

Village of Lombard

*Village Hall
255 East Wilson Ave.
Lombard, IL 60148
villageoflombard.org*



Meeting Agenda

Thursday, January 19, 2012

7:30 PM

Village Hall Board Room

Village Board of Trustees

Village President: William J. Mueller

Village Clerk: Brigitte O'Brien

Trustees: Greg Gron, District One; Keith Giagnorio, District Two;

Zachary Wilson, District Three; Peter Breen, District Four;

Laura Fitzpatrick, District Five; and Bill Ware, District Six

I. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

II. Roll Call

III. Public Hearings

IV. Public Participation

[120027](#)

Proclamation - Sacred Heart Parish 100 Year Anniversary

Attachments: [procsacredheartchufch150yrs2011.doc](#)

V. Approval of Minutes

VI. Committee Reports

Community Relations Committee - Trustee Keith Giagnorio, Chairperson

**Economic/Community Development Committee - Trustee Peter Breen,
Chairperson**

Environmental Concerns Committee - Trustee Laura Fitzpatrick, Chairperson

Finance Committee - Trustee Greg Gron, Chairperson

Public Works Committee - Trustee Bill Ware

Transportation & Safety Committee - Trustee Zachary Wilson, Chairperson

Board of Local Improvements - Trustee Greg Gron, President

Community Promotion & Tourism - President William J. Mueller, Chairperson

Lombard Historical Commission - Clerk Brigitte O'Brien

VII. Village Manager/Village Board Comments

VIII Consent Agenda

.

Payroll/Accounts Payable

- A. [110747](#) Approval of Village Payroll
For the period ending December 17, 2011 in the amount of \$795,824.99.
- B. [110748](#) Approval of Accounts Payable
For the period ending December 23, 2011 in the amount of \$753,212.47.
- C. [120002](#) Approval of Accounts Payable
For the period ending December 30, 2011 in the amount of \$52,312.74.
- D. [120009](#) Approval of Village Payroll
For the period ending December 31, 2011 in the amount of \$930,001.70.
- E. [120010](#) Approval of Accounts Payable
For the period ending January 6, 2012 in the amount of \$90,555.66.
- F. [120023](#) Approval of Accounts Payable
For the period ending January 13, 2012 in the amount of \$447,115.02.

Ordinances on First Reading (Waiver of First Requested)

Other Ordinances on First Reading

- G. [110644](#) ZBA 11-06: 661 N. Charlotte Street
Requests a variation from Section 155.407(F)(4) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to reduce the required rear yard setback to fifteen feet (15'), where thirty feet (30') is required to allow for the construction of a screened porch addition in the R2 Single-Family Residence District. (DISTRICT #4)

Attachments: [110644 BOT11 17 11.pdf](#)
[110644Coverpage11-17-11](#)

Chairperson DeFalco opened the meeting for public comment.

The property owner, Matt Berberich, 661 N. Charlotte St., Glen Ellyn, presented the petition. Mr. Berberich stated that he understands why he is before the Zoning Board of Appeals. He then stated that he is a longtime resident of Lombard with three kids. He stated that he is requesting a variation to allow for a screened porch addition because his son has required medical attention twice for mosquito bite allergies. He added that his son also has to miss outdoor activities because of his mosquito allergies. Mr. Berberich then explained that there is a fence that is located six (6) to seven (7) feet inside of his rear property line, which results in a lack of space in his rear yard. He then added that the rear yard drops off to the back of the property. Mr. Berberich then asked the members of the Zoning Board of Appeals if they visited the site.

Chairperson DeFalco and Mr. Bartels responded by stating that they had visited the site.

Mr. Berberich stated that the original deck (that the screen porch addition was built upon) was built with a permit in 2002. He then stated that the screen porch addition is located fifteen (15) feet from the side property line, where only six (6) feet is required. He added that the difference in setback equates to eight-hundred (800) square feet of lot area. Mr. Berberich then referred to the neighbor petition that has been provided to each ZBA member. He stated that none of the neighbors he approached to sign the petition were against his screen porch addition. He then stated that all of his neighbors signed the petition, with the exception of a couple neighbors whose homes were actually being rented out. Mr. Berberich then mentioned that he submitted a doctor's note regarding his son's mosquito allergy and also a picture of his son after a mosquito bite.

