

Approved 9/3/08

MINUTES

**VILLAGE OF HINSDALE
ZONING CODE REVIEW TASK FORCE
THURSDAY, AUGUST 21, 2008
MEMORIAL HALL
7:30 P.M.**

Task Force Member Finlay called the meeting to order at 7:33 P.M. Thursday, August 20, 2008, in Memorial Hall Board Room, the Memorial Building, 19 East Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale, Illinois.

PRESENT: Task Force Member Finlay, Task Force Member Anglin, Task Force Member Tuggle, Task Force Member Jim Weil

ABSENT: Task Force Member Wood

ALSO PRESENT: Tim Bleuher, Community Development Director Bleuher, Arista Strungys, Camiros Consultant

Minutes

August 6th, 2008 forthcoming.

Discussion

Public Comments

Karl Webber, Hinsdale Resident, discussed that the Planned Development process is the most important section of the code in his mind and he wanted fellow Hinsdale residents to be educated on this section so the process has the entire Village's best interest in the re-write process.

John Bohnan, Hinsdale Resident, stated he agreed with Mr. Webber about the Planned Development Process. He questioned why there were not public hearings held at the Zoning and Public Safety for discussion of the Planned Development Process prior to discussion at the Zoning Re-Write Task Force Committee that was originally discussed in a 2007 ZPS meeting. He stated the content should stay the same and the only changes should be the format to make it easier for residents to read and follow. He also discussed a concern with an attempt to streamline the planned development process at Plan Commission and noted he thought this process should be even slower than it is today. He referenced the Village of Northbrook and how they handle their own PD process with their Zoning Board of Appeals sitting in on any Plan Commission meeting that is discussing a PD. Mr. Bohnan also discussed major adjustments to Planned Developments, such as Hinsdale Club, and how developers could take advantage of the system. He also noted problems with the term length of a Plan Commission member as he thought it should be at least four years instead of the present three. Mr. Bohnan offered ideas to increase public awareness of new planned developments such as mandatory scale models to be submitted or longer time frames in between meetings so the public has a chance to review the application.

Task Force Member Finlay questioned whether Northbrook included their Zoning Board of Appeals in the Planned Development process because he was unable to find it written in their code. Mr. Bohnan stated this is a procedure that it is not written in their code but it is a procedure they follow. Task

Force Member Finlay also discussed that anything found by this Task Force is subject to a public hearing. He also referenced discussions from the last Zoning Rewrite Task Force Meeting such as the separation of potential zoning changes linked to Planned Developments.

Camiro's Technical Memorandums

Arista Strungys gave a brief overview of the comments that Camiros has made to the planned development section. She looked at the purpose statement and discussed the recommendations Camiros made such as certain word choices. She was concerned with changes made to the open space district requirements and stated generally open space is mandatory for Planned Developments that are primarily single-family residential developments. She stated other public benefits would be more sufficient than open space in commercial planned developments, and in certain cases, open space in these areas can become dead space because the residents do not use the area.

Arista continued to explain the comments and recommendations made by Camiros. She looked at lifestyle housing and car dealerships and stated they are a special use and not a planned development. She stated they would still go through the same process but this would get rid of them included within the planned development process. She noted to the committee that normally certain uses are not listed as planned developments because a planned development is considered its' own special use.

Karl Webber questioned that a planned development should consist of two or more building because otherwise a developer would always apply for a planned development in order to work around the code. Task Force member Finlay agreed with Mr. Webber but stated there are also other ways to regulate this section which could be forwarded to the Village Board for review. Arista stated a planned development is sometimes a loophole for variances. She stressed the importance for a strong and detailed planned development section and also zoning code regulations because of this reason.

John Bohnan discussed a newspaper article from 1994 regarding planned developments. He stressed how the planned development process must look good on paper but also work in the real world.

Arista continued to explain the comments made by Camiros. She touched on public amenities and benefits. She referenced how the community of Park Ridge handled this section and how their language was very readable and easy to follow. She discussed the issues with common open space such as what exactly qualifies as common open space and what developments are required to provide common open space. She stated requiring this open space in certain situations would be inappropriate.

The Zoning Rewrite Task Force went over Task Force Member Wood's comments regarding planned development such as certain dialogue and content that seemed to repetitive. Karl Webber expressed his concerns with having two different regulations for planned developments in certain zoning districts. He stated that there is no need for planned developments in the B-2 Business district. Task Force Member Anglin offered his thoughts on how to remedy this situation. General discussion between the Task Force Members took place.

Planned Development Procedures

Jeff Finlay questioned why there was a concept plan, a detailed plan, and than a final plan for a planned development. Task Force member Tuggle stated Northbrook's process, although written by the same attorney, seemed to flow more logically than Hinsdale's current planned development process. Task Force Member Anglin gave detailed differences between Northbrook and Hinsdale's planned development process and concept plan. General discussion took place between the Task Force Members. Arista and the Zoning Rewrite Task Force looked at different ways to create a more

efficient process such as creating pre application meetings with Village staff to clear up confusion and also to add a mandatory neighborhood meeting to help spread awareness of the incoming application and to answer any questions residents may have. Community Development Director Bleuher agreed and stated he would like to see a more stringent process conducted for planned developments. He discussed that changes to the plan should be made early on because they are much easier to make rather than at the end of the process. The Task Force agreed these extra steps would act as a screening process. Jeff Finlay questioned the amount of time allotted between each meeting. Community Development Director Bleuher stated that both the applicant and staff would both be affected under the time constraints. The Zoning Rewrite Task Force opened up general discussion over administrative items such as determining public amenities

Jeff Finlay opened up a discussion regarding major and minor adjustments to planned developments. Community Development Director Bleuher stated the process is longer for major adjustments. Discussion ensued between the Task Force Members about how narrowly defined these sections are currently written such as what qualifies for a major or minor adjustment to a planned development. The Zoning Rewrite Task Force asked questions such as, "if I move my building a foot or ten feet, where would that qualify."

Karl Webber questioned whether a scale model should be on display before the public hearings take place because residents sometimes can not get a good sense of what the building will actually look like from the drawings. General discussion took place over alternatives to a model were discussed because of the expensive cost that could arise from creating a scale model.

Zoning Rewrite Task Force Member Finlay questioned the role of the Zoning Board of Appeals in the planned development process. He stated he was unaware of any other communities except for Northbrook, which was not mandatory and was not actually documented in the zoning code. John Bohnan stated in the past Village staff provided information that was misleading and sometimes incorrect. He felt that the Zoning Board of Appeals would be more qualified to handle planned developments because they are dealing with the zoning codes on a daily basis. He also felt that certain members of the Plan Commission do not feel comfortable with the zoning code. Community Development Director Bleuher stated that it would be hard for both parties to get together on one night so he suggested that possibly a member of the Zoning Board of Appeals be present during the initial staff reviewal phase. Zoning Rewrite Task Force Member Finlay offered his thoughts on the cautions of incorporating the Zoning Board of Appeals in the planned development process.

Community Development Director Bleuher discussed engineering standards for infrastructure improvements that will be brand new in the Municipal Code. He stated the Village would no longer have to rely on the Illinois Department of Transportation's standards.

Adjournment

With no further discussion, Task Force Member Tuggle motioned to adjourn at 9:10. Task Force Member Anglin Seconded.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tim Bleuher,
Community Development Director Bleuher