

**Village of Martin's Additions
Council Meeting
7013 B Brookville Road, Chevy Chase, MD 20815
Thursday, September 27, 2007**

Council Members and Village Representatives Present: Tim Price, Chair; Noell Sottile, Vice-Chair; Richard Krajeck, Treasurer; Diane Everts, Secretary; Jean Sperling, Village Manager; David Podolsky, Village Attorney, Alan Beal, Building Consultant.

Village residents present: March Dodge, Jeff Stann, Paul Iadarola, John Sharrow, Ed Novak

CALL TO ORDER, 7:30 by Chairman Tim Price

POLICE REPORT: Officer DaSilva. There were no incidents to report in the Village of Martin's Additions during the past month. There has been a rash of vehicle break-ins in the surrounding community however. Consequently the CCV Police have been paying particular attention to the cars parked on the streets. Resident March Dodge stated that she had reported an attempted bicycle theft and possibly an attempted auto theft that did not appear on the CCV police report. The officer said he would look into it. The officer also explained that CCV police are considered a non-emergency dispatch and the residents of both Martin's Additions and Chevy Chase Village are urged to call the non-emergency number (301- 279-8000) at the Bethesda Station to report an incident and to call 911 for any suspicious activity or emergency. The police will generally take a report over the phone when they feel there is no chance of recovering anything and they will dispatch an officer if they feel there is evidence to recover.

Approval of Minutes: August 16, 2007. A few typographical errors were noted. With those corrections, approval of the minutes was motioned by Richard and seconded by Diane. All voted in favor.

Treasurer's Report: July and August 2007: Richard Krajeck

The Council did not hold a full meeting in August so it is necessary to report the July and August financials at this meeting. For the month of July, which is the beginning of the Village Fiscal Year, income was \$1,161, nearly all from permit fees. Expenses totaled \$24,917. Included were the insurance renewal premium of \$4,600 and membership in the Maryland Municipal League of \$3,000. All other expenses were the normal monthly operating expenses. Income for the first quarter of the fiscal year is expected to be low. We drew down reserves by nearly \$24,000.

For the month of August, income was \$28,258 including reimbursement of nearly \$17,000 of tax duplication for services village residents pay to the county but are provided by the village such as waste management, snow plowing, etc. The reimbursement is limited to the amount of property tax the Village collects from the residents. Nearly \$5,000 was received in interest from our savings account with the State.

Expenses for the month totaled \$61,000. Other than the usual monthly operational expenses, we had legal expense of \$4,800 for drafting of proposed ordinances and legal counsel participation in council work sessions and meetings; we had nearly \$15,000 in street and sidewalk maintenance that included cleaning up the dead end of Raymond and Bradley, repair of the sidewalk on Taylor, the purchase of street signs and other miscellaneous expenses; and the annual purchase of leaf bags added about \$6,400.

For the month of August, we drew down reserves by \$32,800. As I said above, the early months of the fiscal year do not produce much income. As I recall, our first income tax rebate comes in November. Income tax rebate is approximately 70% of our total projected income.

Motion to Approve: Richard moved acceptance of the July and August financial reports as presented. There was no discussion. Noell seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

ACTION ON TRAFFIC ENGINEER'S RECOMMENDATIONS & DISCUSSION

Tim Price summarized the traffic engineering recommendations made by Joe Cutro, P.E. under review by the Council. The Council has the authority to adopt these actions by resolution (Number 9-07-1, under Section 8-103 of the Village Code of Ordinances) The first proposed regulatory change is as follows:

1. Issue: Mid-Block 2 way Stop signs on Chestnut Street

Proposed Action: Remove. **Optional Extra:** Put in a speed bump.

Description/Justification: Encourages variable and unpredictable behavior and reduces safety for both motorists and pedestrians, No conflicting flows to justify a control intended for intersections. Fails to comply with national/state standards or accepted practice. Potentially hazardous and a liability problem for the Village. Poorly executed and maintained, Parking requirements not enforced and signs frequently obstructed. Inequitable treatment-only known usage in the Village.