Chairperson DeFalco asked if there was anyone present to speak in favor or against the petition.

Ron Schulze, 656 N. Charlotte St., stated that the petitioners did a nice job with the screen porch addition. He then stated that he also understands the need for zoning laws. Mr. Schulze stated that the laws need to take medical issues into consideration. He added that if this were a handicap ramp that this wouldn't be an issue. He stated that medical conditions should always be taken seriously.

Jennifer Jendras, 664 N. Charlotte St., stated that she is also a longtime resident of Lombard. She stated that she is on the Environmental Concerns Committee and is also on a board for Glen Westlake School so she also understands the need for zoning laws. She stated that setbacks provide privacy and also reduce noise impacts on surrounding properties. She stated that the lot that abuts the rear yard of the subject property has a rear yard setback of seventy-five (75) feet and there is a fence and group of trees so the screen porch is invisible to the property to the rear of the subject property. She then mentioned some of the other setbacks in the surrounding area and stated that she has no issues with the screen porch addition.

Joseph Batka, 669 N. Charlotte St., stated that he lives a couple homes down from the petitioner and is in favor of the variation. He stated that he also understands the rules, but sometimes the rules are meant to address a large group and that the screen porch addition should be an exception to the rules.

Chairperson DeFalco then requested the staff report.

Mr. Toth stated that staff is entering the IDRC Report into the public record in its entirety. The petitioner is requesting a variation to reduce the rear yard setback to fifteen (15) feet to allow for an existing three-hundred (300) square foot (15'x20') screened porch addition. The screened porch was built on top of an existing deck and extends fifteen (15) feet into the thirty (30) foot rear yard setback. The structure is considered to be a building addition, which are not listed as permitted encroachments in the rear yard. As such, a variation is required.

The same property owner petitioned for a variation in 2002 (ZBA 02-21) to allow for a three-hundred (300) square foot (15'x20') screened porch addition fifteen (15) feet into the rear yard. The proposed screened porch addition is the

exact size and location that was previously petitioned and was recently constructed over an existing deck. The screened porch addition variation was ultimately denied by the Village Board. The petitioner did receive a permit for the deck in 2002; however, the property owner was recently cited for constructing the screened porch addition over the existing deck without a building permit.

Decks which are open and not over three feet above the average level of the adjoining ground are permitted within the rear yard, provided that a minimum two-foot side yard setback is provided. As the subject screened porch is roofed over and enclosed, it is considered to be an addition to the principal structure. Therefore, the structure must observe the rear yard setback provision required of a principal structure, unless a variation is granted.

The subject property is located in the Providence Glen subdivision. The Providence Glen subdivision received approval to provide for thirty (30) foot rear yards on each of the 32 residential lots within that subdivision, which is five (5) feet less than the thirty-five (35) foot rear yard required on other lots within the R2 Single-Family Residence District.

The principal structure on the subject property is located thirty (30) feet from the eastern (rear) property line. The addition maintains the existing building line of the home and extends fifteen (15) feet to the east, placing it fifteen (15) feet from the rear property line and directly outside of the fifteen (15) foot public utility and drainage easement located in the rear of the property. The principal structure is also located fifteen (15) feet from the northern (interior side) property line, where only six (6) feet is required. As the addition holds the same building line as the north elevation, the principal structure and subject addition are located more than double the distance to the adjacent side property line than what is required by Code.

A comprehensive review of all residential properties within the Providence Glen planned development revealed no cases in which zoning relief has been granted for a building addition, including screened porches. The petitioner states that the small lot size precludes him from utilizing his back yard. Staff recognizes that the lot depth is somewhat less than that of the majority of lots in the R2 District; however, that is why the rear yard setback has already been reduced from 35 feet to 30 feet. Each of the lots in the Providence Glen planned development has a 30-foot rear yard, granting the property owners an additional 5 feet of building space that they would not be permitted to build upon on other R2 lots.

