legal principal that Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) considerations take precedence over Village code.

President Cauley said if this is moving from a variance request to an ADA request, it is a completely different issue. Mr. Chimenti pointed out it is a difference between the two applications, and there is a possibility the ADA would apply. President Cauley doesn't want to take a vote on this variance if ADA considerations are being introduced, as they have not been analyzed by this Board. Mr. Chimenti agreed to save that argument for another time.

*Number 10:* Mr. Chimenti explained the Cheniers sought an interpretation of the single property for zoning purposes provisions of the code, the legal non-conforming overlay. The opinion was rendered to the effect that the only way available to them to cause the vacant lot to become buildable was to apply for a zoning variation. The applicant was guided by the direction of the Village attorney and the Village Board to proceed with a variation application. That is a feature of the application that is different than the Woodside application.

Mr. Chimenti pointed out that some Board members have struggled with the not self-created standard; in his opinion that standard refers to the unique conditions of the property that creates hardship, not the action of the applicant or a prior property owner. Discussion followed regarding 'constructive knowledge' and whether there is any obligation on the part of someone who buys a property to find out if there is any outstanding issue regarding the property. Mr. Chimenti stated he knows of no ordinance, no statute, no court decision or rule of law that places a duty on the applicant as described. President Cauley said if someone buys a property knowing the property couldn't be subdivided, you can't meet the self-created test.

It was clarified that there was an error in the ZBA application inasmuch as it states the applicant purchased the subject property in anticipation of dividing the property for their son to build a home on the second lot. Mrs. Chenier assured the Board she and her husband did not buy the property with the intention of selling it to their son, as her children were in grammar school when the home was purchased; there is an error in the application and it is badly phrased.

Mr. Chimenti mentioned one other feature of the zoning code that may be relevant. The Woodside case and the Mills case are before the Village Board because the requested variances are greater than 10%, and the Board correctly pointed out these cases involve the same zoning code provisions. However, the ZBA has heard other variation cases involving the same code provisions, those being single zoning lot provisions and legal non-conforming lot provisions. These are not the only two cases decided by the ZBA. Two others have been granted, one at 26 East Sixth Street, and another on Phillippa. He mentions these not because the facts are the same as Woodside or Mills, but only to emphasize the ZBA has wrestled with this issue and the anomalies of the code on prior occasions, and ruled to grant the variations based on the seven standards in the code that must be met. This applicant contends that the standards were met, and considering the significant factual differences between their case and the Woodside case, they hope the Board will feel comfortable in deciding in favor of the applicant in this case.

Trustee Elder asked Mr. Chimenti to clarify the not merely special privilege standard. Mr. Chimenti explained that all over the Village people are allowed to develop on legal non-conforming lots that have 60' foot frontages, to say that years ago a home crossed the lot line, had nothing to do with the Cheniers. His client is only asking to do what other people do on these types of lots. President Cauley believes the real question is whether they have lots that can be divided, or was there a house on both lots; only the lots that are analyzed by this standard should be relevant.

Trustee Ripani said he looked at the ZBA record on this specific case, irrespective of the outcome of the Woodside case. Mr. Chimenti explained there is no precedential value in these cases, and all must stand on their own merits. Trustee Ripani referenced the not a special privilege discussion in the ZBA transcript, the evidence he sees is they want to restore the lot to its original buildability. Mr. Chimenti doesn't know if there are any other factors relevant to this issue in the record; and does not believe someone is asking for something special if it is restored to its original state. Trustee Ripani also questioned the standard of whether the request is consistent with the code plan and purposes. Is not the purpose of the code that the properties in town be less dense? Mr. Chimenti countered

that density is a bulk regulation, not the buildability of lots or if they should be legislated to be vacant, density has always been related to a scale of development with structures too large. President Cauley said he agrees the drafters of the 1988 code did not want any more non-conforming lots. The drafters of the 1988 code did not say that legal non-conforming lots that currently exist cannot be built on, but they did not want to create any additional lots smaller than the standards they set forth. Mr. Chimenti believes the framers of the code did not say that legal non-conforming lots that currently exist should not be built on because it would add to density. Trustee Ripani offered that a possible remedy could be that a family member stay with Mrs. Chenier when her husband is out of town; this may not be desirable or convenient, but it is still a remedy.

There being no further comments or questions, President Cauley asked for a motion.

Trustee Byrnes moved to **Approve an Ordinance approving Lot Size and Lot Width Variations from Section 3-110 of the Village of Hinsdale Zoning Ordinance at 640 Mills Street, Hinsdale, IL – Case Number V-07-17.** Trustee Elder seconded the motion.

