

# 1.0 Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

The meeting was called to order by Trustee Puccio at 7:00 p.m.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

# 2.0 Roll Call

Present	7 -	Anthony Puccio, Dennis McNicholas, Garrick Nielsen, Matthew Pike, Paula
		Dillon, Laine Vant Hoff, and Patrick Kennedy
Absent	2 -	Gregory Ladle, and Alan Bennett

Garrick Nielsen arrived at 7:10 pm.

Also present: William Heniff, AICP, Director of Community Development, and Keith Steiskal, Director of Building and Code Enforcement.

### **3.0 Public Participation**

None

#### 4.0 Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Mr. Pike, seconded by Ms. Vant Hoff, that the minutes of the November 14, 2022 meeting were approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

- Aye: 6 Anthony Puccio, Dennis McNicholas, Garrick Nielsen, Matthew Pike, Laine Vant Hoff, and Patrick Kennedy
- Abstain: 1 Paula Dillon

Absent: 2 - Gregory Ladle, and Alan Bennett

# 5.0 Unfinished Business

### 6.0 New Business

230021Lombard Downtown Tax Increment Financing (TIF) District<br/>TerminationWith the life of the Lombard Downtown TIF District terminating on<br/>December 31, 2023 and pursuant to State Statutes (65 ILCS<br/>5/11-74.4-3.5(c)(50)), The ECDC recommends that the Village Board

authorize the Village Manager to execute a Professional Services Agreement between the Village and Ryan relative to the future termination of the Downtown Lombard TIF District. (DISTRICT #1 & 4)

William Heniff introduced a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the history of the Downtown Lombard Tax Increment Financing (TIF) District. It was established in February, 1989 as an economic development tool to assist financing of numerous public and private projects within the designated area. Originally established as a 16-year TIF District, the District time periods were extended in 2002 and 2007 and will expire at the end of 2023, with 2024 being a reconciliation year to close out any open project commitments.

With the final year of the TIF starting, the Village needs to undertake many administrative activities, including procedural elements, legal and statutory requirements pertaining to the TIF closeout, and addressing open Village expense obligations. He noted the existing account reserves and prospective projects that could be funded over the next year. He stated that there is funding available for downtown business grants. Garrick Nielsen asked for clarity on a few of the expenditures on the slides.

To begin this effort, staff discussed the TIF termination with Kane McKenna Associates (now known as Ryan per a recent acquisition), and they provided staff with a Professional Services Agreement for consideration. While the agreement costs could be approved administratively by staff, it being brought to the ECDC and Village Board for concurrence and as a pretext for further discussions. By Statute, the anticipated agreement costs for closing out the TIF District are deemed to be acceptable administrative expenditures.

Dennis McNicholas commented that he was on a committee that created the TIF District and that its creation and existence was a great success.

Audience member Michael Batts as for clarity as to why the TIF is being terminated. Mr. Heniff noted that TIF State Statutes sets forth the provisions for TIFs including the eligible time periods and in this case, 35-year life time period.

A motion was made by Dennis McNicholas, seconded by Paula Dillon, that the Village Board approve the Professional Services Agreement. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Dennis McNicholas, Garrick Nielsen, Matthew Pike, Paula Dillon, Laine Vant Hoff, and Patrick Kennedy

	Absent: 2 - Gregory Ladle, and Alan Bennett
230022	<ul> <li>Text Amendments to Chapter 94 of the Village Code</li> <li>The Economic and Community Development Committee (ECDC)</li> <li>recommends approval of the text amendments to Chapter 94 of the</li> <li>Village Code, nuisance provisions and pertaining to the following: <ul> <li>a. Amending the descriptions of vehicles which can be parked on a residential lot;</li> <li>b. Establishing clarity provisions for the temporary parking of snow clearing equipment;</li> <li>c. Amending surface parking standards for recreational vehicles being parked on residential lots;</li> <li>d. Capping the number of recreational vehicles and trailers stored on a residential property;</li> <li>e. Adding provisions consistent with the Lombard Traffic Code (Section 70 et. seq. of the Village Code) for parking vehicles for sale on private property; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>f. Amending the structure and requisite notice provisions within Chapter 94. (DISTRICT ALL)</li> </ul>
	William Heniff introduced a PowerPoint presentation summarizing proposed changes to the nuisance provisions. He noted six areas which were reviewed and was looking for ECDC concurrence for the amendments. First, he discussed how the Village's current provisions of tying permissible and prohibited vehicles to the license plate issued by the State was not an effective tool in determining whether such a vehicle should be permissible on a given residential property. The Village observed cases in which a pick-up truck with contractor storage cabinets had a higher plate weight limit than necessary. Conversely, some smaller trucks can have dump boxes attached to them which based upon past code enforcement cases, presents the reverse compliance challenge.