To be granted a variation the petitioner must show that they have affirmed each of the "Standards for Variation". Staff has reviewed the petitioner's responses and offers the following comments:

1. That because of the particular physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the specific property involved, a particular hardship to the owner has been shown, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience if the strict letter of the regulations were to be applied.

The rectangular shape of the petitioner's property is standard for all residential lots within the Village, and there are no topographical conditions that affect the variation request. The petitioner's property is 7,840 square feet and 70 feet wide, which exceeds the R2 District minimum lot sizes of 7,500 square feet and 60 feet wide. As such, the petitioner has not demonstrated any hardship.

2. *The conditions upon which an application for a variation is based are unique to the property for which the variation is sought, and are not generally applicable to other property within the same zoning classification.*

The conditions are not unique to the subject property as each of the 32 lots within the Providence Glen planned development has a 30-foot rear yard.

3. *The alleged difficulty or hardship is shown to be caused by this ordinance and has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property.*

Staff finds that the ordinance has not caused the hardship as the rear yard setback provision does not prevent the petitioner from utilizing his backyard.

4. *The granting of the variation will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located.*

Staff finds that granting the request could be injurious to neighboring properties because it increases bulk on the property and contributes to loss of suburban character of the neighborhood.

5. *The granting of the variation will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood.*

There is currently a 30' rear building setback line that extends unbroken from Goebel Drive to North Avenue that is preserved by the Providence Glen property covenants prohibit the construction of any outbuildings such as sheds. Even if there were no such property covenants, granting this variation would create an obstruction within that open space that is larger than any of the accessory structures that would otherwise be permitted by the Zoning Ordinance. Also, granting this variation would set a precedent to allow each of the other properties within Providence Glen to be granted similar variations.

Mr. Toth stated that staff is recommending denial of ZBA 11-06.

Chairperson DeFalco then opened the meeting for discussion by the ZBA members.

Ray Bartels asked if open space is an issue on the subject property.

Mr. Toth explained that the screen porch addition was built on top of an existing deck, which was built with a permit. He stated that past policy has dictated that building a structure over an existing structure does not affect open space, therefore open space is not being considered at this time.

Chairperson DeFalco asked if the homeowner's association has any issues with the screen porch addition.

Mr. Berberich stated that two members of the audience are on the association board. He then stated that there aren't any conflicting association rules that they are aware of.

Chairperson DeFalco stated that all of the homes in this subdivision were approved to be built at thirty (30) feet where thirty-five (35) feet is typically

required.

Mr. Berberich stated that there have been other variations granted for additions in the rear yard. He then cited some examples. He then added again that there are no association rules that conflict with his project.

Chairperson DeFalco stated that all variations need to meet the required standards. He stated that the case before the ZBA involves a home that has a rear setback of thirty (30) feet where thirty-five (35) feet is typically required so they already have limited space. He added that the addition now consumes fifteen (15) feet of the thirty (30) foot rear yard.

Mr. Bartels asked the petitioner when the screen porch addition was built.

Mr. Berberich replied, July.

Mr. Bedard asked when in July.

Mr. Berberich replied, around the fourth of July. He then added that the addition is not finished.

Mr. Bedard asked if someone complained about the addition.

Mr. Toth replied, yes.

Dr. Corrado asked what would happen if the variation was denied.

Mr. Toth explained that the Building Division has an open property maintenance case on the matter. He then stated that because the petitioner is going through the variation, any such enforcement is deferred pending the outcome of the variation. If the variation was to be denied then the property maintenance case would be revisiting. He stated that he is unaware of what the next step would be, but it may involve fines or having to remove the structure.

Chairperson DeFalco then discussed the Standards to Variations that were mentioned in the staff report as not being met. He stated that there are no uncommon features on the property that warrant a variation. He stated that the addition was built outside of the Village Ordinances. He stated that the topographic features are not uncommon. He added that the rear has already been reduced and the whole neighborhood is the same way. He stated that it may set a bad precedence to approve this petition. He also stated that it isn't permissible to construct an addition in a typical thirty-five (35) foot rear yard. He then restated Jendras' statement about the location of the house to the rear and the fact that the fence blocks the addition from the house to the rear. He then stated everyone has a deck, but the addition would constitute a loss of space and that the loss of space would alter the suburban characteristics of the neighborhood.