Trustee Elder began discussion stating that he originally was against this, but has been persuaded because it has been definitively stated the application incorrectly stated the intention has always been to subdivide the property; with respect to special privilege, if he voted the same on another case like this one, it wouldn't be a special privilege. He also commented that 'remedy' in this case is not about Ms. Chenier's care, but about alternatives to how to build another house on the property. Trustee Ripani feels the applicant knew what the issues were when they purchased the property, and although their personal circumstances have changed, these circumstances are not contemplated by the code. Trustee Stifflear had no comment. Trustee Hughes said he cannot support this request. The code intentionally addresses the single zoning lot provisions, and therefore he cannot dispense with this standard. He believes these types of issues were considered in 1988, the plan was to arrive at lots of a desirable size. With respect to the standards, he doesn't believe this lot is a unique physical condition; it seems to him there is a lot of circular logic to get to the end result of two homes next to each other. The physical condition is really about the lot, this is a flat rectangle; arguments about the sound wall and the Tollway, are about value. Trustee Posthuma is troubled by the idea that a developer could tear down a house, and that a homeowner could then build something the developer could not. He believes this is an unwanted precedence. Trustee Byrnes commented that the not self-created standard applies because these homeowners did not know about this condition. He believes the Woodside case and this one are entirely different, the Zook house defines that area, but he does not believe that if a home were built on the Mills property anyone would notice a difference.

President Cauley asked for a roll call vote.

**AYES:** Trustees Elder and Byrnes

**NAYS:** Trustees Ripani, Hughes and Posthuma

**ABSTAIN:** Trustee Stifflear

**ABSENT:** None

Motion denied.

b) **Approve an Ordinance Approving a Site Plan and Exterior Appearance Plan for Redevelopment for an Auto Dealership – Bill Jacobs Land Rover – 336 E. Ogden Avenue** (*First Reading – January 23, 2018*)

Trustee Stifflear introduced the second reading to approve a site plan and exterior appearance for the new Landrover dealership, and recapped the specifications of the proposed building, noting an auto dealership is a permitted use in the B3 district. By way of background, Trustee Stifflear explained that in December 2016, the Village of Hinsdale and Landrover entered into a sales tax revenue and sharing agreement. This would ensure Landrover, one of Hinsdale’s largest sales tax generators, would remain in the Village, and the Village would have a base amount of sales tax revenue going forward. He further outlined the public hearings and neighborhood meetings that addressed the issues with respect to the relocation of Landrover. In his opinion, the biggest change was to move all south facing doors to the east side to mitigate noise for the neighbors. The Plan Commission unanimously recommended site plan and exterior appearance, but with instructions for further discussion regarding the perimeter fence, landscaping and lighting. Since the first reading at the Village Board meeting, a compromise has been reached between Landrover, neighbors and the Village with respect to these issues. Regarding the fencing, Landrover will pay the full cost of \$168,000 for installation of a stone or pre-cast concrete eight foot fence, however, the Village will forgo \$50,000 of shared sales tax revenue above the base amount. This will not create a liability for the Village or require any payments be made from Village funds to Landrover or a fence vendor.

Trustee Stifflear moved to **Approve an Ordinance Approving a Site Plan and Exterior Appearance Plan for Redevelopment for an Auto Dealership – Bill Jacobs Land Rover – 336 E. Ogden Avenue.** Trustee Elder seconded the motion.

**AYES:** Trustees Elder, Ripani, Stifflear, Hughes, Posthuma and Byrnes

**NAYS:** None

**ABSTAIN:** None

**ABSENT:** None

Motion carried.

President Cauley added it is important to bring commercial enterprises into the Village, but also be sensitive to the concerns of residents. He said the Village needs revenue, and the goal of the Board is to reach a compromise between the parties.

**Michael Stick of 802 Franklin**, addressed the Board stating this has been a long process, but he appreciates Landrover listening to residents, and the Board and staff for bringing the parties together.

Trustee Stifflear recognized the amount of work staff did to bring the parties together.

## DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) **Refuse, recycling and yard waste contract**

Trustee Byrnes introduced the item which is a recommendation to retain Republic Services, the current waste hauler. He added people are satisfied with their performance, and outlined the cost reductions that are included in the proposed contract. There will be a 39% reduction in cost if people elect curbside pickup, a 45% senior discount and no increase in sticker prices. He said Ms. Emily Wagner, Ms. Jean Bueche and staff did a tremendous job negotiating this contract. Ms. Wagner addressed the Board, and thanked Ms. Bueche and Director of Public Services George Peluso for their efforts. Last fall, staff received Board approval to go ahead with a formal bidding process, which hadn't happened since 2007. Additionally, staff conducted a survey of residents regarding their satisfaction with garbage related issues. The new contract is driven by those responses, and is a five year contract with the option to renew for three single years. The current contract expires in April, but staff would like to extend that contract to October 31<sup>st</sup> and have the new contract take effect on November 1<sup>st</sup>. This will ensure ample time for residents to make an informed decision. Currently, all service is for back door service, and the survey indicated that people would like to have a curbside option and save money. It has been observed that people are already taking their garbage to the curb, but Ms. Wagner confirmed that all residents are paying for back door service. It was noted the three one year renewals would be a different cost structure, and costs would be renegotiated at that time. She noted the packet provided to the Board includes comparison cost information, for example current back door pickup is \$32.28/per month; if a resident opted for curbside pickup the monthly charge would drop to \$19.60/per month. One of the other key features of the contract is recycling pick up. The survey indicated residents would like a larger toter. Currently, these have a 65 gallon capacity, but in the spring of 2019 residents will be provided a 95 gallon toter. The contractor recommended waiting until 2019 for this improvement because there will be lots of changes, and residents might be overwhelmed with another change. It was noted the default service is back door pick up, and President Cauley suggested flipping this. Ms. Wagner said staff will look into this, but the contractor had suggested this default because of the long-standing history of back door pickup in Hinsdale. Ms. Wagner explained the timeline would be to have first and second readings at the next two Board meetings, and work with the contractor to provide public information, and send a mailer to every household.

Trustee Byrnes noted there is a small 8% increase to residents who opt to stay with back door pickup, and President Cauley added that the senior discount might make this a net zero as he believes most back door users are seniors. It was pointed out the senior discount is only applicable to curbside pickup, but staff will revisit this based on Board feedback.

**b) Online vehicle sticker program**

Village Manager Gargano announced that on March 1<sup>st</sup> residents, for the first time, will be able to purchase their vehicle stickers on line. Staff is happy to be able to accommodate this resident request.

**c) Community Pool private lesson pay rate**

Superintendent of Parks & Recreation Heather Bereckis addressed the Board and explained staff is asking for an additional dollar per hour paid to staff that teach private swim lessons. These staff members are required to take additional training to teach private lessons. Compared to other communities, Hinsdale charges more for the lessons, but pays staff less. Raising the pay to \$10.00/per hour would be more equivalent to other communities. Trustee Hughes suggested a tiered pay in the future, based on longevity and consumer feedback.

This might help with retaining quality instructors. Ms. Bereckis agreed, stating that type of tiered pay scale is already being used for lifeguards. The Board expressed no objections to the increase in pay for private lesson instructors.

**d) Update on proposed I-294 Tollway expansion**

President Cauley said there is nothing new to report at this time.

**e) District 181 update**

Village Manager Gargano reported staff, the Village Attorney, Trustee Byrnes and President Cauley continue to work through elements of the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with the school district and hope to have a final document within the next few weeks.

**DEPARTMENT AND STAFF REPORTS**

- a) Treasurers Report
- b) Community Development
- c) Parks & Recreation
- d) Economic Development

The report(s) listed above were provided to the Board. There were no additional questions regarding the content of the department and staff reports.

**REPORTS FROM ADVISORY BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS**

No reports.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**NEW BUSINESS**

None.

**CITIZENS' PETITIONS**

**Ms. Vida Chenier of 640 Mills Street** addressed the Board and stated she is very disappointed with the outcome tonight regarding her variation request. She stated that President Cauley told her at a Village meeting that she would not need an attorney and should bring this to the Board. She feels disappointed and let down, and asked why the Village has a ZBA if they can't make these decisions. She believes she did not get any help through this difficult process from anyone in the Village.

**TRUSTEE COMMENTS**

None.

### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Board, President Cauley asked for a motion to adjourn into Closed Session. Trustee Hughes moved to **adjourn the regularly scheduled meeting of the Hinsdale Village Board of Trustees of February 6, 2018 into closed session under 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(11) Litigation, filed or pending before a court or administrative tribunal or when an action is probable or imminent, and not to reconvene.** Trustee Elder seconded the motion.

**AYES:** Trustees Elder, Ripani, Stifflear, Hughes, Posthuma and Byrnes

**NAYS:** None

**ABSTAIN:** None

**ABSENT:** None

Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
Christine M. Bruton, Village Clerk