Discussion: Resident John Sharrow voiced his objection to the removal of the mid-block stop signs on Chestnut Street. He explained that they were installed a number of years ago because there were a lot of children on the block. He observed that there are still many children on the street. He expressed the opinion that removing the stop signs without putting something else in to slow traffic will result in a fatality in the Village. He noted that he has witnessed

amazing speeds on Chestnut Street and that there were no other deterrents besides these stop signs, although he did note that most people don't stop at the stop signs. He asked if the Council was considering any other deterrent to stop people from speeding.

Chairman Tim Price said that the Village intends to take a volume and speed count and consider alternate methods, perhaps a speed hump. He added that the safety of the residents was the first concern of the Council.

Mr. Sharrow wondered how residents will feel about a speed hump. What would be required to get a speed hump? Would it require resident input? He speculated that it would.

Tim said that the first thing on the mind of the Council was the safety of the residents and the children. The overriding information that the Council received from Mr. Cutro was that a mid-block traffic sign was more of a hazard than a safety device, because the children might rely on the Stop sign and people didn't stop for it. He stated that it's actually safer for the kids when they don't rely on a Stop Sign that's not enforceable and people aren't stopping for. That's why we don't have mid block stop signs everywhere.

Resident March Dodge stated that she lives in front of the Stop signs. Her husband supports the Stop signs and she does not—she would like them removed. She understands that it was a group effort to have to Stop signs put in, but would like to go on record saying that she does not support a speed bump; they are noisy and people frequently honk at the bump. While it is nice to have the Stop sign there, the people who stop are the residents; many construction guys blow right through them at significant speeds—perhaps 35 MPH—in big trucks.

Richard Krajeck pointed out that Mr. Cutro mentioned that parking at the Stop signs contributes to the reduced visibility of the Stop signs. Jeff Stann said that he was sympathetic to the safety of the children, but that it was very easy to miss that Stop signs—a driver doesn't see it until the last second.

John Sharrow suggested that the Village paint "STOP" on the street. He considers the removal of the stop sign to be arbitrary and capricious. Tim disagreed with him saying that this decision was not at all arbitrary.

Diane Everts noted that the Stop sign doesn't solve any problem, and that the Council intends to collect traffic data; if the law is being broken (e.g. speeding) the Council will consider other control options—the Council will figure something else out that makes more sense.

2. Issue: Quincy Street at Oxford.

Proposed Action: Remove STOP on eastbound Quincy **Option:** Add STOP on westbound Quincy.

Description/Justification: A two-way stop at a 3-way intersection does not comply with accepted practice. Supports unusual conflict that is inconsistent with the rules of the road. Inconsistent with good practice at other (e.g. Raymond /Melville) intersections. Presence of a potentially-obstructing tree and statutory elimination of parking (30') argues against full 3-way stop.

Discussion: Tim pointed out that in the work session held on September 20, 2007, Mr. Cutro explained that this intersection was confusing, it presented an unconventional approach and while not really dangerous, it did create confusion. It is also contrary to the rule of the road--the Boulevard rule—which applies at Oxford Street; that is, if there were no Stop signs at this intersection, drivers on Oxford Street have to stop. Solutions to this situation are to remove one Stop sign --the one on east bound Quincy at Oxford-- or install another stop sign on Quincy westbound at Oxford. The installation of an additional stop sign poses a particular problem because there is a tree where the Stop sign would go and a lot of parking would be lost because the 30' rule would have to be enforced,

Removing the eastbound stop sign on Quincy Street at Oxford Street would take the conventional approach and make it consistent with action being proposed for Bradley and Raymond. If speed is an issue, address that, but not with a stop sign.

3. Issue: Bradley Lane at Melville Place

Proposed Action: Remove STOP signs on eastbound and westbound Bradley. **Option:** Leave as 3 way stop but normalize approach.

Description/Justification: Existing 3-way STOP is poorly executed, and results in unusual conflicts, including encouraging eastbound traffic to drive on left side of Bradley, contrary to basic rule of the road. Left-side stop bar marking is particularly confusing. The statutory parking clearance (30') for the right side STOP is not regularly enforced, and sign is frequently obstructed by parked cars. This sign is also partially obstructed by a tree. Parking in this zone also constrains movements of right turns from Melville Place. Inconsistent with good control at nearby Raymond/Melville intersection.