Mr. Bedard stated that petition was originally denied in 2002. He then asked the age of the petitioner's son with the mosquito allergies.

Mr. Berberich replied, four.

Mr. Bedard stated that he believes that the screen porch addition encroaches too far into the rear yard.
to December 1, 2011

- H, [120015](#) Boundary Line Agreement with the Village of Glen Ellyn (Continued from February 2, 2012)
Authorizing the execution of a Boundary Line Agreement with the Village of Glen Ellyn.
Attachments: [120015_BOT_1_19_12.pdf](#)
[120015Coverpage1-19-12](#)
[Boundary Agreement with Glen Ellyn](#)
[Glen Ellyn Ordinance](#)
[Ordinance 6693](#)
- I. [120016](#) Amending Title 11, Chapter 112 of the Lombard Village Code
Increasing the Class "A/B-II" liquor license category granting a liquor license to Trademark Tavern and Tap, 777 E. Butterfield Road.
(DISTRICT #3)
Attachments: [120016 BOT 01192012.PDF](#)
[Ordinance 6674](#)
[120016Coverpage1-19-12](#)
- J. [120022](#) Transportation Amendments
Amending Title 11, Chapter 121 of the Lombard Village Code with regard to Taxicab Licensing.
Attachments: [120022 BOT 01192012.PDF](#)
[Ordinance 6675](#)
[120022Coverpage1-19-12](#)
- K. [120026](#) Water and Sewer Rates FYE 2012
Three Ordinances amending the Village Code as it relates to water and sewer rates for FYE 2012.
Attachments: [Leg 120026 BOT 1-19-12 .pdf](#)
[Ordinance 6676](#)
[Ordinance 6677](#)
[Ordinance 6678](#)
[120026Coverpage1-19-12](#)

Ordinances on Second Reading

- L. [050656](#) PC 05-41: 1301 North Lombard Road
Granting a fourth time extension to Ordinance 5794, amended by Ordinances 5964, 6122, and 6432 for a 2-year time period (January 5, 2014) relative to the O'Hare/DuPage Business Park Planned Development. (DISTRICT #1)

Attachments: [APO Names 05-41.doc](#)
[Cover sheet.doc](#)
[ORDINANCE 05-41 final.doc](#)
[publichearnot.doc](#)
[ReferralLetter 05-41.doc](#)
[Report 05-41.doc](#)
[WTL referral memo.doc](#)
[Cover sheet2.doc](#)
[WTL referral memo time ext.doc](#)
[ORD 5964.pdf](#)
[Ord 5964.pdf](#)
[Cover sheet3.doc](#)
[Ord 2nd time Extension 05-41.doc](#)
[WTL referral memo time ext PC 05-41.doc](#)
[61220001.pdf](#)
[Ord 5794.pdf](#)
[Cover sheet3rd time extension.doc](#)
[DAH referral memo 3rd time ext PC 05-41.doc](#)
[Ordinance 6432.pdf](#)
[050654.pdf](#)
[050656.pdf](#)
[060656.pdf](#)
[050656.pdf](#)
[050656BOT12_27_11.pdf](#)
[050656Coverpage12-27-11](#)
[Ordinance 6669](#)

Prior to the start of the public hearing Commissioner Martin Burke recused himself from the petition. He stated that he has a business involvement with the project. He noted that after the Plan Commission and Village Board approved the project earlier this year, his employer, Location Finders International, acquired the property from the previous developer. His firm then contacted one of its clients, Walter E. Smithe, as to whether they would be interested in locating their business on the subject property. With their petition now being brought forward to the Village for consideration, he is removing himself from considering this petition.

Mark Smithe, petitioner, stated that his business Walter E. Smithe Furniture is proposing to construct their corporate headquarters on the subject property. He noted that the proposal will be for a single building of 179,000 square feet in size, with a future expansion of 53,000 square feet on the property. The site will have 42,000 square feet of office space for their headquarters. They anticipate 225 additional employees and 30 delivery contractors will be located out of the site.