Given that this is an aesthetic regulation, staff recommends that in lieu of vehicle plates, nuisance codes should be modified to state which vehicle types are deemed to be inconsistent with residential properties, and instead functional performance standards are established.

Garrick Nielsen asked about electric vehicle weights and if that would impact the proposed code amendments. Keith Steiskal and William Heniff responded by noting the review of vehicle weights and upon additional research, it will not make a material difference. Laine Vant Hoff asked about larger tow trucks and their appropriateness on residential lots. William Heniff explained the history of the current regulation - the matter was brought to the ECDC in 2006, but the amendment to make tow trucks exempted was not completely codified, so staff brought back this item for clarity purposes. The ECDC supported the amendments.

Second, the surface parking standards for recreational vehicles and trailers was discussed. Current code allows for parking of trailers and recreational vehicles is simply placing a hard surface underneath tires or hitch supports and not under any other parts of the vehicle. Staff is proposing language changes as this approach does not account of vehicles being moved from a support, thereby creating pathway ruts on soft surfaces and the supporting weight provisions can be arbitrary from an engineering standard. The amendment would require vehicle and trailer parking areas shall wholly meet the driveway standard. The ECDC supported the amendment.

Third, code provisions are generally silent as it pertains to the number of recreational vehicles that can be stored on a property. Code enforcement staff has been engaged with several properties that have had multiple RV trailers, which has raised concerns that rear yards are functioning more like general storage lots. Staff recommends that outdoor parking of more than one recreational vehicle or more than one trailer on a single-family or two-family property is deemed a nuisance. Garrick Nielsen asked about moving of recreational vehicles. William Heniff noted that the winter RV parking restrictions helps ensure that vehicles are not staying at one location year-round when located in front of a house. The members asked for clarity regarding the number of proposed vehicles and trailers being sought as part of the amendment. William Heniff stated the intent is to allow for one RV and one trailer. The ECDC supported the amendment.

Fourth, enforcement of vehicles for sale on private commercial parking lot properties can only be undertaken by the Police Department. In consultation with the Police Chief, staff proposes to add the language within Chapter 94 for cases whereby the vehicle for sale is in a commercial parking lot located in close proximity to a street. This addition would allow for Code Enforcement staff to administer the provisions in a similar manner as other property-related nuisances. However, the language is intended to also remain within the Traffic Code, as it would still give the Police Department authority to cite or even remove vehicles, if deemed necessary. Dennis McNicholas asked about vehicles being parked in front of houses on the street and William Heniff stated that the Police Department would retain jurisdiction on that aspect, if there was a code violation. Dennis McNicholas also inquired about distances from the property line and William Heniff stated that the existing vehicles for sale on private property provisions would remain unchanged, but enforcement of existing provisions could also be undertaken by Code Enforcement staff in addition to the Police Department. The ECDC supported the amendment.

Fifth, it is not uncommon for owners of larger commercial or industrial properties to store snow removal equipment on properties. This is done so that clearing response times are quicker and the clearing can be done more efficiently. Staff has received occasional inquires questioning such storage activities as permissible. To that end and to clarify the parameters of such activities, staff proposes clarity language. The ECDC supported the amendment.

Sixth, staff is working with Village Counsel to memorialize the proposed amendments and prepare a draft ordinance restructuring the Chapter 94 provisions, particularly the due notice provisions and the process. Should the amendments be advanced, staff will work with Counsel to memorialize the enforcement language in the draft ordinance.

On a motion by Mr. Pike and seconded by Ms. Vant Hoff, the ECDC recommended that the staff and Village Counsel prepare an Ordinance amending the recommend changes to Chapter 94 of Village Code.

- Aye: 6 Dennis McNicholas, Garrick Nielsen, Matthew Pike, Paula Dillon, Laine Vant Hoff, and Patrick Kennedy
- Absent: 2 Gregory Ladle, and Alan Bennett

# 7.0 Other Business

#### 8.0 Information Only

#### 9.0 Adjournment

On a motion by Mr. Nielsen and a second by Mr. Pike the meeting adjourned at 8:13 p.m.