Discussion:

Diane noted that parking along Bradley is a very big issue; many of the homes either share a driveway or don't have a driveway at all. If we leave the Stop sign it causes a major loss of parking spots.

4. Issue: Summit at Taylor STOP sign.

Proposed Action: Replace with Turn warning/10mph

Description/Justification: There are no conflicting flows entering a one-way street. Not really an intersection. Fails to comply with national/state standards or accepted practice. Probably unenforceable. Conflicts with nearby parking control signs.

ACTION ON ITEM #1- #4 of TRAFFIC PROPOSALS:

Richard Krajeck moved to adopt the actions proposed by Mr. Joseph Cutro, P.E. in Traffic Order No. 2007-02 dated September 27, 2007. This action can be effected as a resolution, consistent with the authority vested in the council by the Code of Ordinances (Section 8-103). This authority is described in Resolution No. 9-07-1. The motion was seconded by Diane.

Mr. Sharrow asked if there could be a 30 day delay on this action so he can consult with his attorney to seek an injunction to prevent the Council from removing the Stop signs. Tim said that the action was effective immediately and that Mr. Sharrow could consult with his attorney.

Jean asked for a clarification of her authority to act. It was confirmed that she may proceed with this order. There is to be no delay in the effective date of this resolution, although it was recognized that the work cannot be done immediately, simply for staging reasons. Jean added the Mr. Cutro has proposed that the Stop signs on Chestnut Street be replaced with Children at Play signs that are located elsewhere on the street and that the remaining two posts be used for Speed Limit 20 mph signs.

5. Issue: Stop Sign at Taylor and retail center driveway crosswalk:

Proposed Action Replace with twin florescent yellow green Pedestrian Crossing sign. Leave unchanged

Description/Justification: No conflicting vehicular flows. Fails to comply with national/state standards. Low level of activity does not justify stop when pedestrians not present. No objection however to stop sign remaining. The Council agreed with Mr. Cutro's observations made at the working session on September 20, 2007 this stop sign could be justified. The Council felt that it would best be left in place, given the variability of traffic at the market area. Consequently the Stop sign at the cross walk to the market will be unchanged.

Final Vote: Mr. Price called for a final vote. It was noted that the traffic order confirmed (left unchanged) item #5 which is the Stop sign at Taylor and the market area. **All voted in favor.**

John Sharrow suggested that this item should be set to referendum because the Village was acting without resident input. Jean read from Mr. Cutro's notes that the "Council is responsible for traffic control on village streets, including traffic control devices, signs and markings." (See Chapter 8 of the Village Code of Ordinance). Tim also noted that the information on this action has been published step by step and that the decisions were made based on the professional judgments that were offered to the Council by our traffic engineer.

URBAN PLANNING CONTRACT DISCUSSION/ACTION

Action on Proposal. The Council met with Jakubiak and Associates at a work session on September 11 to discuss more fully the proposal presented by Jakubiak to address the zoning and planning issues that Martin's Additions is facing and to address the possibility of developing and adopting new regulations.

Diane Everts moved to approve the proposal of Jakubiak & Associates, modified according to the comments and requests from the Council at a price of \$79,650, the work to include meetings or forums with the entire Village and a Council appointed Citizens Advisory Committee. The work will also include assisting the Committee in preparing reports to the Council and Village at large. The Council anticipates, and the proposal should reflect, that the scope of work is expected to last 12 months or more.

Noell Sottile seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Jean was directed to contact Chris Jakubiak for a contract. The Council agreed that the work was to begin as soon as possible.

Selection of Citizen Advisory Group.