He then discussed the zoning actions requested as part of the petition. He stated the additional fence height is requested to screen the contractor's yard west of the property. The additional fence height is intended to minimize the amount of dust that blows onto the subject property. He then noted that they are requesting an amendment to the proposed use list to allow for temporary retail sales on the site. The intent of this request is to allow for special clearance events.

Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for public comment. There were no comments in favor or in opposition to the proposal. Chairperson Ryan then requested the staff report.

William Heniff, Senior Planner, reiterated the requested actions, summarized the project and submitted the IDRC report to the public record in its entirety. In August, 2005, the Village Board approved a conditional use for a planned development for the subject property (PC 05-17). A condition of this approval was a requirement that any future developers of the property seek site plan approval from the Village for their respective project.

Since the Village Board approved the petition, a substitute developer has acquired the property and is now seeking to develop the entire property with a single user (Walter E. Smith Furniture). The development proposal attempts to follow the guidelines established by the planned development approval and follows the single-user building concept.

As a refinement to the development petition, the petitioner is also seeking relief for perimeter fence height requirements. Also, this petition includes provisions to allow temporary retail sales on the property, which would require an amendment to the planned development approval.

Regarding the Inter-departmental Review Comments, he noted that the engineering comments related to the construction project are under separate cover and were given directly to the petitioner.

In the initial planned development approval, three plans were approved in order to provide maximum development flexibility. The current proposal being brought forward is the single building option. The initial phase proposes a single 184,500 square foot building, of which 25,000 square feet of the building will be used for office purposes. The plan includes a truck dock for 27 small and 6 full docks and a single drive-in door. Parking for 304 cars is also proposed for the initial phase. Future phases will include an additional 53,000 square feet of building space as well as 20 additional docks and parking for 156 additional spaces. The primary use of the property will be the warehouse/distribution activities. Although furniture manufacturing will be done elsewhere, there may be minor furniture repair activities that may occur on the site as well.

The plans also depict future development activity that may occur. The plan shows an additional 53,000 square feet of warehouse spaces as well as additions to the parking lots and loading docks. From staff's perspective, knowing the future development plans for the property is also advantageous, so all facets of the site design could be considered early in the review process.

Staff also finds the idea of the property to be occupied by a single entity to be desirable. First, all infrastructure improvements can be completed at once, rather than in phases. Second, cross-access, parking and property maintenance

issues will either not be a concern or will be more easily addressed.

He noted that the site plan approval process provides the ability of the Plan Commission to review, approve, deny or modify the individual components within the overall development.

He then described the proposed project elements. The office area is located on the north side of the building. Short loading docks for local delivery vehicles and long receiving berths are located along the east and south sides of the building. The building's design and orientation maximizes the available space on the property and incorporates the existing wetland site constraints. The plan proposes to segregate automobile parking and truck delivery functions. Moreover, among the automotive parking areas, the north parking lot will be for office employees while the east lot will be for truck delivery staff.

The petitioner has submitted building elevations depicting pre-cast concrete exterior walls with additional glass and masonry treatments at the office entrance on the north elevation. This treatment is typical of most modern hi-cube warehouse/distribution facilities. Trash collection will be addressed with a compactor to be located on one of the east loading dock areas.

The petitioner prepared a concept landscape plan. The plan shows landscape improvements for those areas that may be developed at a later date. The plan conceptually meets the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance, except as varied as part of the planned development approval. The plan does not show landscaping within the wetland area - the final plant materials and maintenance requirements will be established by DuPage County as part of the wetland review process.

While the final light pole fixtures have not been selected by the petitioner to date, the light poles and fixtures to be utilized for all private roadway lighting and parking lot lighting should be uniform. The petitioner intends to meet this request. The petitioner shall provide complete specifications and photometric plans for the fixtures. The lighting plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Village as part of a building permit submittal prior to installation.

The plan has been reviewed to ensure that truck and emergency vehicle turning movements can be met. The plan intends to minimize conflict points between truck loading/circulation and customer/employee parking areas. The main entrance drive into the property may include a guardhouse and/or additional lanes to segregate the truck operations from automotive traffic.

To ensure proper traffic flow to the eastern parking lot, staff recommends that the parking spaces be reconfigured to allow for a direct access aisle linking the southern access aisle to the entrance drive proposed south of the building.