The Council discussed the selection of a Citizen Advisory Committee from the list of residents who had volunteered to offer their services. It was agreed that the recommendations of Chris Jakubiak would help guide the selection process. Mr. Jakubiak recommended a committee of 5 to 7 people with geographical and professional diversity. It was agreed that Jean would get a description of the committee responsibilities from Jakubiak to help explain to volunteers the amount of work that will be involved with this group. Jakubiak has suggested this diversity because we want to hear different voices and perspectives, including lawyers, builders, and average citizens. Tim agreed to begin the discussion with the volunteers

PUBLIC HEARING on Ordinance 8-7-1

THE VILLAGE OF MARTIN'S ADDITIONS

SUBJECT: AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION 6-302 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE VILLAGE OF MARTIN'S ADDITIONS TO REQUIRE, AS A CONDITION OF A BUILDING PERMIT FOR CONSTRUCTION WITHIN THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY, THE EXECUTION OF A REVOCABLE LICENSE TO USE THE RIGHT-OF-WAY AND TO CLARIFY THE REPAIR EXEMPTION FROM THE BUILDING PERMIT REQUIREMENTS

Discussion: Mr. Price explained that this amendment was introduced August 16, 2007. In accordance with Village regulations this ordinance is being discussed at a public hearing September 27, 2007. If adopted at this evening's

meeting, it will become effective October 17, 2007. Tim explained that the amendment is intended to address the construction of walls, fences and the like within the public right of way and to indemnify the village against any damages. Going forward, residents will have to apply for a license from the Village in order to place structures in the right of way (ROW).

This regulation to require a license to build in the ROW will assure that permission is granted by the Village to use the ROW. Understanding that structures placed on the ROW have to be removed at the direction of the Village, this regulation will require the property owner to pay for the removal of the structure. If they don't, the Village can remove it and make the owner pay for it. When a property is sold, the buyer will be notified that they don't have that structure for perpetuity and that somewhere down the road they may need to take it out. Basically, it's reserving the town's right to remove a structure from the ROW without any questions.

March Dodge remarked that she believes there are issues on Chestnut Street that relate to the Stop signs and the safety of the street -- that there are no sidewalks on Chestnut Street. People plant right up to the curb—residents are forced to walk in the street because of the plantings up to the curb. What is private property here and what is public property? What about a basketball hoop that forces people to walk in the street. Does the Village have guidelines about where things can be planted? Does the Village have any legal interest or authority in this issue? Jeff Stann explained to Ms. Dodge that property owners do not own to the curb—the village has a right of way (ROW) that is considered public space. It is not an easement.

Mr. Podolsky explained that the subdivision plat for Martin's additions set out the amount of area dedicated for the street. Generally it is 50 feet, and if the road has been constructed in the middle of the ROW (which doesn't always happen) the ROW can be measured 25 ft from the center of the street. It is in this public ROW that Martin's Additions could put a sidewalk, street trees—what ever it wants

Mrs. Dodge continued that there are all sorts of obstacles on the Village ROW that prevent anyone from walking along a public path. Residents can't park in front of certain houses because the car door cannot be opened and parking is tight to begin with because many residences don't have driveways. Tim noted that the Village has a contract to identify the ROW lines that will help us delineate public and private property. Tim remarked that it is evident that keeping the ROW clear hasn't been regulated in the past.

March Dodge commented that from the perspective of public safety of the residents, it would be nice to have a 3' walk in people's front yard. She asked if the Village had an interest in putting a sidewalk there. Tim said it hasn't been addressed because (1) this issue of people planting in the ROW wasn't brought to the attention of the Council and (2) because the Council didn't know where the ROW was.

March requested that the Village pay particular attention, as a part of this entire process of examining the ROW, public safety issues and Stop signs, to areas where there are no sidewalks, working to encourage residents to be considerate of other residents who live on the street in terms of parking and walking along the street.

Call for vote on Ordinance 8-7-1: All in favor.

Further discussion and clarification. Jeff Stann asked for a clarification of "grandfathering" existing structures in the ROW. Mr. Podolsky explained that people who already have a structure in the ROW are not going to be made to sign this document, but that still doesn't give them a vested right—what this document sorts out is that it is the property owner 's responsibility to pay the costs to remove the structures. Removal is always an option that the town holds.

Richard Krajeck suggested that the Council begin to provide the residents with more information on matters related to the right of way and the survey and the fact that people can't put things on the right of way—plants, fences—without village permission. The Council needs to start talking about this. Tim will put an article in the next newsletter.

Assign Council members as "authorized agents".

Richard made a motion to designate the authorized agent to sign the licenses for the ROW as any Council member. Diane seconded. All voted in favor.

FOLLOW UP ON TREE CANOPY DISCUSSIONS

Tim Price explained that the Council held an initial working session in July to discuss how to move forward with issues related to the tree canopy provided by trees on private property. The educational piece that was published in the September newsletter was a result of that working session. Next step is to schedule another working session to formulate whether we want to pass a tree ordinance now that Council members have looked at the neighboring jurisdictions ordinances. Tim agreed to circulate some dates and see when it can be done.

Paul Iadarola asked what the status is of any proposal to regulate trees on private property. Tim explained that the Tree Committee believes that the Village should adopt an ordinance because they think it's in the best interest of the Village to regulate private trees. When asked if the Council could do this over the objection of the residents he explained that technically that could be done, however Village is legally required to follow the Village Code to adopt an ordinance—it is a different set of steps to adopt an ordinance than take out a Stop sign. It would have to be introduced, discussed, commented on at a public hearing, adopted, and become effective. A Stop sign is an administrative matter; an ordinance is a new law so the village has to go through a "new law" passage procedures.

ELECTIONS COMMITTEE ACTION:

Frank Correl has volunteered to replace Ed Holland on the Elections and Ethics Committee. Richard motioned to appoint Frank Correl to the committee and for him to further develop that Committee. Seconded by Diane. All voted in favor. A third member is needed for the committee; volunteers are welcome. The Council would like to thank Debra Berlyn for her service on the Election Committee also.

MANAGER'S REPORT

The following financial obligations have been made during the month:

Taylor Street light (\$2,169). Light on Taylor Street has been approved by the Council, residents have been notified and the order has been placed with Pepco. The Village has not yet received an installation date.

Bulletin Board (\$2,500). A new bulletin board will be constructed (drawing included in the packet) that will incorporate the original Martin's Additions carved leaf and logo. It will be larger so that more of the community can use the bulletin board. Council approved.

Traffic and speed counts action. The Council directed Jean to order speed counting. Understanding is that a two day count is \$350 and another \$50 for data analysis.

Counts and speed will be recorded on Chestnut, Delfield and Summit at the same time, and then on Bradley, Raymond and Quincy.

Records Retention Proposal. The Village has received a proposal from Legal Records Retention LLC to assist in the development of a records retention policy, improve current records management and make the village legally compliant for disposition. The cost of this project is \$2,500. Jean was directed to proceed.

Sidewalk Repairs: Three firms have been asked to bid on the sidewalk and curb repairs that the Council has directed, predominantly in the southern end of the Village. Bids are due back on October 10, 2007. Hopefully the work can begin immediately so it is completed this fall.

Office Furniture: Ed Holland has been kind enough to leave some samples of new office furniture for the Council to try out. Some Council members have already had a chance to try the furniture out at the last working session. Other Council members were encouraged to form an opinion so that the issue can be addressed.

Halloween Party: Scheduled for Sunday October 28th at 3 PM on Turner Lane.

Brookville Market Update: The ownership of the Brookville Supermarket has changed hands- the Pharmacist, Hossein Ejtemai, has purchased the business. The Shirazzi Brothers will continue to own the property. Mr. Reza is the new manager. There have been a lot of complaints about the plantings outside of the market and the lack of appeal of the exterior. The Council fully supports anything that will help improve the appearance of the market.

CONSTRUCTION UPDATE REPORT: ALAN BEAL, Building Consultant

7220 Chestnut Street:

Ed Novak, the owner and developer of the lot has delivered his final plans which include the removal of two right-of-way trees. He is willing to plant one or more trees in the Village right of way as a replacement for the trees that will be removed. He has submitted a letter along with a recommendation from Barbara Neal about those two trees on Thornapple Street. The construction entrance and eventually the permanent driveway will be located on Thornapple Street, but this will require the removal of the two trees. Alan explained that no matter where Mr. Novak put the driveway he is going to have to deal with a town tree. He has made a good effort to make it work. Alan explained that there may be a way to do the project without removing trees, but then you have to deal with design issues.