About 400 employees are proposed to be based out of the building or work on-site. Most of the on-site activities will be during daytime hours.

Regarding the Lombard Road improvements, the petitioner as new property owner, will fulfill the obligations set forth in the initial development approvals, including constructing a new cul-de-sac bulb at the current roadway terminus of Lombard Road and full street improvements shall be made in front of the Haney & Sons property. He also noted that the Village Board has approved the first vacation of Lombard Road as provided for in the development agreement.

Mr. Heniff then stated that in the original planned development plan proposal, the detention was proposed to be located on an unutilized portion of the Commonwealth Edison property southeast of the subject property and on property located in unincorporated DuPage County. The petitioner's current proposal will utilize the Commonwealth Edison property immediately south of the proposed building and within the planned development boundaries. The detention relocation will supplant the previously approved parking/storage area as conceptualized in the initial plans. As this area is within Lombard's corporate limits, stormwater detention requirements will be reviewed and approved by Village staff. The rights to construct the detention on the Commonwealth Edison property will be memorialized through a permanent stormwater detention easement granted to the subject property owner.

The final development agreement outlines the types of uses that would be permitted through the conditional use process or prohibited within the development. The planned development use list does not provide for retail activities as a permitted or conditional activity. Staff notes that occasionally warehouse uses for retail establishments have requested approval for temporary sales events. These requests have been made to the Village for seasonal sales, overstock sales or liquidation sales. As retail activities are not listed as permitted uses within the underlying zoning district and hence, their respective certificates of occupancy/zoning certificates, the business entity would need to apply to the Village for a special event permit to allow for the sales activity. The proposed use list amendment would allow for temporary retail sales as a permitted ancillary use to the office/warehouse activities on the property.

Immediately west of the subject property are heavy industrial contractor's yards. As the petitioner's use is a light industrial/office use, they would like to increase the permitted fence height along the west property line. The proposed solid wood fence will provide a visual screen and noise buffer to the subject property. Moreover, a higher fence may help reduce some of the dust that can be created through the adjacent neighbor's business operations.

At this point in time, the petitioner has not determined the final signage package for the project. As such, if their future plans require additional relief, the petitioner will be required to apply for another site plan approval from the Plan Commission.

The Comprehensive Plan identifies the site for industrial uses. The proposed site plan will meet both of these provisions and will meet the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan.

Regarding compatibility with adjacent uses, the proposed development is surrounded on three sides (north, south and west) by industrial activity. Staff finds that the proposed office/warehouse development as a type of light industrial use will be compatible with the adjacent industrial uses. On the east side of the subject property is property owned by the DuPage County Forest Preserve District and is part of the Fullerton Woods Forest Preserve. In discussions with the District, they envision their property remaining as passive regional open space. To ensure that encroachments do not occur into the District property (a common occurrence elsewhere in the County), the petitioner is proposing to install a ten-foot high chain link fence along the eastern property line. Moreover, the petitioner has been working with DuPage County to ensure that the development meets the County's wetland buffer requirements on the subject property as well as the adjacent Forest Preserve property. At the request of the District, he read their correspondence they submitted relative to

this petition into the record.

Chairperson Ryan opened the hearing for discussion and questions by the Plan Commission.

Commissioners Olbrysh and Sweetser discussed potential encroachments into the District's property. Mr. Heniff noted that most of the District's comments pertain to construction activity, which will be addressed as part of the permit review and inspection processes.

Commissioner Sweetser asked if the proposed 10 foot high fence needs to be conditioned in their approval. Mr. Heniff stated that as the submitted plans depict the fence on their plans, staff can require the fence as part of their construction project. Therefore, it does not need to be placed as an additional condition.

*Commissioner Olbrysh asked about the Lombard Road vacation. Mr. Heniff stated that the final development agreement provided for the right-of-way to be vacated to the adjacent property owner, but if the Village requests after a 20-year period, the right-of-way will be rededicated back to the Village.
R2006-038996*

Resolutions

*M. Lombard Town Centre 2012 Funding (Moved to IX-A1)

- N. [120025](#) Northern Illinois Municipal Electric Cooperative (NIMEC)
Authorizing the Northern Illinois Municipal Electric Cooperative (NIMEC) to serve as the broker for the Village of Lombard with regard to obtaining bids from electricity providers and authorizing the Village Manager or Director of Finance to approve a contract with the lowest cost electricity provider.