Alan reminded the Council that the standard used at 7003 Brookville was that the tree was 24" and the Village agreed to swap its removal for 8- 3" caliper trees. The problem we have now is that we have 40" of caliper to deal with. Planting larger size trees is not an option. Jean said that Mr. Wolfe explained to her that for every inch caliper tree, it takes a year for the roots to establish themselves. A 2 to 2 ½ " caliper tree does the best as a newly installed street tree. Alan said that we have yet to see how this caliper for caliper concept works; we may end up trying to find holes to fill. It seemed like a reasonable approach at the time. The next step is to get the permission of the State forester. Jean noted that when the Village takes down a tree we don't replace that caliper—we put back a tree. Alan suggested that a "banking policy" could also be used, where money was deposited for future tree planting throughout the Village.

Motion: Richard made a motion that Mr. Novak be allowed to remove the Norway Maple without a requirement for replacement because it is recognized as an invasive species. With the understanding that the caliper of the black locust (37") is the only tree to be considered with a per caliper replacement, the appropriate number of trees at 3 "caliper (or recommended size) required to come close to the caliper of the black locust (37" caliper) will be planted in the Village in exchange for removal of the Black Locust. **Noell seconded the motion.**

Discussion: Mr. Novak was under the expectation that he might have to plant 1,2, or 3 trees to make up for this and eventually those would grow, but he didn't expect a one-for one caliper replacement policy. He noted that this motion would be the equivalent of more than 12 trees. This one tree would cost the Village several thousand dollars to remove. He noted the plan to bring the driveway in from Thornapple Street is a better plan than using the driveway off of Chestnut. He could bring the driveway in from the back of the property but it would create a longer driveway as well as more impermeable surface. Mr. Novak and his builder had looked at the alternatives and felt that this was the best option—they

certainly didn't factor in an extra \$10,000. Even the arborist was pleased that he is not using the original driveway which comes off of Chestnut Street. He urged the Council to take this into consideration—this tree is not likely to last another 10 or 20 years.

Jean asked Mr. Podolsky if he was aware of what other jurisdictions have done in such a case. David remarked that some other towns require replacement trees; some do not. He is unaware of any with specific criteria or code requirements that specify how the replacement is formulated. Such decisions are usually done on a case by case basis. There is no standard policy, such as an-inch-for-an inch or a tree for a tree. No other jurisdiction has ever finalized anything like that. What other towns really try to do is not take down trees at all, but most of the houses in the Town of Chevy Chase, for example, already have driveways, so they don't face a lot of these problems. There are also not a lot of vacant lots in neighboring towns.

Tim asked for a **re-reading of the motion**: To approve the removal of the Norway Maple and Black Locust with the understanding that the 37" of lost caliper would be replaced with trees placed throughout the Village, whose total caliper would be equivalent. **Call for vote**: 1 in favor, 2 opposed. Motion failed.

Discussion. Diane mentioned that she supported the removal of the trees, but is against replacement caliper by caliper. She suggested that the Village tumbled into the replacement formula at the McCullough property because they offered to replace the tree that was removed on a caliper by caliper basis. Some of the other factors that were suggested in making the ratio calculations were diminishing percentages and the condition of the tree to be removed. Mr. Beal suggested that one inch of new tree be exchanged for ten of existing tree. Mr. Novak asked that the trees be planted on his right of way because there is some room to place more street trees there.

Motion: Tim made a motion that the Village approve the removal of the 14" Norway Maple and 37" Black Locust located in the right of way adjacent to the property at 7220 Chestnut Street based on acceptance of Arborist Barb Neal's recommendations that the Norway Maple is a non-native and highly invasive tree and that the Black Locust is on the watch list not in very good condition, and difficult to preserve during the construction process. The Black locust will be replaced with 4 trees of a recommended caliper and tree type and planted on the right of way with the approval of the Village. The caliper recommendation and tree type will be made by the village arborist.

Seconded by Noell. All voted in favor.

OTHER BUILDING RELATED ACTIVITY

Site Plan Presentation will be held on October 11, 2007

7:00 PM for the neighbors of 6801 Brookville/ 3521 Raymond

8:00 PM for neighbors of 7220 Chestnut Project, including residents from Section 5

7215 Delfield Demolition and new building are in process.

3413 Thornapple existing portico to be replaced.

In-Fill Development Task Force

Alan and Jean have been attending meetings of the In-Fill Development Task Force that was created originally as a "Mansionization" Task force at the direction of County Council member Roger Berliner. It is made up of builders, architects, realtors, neighborhood associations, Park and Planning Commission, and County Permitting Services. Meir Wolf, Council member from the Town of Chevy Chase is the only municipal representative. The purpose is to determine if new building permit regulations should be put in place in the County.

Town of Chevy Chase (TCC) Planning and Zoning Project. Alan reported that the TCC Proposal by Jakubiak and Associates was made earlier this evening and is essentially a combination of FAR, EBL, lower lot coverage, lower height, and all sorts of credits. It is extraordinarily complicated.

Mr. Sharrow asked that builders post Noise Regulation Signs prepared by the County. Alan said he would look into acquiring additional noise signs.

The meeting was adjourned at 10 PM.

Resolution No.: 9-07-1
Introduced: 9/27/07
Adopted: 9/27/07
Effective: 9/27/07

THE VILLAGE OF MARTIN'S ADDITIONS

SUBJECT: A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE VILLAGE MANAGER TO PROVIDE FOR THE ERECTION OF APPROPRIATE TRAFFIC OR PARKING SIGNS OR DEVICES

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 8-103 of the Code of Ordinances of the Village of Martin's Addition, when it is deemed appropriate, necessary, or advisable for the public good, safety, and convenience to control or regulate vehicular or pedestrian traffic or parking, the Village Council may, by resolution, authorize the Village Manager to provide for the erection of "stop," "speed limit," "no-parking," and other traffic and parking control signs or other devices on public streets or other areas in the Village;

WHEREAS, the Village's traffic and parking signage consultant, Joseph Cutro, P.E., conducted a study of traffic, parking, and signage in the Village and concluded that many traffic, parking, and signage issues exist in the Village that should be addressed to promote the public good, safety, and convenience;

WHEREAS, Mr. Cutro provided a report and recommendation pertaining to the regulation of the traffic and/or parking and the installation or removal of control signs or other devices as described in the attached Traffic Orders;

WHEREAS, on the 27th day of September 2007, the Village Council conducted a public hearing regarding the proposal to regulate traffic and/or parking and the installation or removal of control signs or other devices described in the attached Traffic Orders;

WHEREAS, the Village Council gave notice to Village residents that this Resolution and the attached Traffic Orders would be considered at the aforesaid hearing;

WHEREAS, upon consideration of the criteria set forth in Section 8-103 of the Village Code, the report and recommendations of Mr. Cutro, and the testimony and evidence presented at the aforesaid hearing, the Village Council finds that it is appropriate, necessary, and advisable for the public good, safety, and convenience to control or regulate or cease to control or regulate vehicular or pedestrian traffic or parking by the erection or removal of the traffic and parking control signs or other devices as described in the attached Traffic Orders; and

NOW, THEREFORE, it is, this 27th day of September, 2007, by the Village Council:

RESOLVED, that the Village Manager be and is hereby authorized and directed to provide for the erection or removal of the traffic and parking control signs or other devices in accordance with the attached Traffic Orders, and it is further,

RESOLVED, that the foregoing Resolution shall become effective on the 27th day of September, 2007, and it is further,

RESOLVED, that written notice of the adoption of the foregoing Resolution shall be provided to Village residents in accordance with Section 502 of the Village Charter, and it is further,

RESOLVED, that the foregoing Resolution shall be permanently filed by the Secretary and kept available for public inspection.

I, Diane Everts, Secretary of the Village Council, hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Village Council in public session on the 27th day of September, 2007.

Diane Everts, Secretary
Village Council

L:\CLIENTS\P\Podolsky.Dav\CLIENT FILES\MARTINS ADDITIONS\Resolutions\359-Traffic Signs (8-103 Template).doc