Attachments: [Leg 120025 BOT 1-19-12.pdf](#)
[Electric Submittal - NIMEC Res 1-12.docx](#)
[Electric Resolution - NIMEC 1-12.docx](#)
[Electric Memo - NIMEC Res 1-12 Water Pumping.docx](#)
[R 54-12](#)

Other Matters

- O. [120003](#) Purchase of Front End Loader
Request for a waiver of bids and award of a contract to West Side Tractor in the amount of \$131,105; and approving an ordinance declaring Village unit WT451 as surplus equipment and authorizing its trade in. Public Act 85-1295 does not apply. A waiver of first reading is requested by staff.

Attachments: [120003 BOT 1-19-12](#)
[Ordinance 6670](#)
[Letter from Westside Tractor Sale](#)

- P. [120024](#) Single Axle Dump Truck Purchase
Request for a waiver of bids and award of a contract to Prairie International in the amount of \$127,732.00; and approval of an ordinance declaring Village unit ST330 as surplus equipment and authorizing its trade-in. A waiver of first reading is requested by staff. Public Act 85-1295 does not apply.

Attachments: [120024 BOT 1-19-12](#)
[Ordinance 6671](#)

- *Q. Agreement with Third Millennium Associates, Inc. (Moved to IX-D)

IX. Items for Separate Action

Ordinances on First Reading (Waiver of First Requested)

Other Ordinances on First Reading

Ordinances on Second Reading

Resolutions

- *A1. [110623](#) Lombard Town Centre 2012 Funding
Providing the Lombard Town Centre with funding in the amount of \$38,500 for the 2012 calendar year subject to certain terms and conditions.

Attachments: [2012 LTC Funding.pdf](#)
[LTC Funding Request Memo.pdf](#)
[LTC Funding Exhibit A.pdf](#)
[LTC Funding Exhibit B.pdf](#)
[LTC Funding Exhibit C.pdf](#)
[LTC Funding Exhibit D.pdf](#)
[LTC Funding Exhibit E.pdf](#)
[LTC Funding Exhibit F.pdf](#)
[LTC Funding Exhibit G.pdf](#)
[LTC Funding Exhibit H.pdf](#)
[LTC Funding Exhibit I.pdf](#)
[LTC Funding Exhibit J.pdf](#)
[LTC Funding Exhibit K.pdf](#)
[LTC Funding Exhibit L.pdf](#)
[LTC Funding Exhibit M.pdf](#)
[LTC Funding Exhibit N.pdf](#)
[LTC Funding Exhibit O.pdf](#)
[LTC Funding Exhibit P.pdf](#)
[LTC Funding Exhibit Q.pdf](#)
[LTC Funding Exhibit R.pdf](#)
[LTC Funding Exhibit S.pdf](#)
[LTC Funding Exhibit T.pdf](#)
[LTC Funding Exhibit U.pdf](#)
[LTC Update & 2012 Funding Memo.pdf](#)
[Exhibit A to LTC Update & 2012 Funding Memo.pdf](#)
[Exhibit B to LTC Update & 2012 Funding Memo.pdf](#)
[Exhibit C to LTC Update & 2012 Funding Memo.pdf](#)
[Exhibit D to LTC Update & 2012 Funding Memo.pdf](#)
[Exhibit E to LTC Update & 2012 Funding Memo.pdf](#)
[110623 Part 1 BOT 1 19 12.pdf](#)
[110623 Part 2 BOT 1 19 12.pdf](#)
[110623 Part 3 BOT 1 19 12.pdf](#)
[110623Coverpage1-19-12](#)
[R 55-12](#)

Other Matters

- A. [100553](#) Approval of Purchase
Request for the approval of \$685.80 in purchases from Giagnorio's Pizza.
- Attachments:** [100553.pdf](#)
[100553 BOT January 19.pdf](#)
[100553Coverpage1-19-12](#)
- Manager Hulseberg indicated this purchase was for the members and volunteers at the Recycling Extravaganza. He said this has been the practice for many years. He indicated Trustee Giagnorio should not vote. Trustee Moreau questioned if any time a purchase is made from Trustee Giagnorio's restaurant, a separate vote would need to be taken. Trustee Wilson indicated he was going to vote no. President Mueller stated it was a custom to buy lunch for the all those who work at the Extravaganza and this is what the purchase was for.*
- B. [120004](#) Fleet Replacement Policy
Recommendation from the Public Works and Transportation & Safety Committees to continue the current practice of depreciation, funding, review and replacement of the Village's fleet.
- Attachments:** [120004 PWC-T&S 1-10-12](#)
[120004 BOT 1-19-12](#)
[120004Coverpage1-19-12](#)
- C. [110706](#) Police Vehicles Purchase (Continued from December 27, 2011)
Request for a waiver of bids and award of a contract to Currie Motors in the amount of \$49,700 for the purchase of one Police Interceptor Sedan and one Police Interceptor Utility vehicle. Public Act 85-1295 does not apply.
- Attachments:** [110706 BOT 12-27-11](#)
[110706Coverpage12-27-11](#)
[110706 BOT 1-19-12](#)
[110706Coverpage1-19-12](#)
- Village Manager David Hulseberg indicated this was the regular purchase of police vehicles once the squad cars reach 80,000 miles. He indicated this is when the vehicle value is peaked and the vehicle has lived its useful life. After 80,000 miles, the maintenance is very costly. This is the most cost effective time to remove and replace the vehicles. President Mueller stated that Trustee Wilson had requested this item be removed from the Consent Agenda. Trustee Wilson stated that he recalls the comments being made about the number of squad cars in the parking lot and he has tried to get a handle on the number of vehicles and if the useful life is 7 years versus 4 years. He felt he was not sure this was the way to go. He recommended this be referred to the Public Works Committee and the Transportation & Safety Committee for review. He felt the Village had more vehicles than officers on duty. He suggested this be reevaluated. Trustee Wilson moved that this matter be sent to the Public Works*

and Transportation & Safety Committee and then be referred to the Finance Committee before it comes back to the Village Board.

Trustee Fitzpatrick indicated she agreed with Trustee Wilson, but questioned the process of going to three committees during the budget process and if the Village could wait to purchase the vehicles. She talked about approving the purchase now and then moving forward after reports had been received from the committees asked to review the matter.

Trustee Wilson asked if there was urgency in the purchase.

Chief Byrne indicated there was no urgency. He stated that Director Goldsmith had taken this purchasing policy to the Public Works Committee before and this had been reviewed and approved. He talked about maintenance costs increasing after a certain time and also about down-time for the vehicles. He stated this was the most efficient and cost-effective means for replacement.

Manager Hulseberg indicated the Village can wait thirty days with regard to the purchase.

Trustee Wilson asked Chief Byrne if he was involved in the purchase decision or was the department just given the new cars.

Chief Byrne indicated he was involved in the decision.

Trustee Breen suggested having a joint meeting of the Public Works and Transportation & Safety Committees to discuss this matter and stated that since T&S can not meet on the first Monday of the month due to the holiday, he suggested combining the T&S meeting with the Public Works meeting on January 10, 2012.

Trustee Wilson agreed.

President Mueller asked that this be brought back to the Board on January 19th and asked that the motion be amended accordingly.

2*D. [110314](#)

Agreement with Third Millennium Associates, Inc.
Motion authorizing the renewal of an Agreement with Third Millennium Associates, Inc. for vehicle sticker printing, mailing and processing services.

Attachments: [Vehicle Sticker Contract Renewal 2011.doc](#)
[VS EPay Software Agreement.pdf](#)
[VS TMA Contract 2007.pdf](#)
[Vehicle Sticker Printing 2011.DOC](#)
[110314.pdf](#)
[110314 BOT January 19.pdf](#)
[Agreement with Third Millennium](#)

X. Agenda Items for Discussion

XI. Executive Session

XII. Reconvene

XIII Adjournment

.