

Approved 10/16/08

# MINUTES

**VILLAGE OF HINSDALE  
ZONING CODE REVIEW TASK FORCE  
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 1, 2008  
MEMORIAL HALL  
7:30 P.M.**

Task Force Member Finlay called the meeting to order at 7:37 P.M. Wednesday, October 1, 2008, in Memorial Hall Board Room, the Memorial Building, 19 East Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale, Illinois.

**PRESENT:** Task Force Member Finlay, Task Force Member Wood, Task Force Member Tuggle, Task Force Member Weil

**ABSENT:** Task Force Member Anglin

**ALSO PRESENT:** Timothy Bleuher, Director of Community Development, Arista Strungys, Camiros Consultant

---

## Minutes

The Task Force discussed the minutes from September 3, 2008. Mr. Weil motioned to approve the minutes as corrected from September 3, 2008. Mr. Tuggle seconded.

## Discussion

### **Discussion on Article Nine, Section 11-603 Planned Developments**

Mr. Finlay gave an overview of where the Task Force left off on their discussion of planned developments from the previous meeting. He stated this meeting would focus on the tech memo Ms. Strungys prepared.

Ms Strungys reported on the tech memo and stated it was previously submitted to the Task Force except for slight changes made as a result of discussion from the last Task Force meeting. She presented her changes on the preliminary plan section and also the concept plan. She also discussed other changes to the public amenities section, neighborhood meeting details, and notice details to upcoming meetings. Mr. Finlay questioned where the best place to give resident notice would work such as in the newspaper or mailings to residents. Ms. Strungys stated a sign on the property as well as a notice posted on the website would work the best with an option of a newspaper notice. She stated mailings could be a problem because of the task of obtaining all of the adjacent addresses and the backlash if a resident did not receive the mailing. Mr. Finlay stressed the need for resident notification and stated any type of notification would be beneficial to the Village and residents. The Task Force discussed alternative ways of notification. John Bohnen, Hinsdale resident, used an example of an electronic system to provide mailing that is constantly updated and should ensure correct mailing addresses. Ms. Strungys suggested to add a provision if a mailing was not received by a resident the meeting would not be considered invalid.

Ms. Strungys continued to go through the changes to the tech memo. The Task Force engaged in discussion regarding the financial aspect of the developer such as the financial arrangements and conditions of the developer as well as the issuance of a bond on a developer in case they experience

financial trouble. Ms. Strungys stated issuing a bond is generally not done in other communities or in a planned development. Mr. Bleuher used an example of an economic disclosure form that he has worked with in the City of Chicago and stated he would provide this to the Task Force to analyze. Mr. Bohnen questioned if performance bonds could be submitted to the Village to assure the developer could complete the project. He used the Hamptons of Hinsdale as an example. Mr. Tuggle stated this would not work economically and stated examples of why this idea would not work legally. Mr. Bohnen used examples of past projects in the City of Chicago that he was involved in and gave examples of their bonding process. Mr. Tuggle stated this would create problems and ultimately someone would have to take the project over whether another contractor was hired or the property was sold to another developer. He also questioned where the money to finish the project would come from. Mr. Bohnen stated the company that bonded the project would have to provide the additional funds to complete the project. Discussion between the Task Force Members ensued and the debate over the leverage of performance bonds and it was determined the Village Attorney would need to be consulted to take a look at the ins and outs of this possible procedure.

Ms. Strungys continued the discussion and began to look at the section where an independent consultant or third party appointed by the Village would be involved to review each project.

Ms. Strungys looked at the changes to the portion of the tech memo regarding the requirement of a scale model of each project proposed. She noted this must be determined at the concept plan to give the developer time to produce a model. She also stated this would be a good idea for large scale projects but smaller projects may not need a scale model due to their size or complexity.

The Task Force discussed aspects of the fiscal impact report and other aspects regarding the financing of the project. Mr. Bohnen used the Hinsdale Club Development as an example.

The Task Force discussed the organization of this section and what changes needed to be made to the wording to make it flow better. Mr. Bohnen used Hinsdale Club as an example and stated the primary tradeoff for 75 waivers was the revenue to the Village. He expressed his concerns and noted the justification of the waivers should guarantee the Village their portion of the tradeoff. Mr. Bohnen also questioned if this tradeoff would still be viable with the current downsizing changes taking place to the Hinsdale Club Development, which will ultimately produce less money to the Village.

Ms. Strungys gave a brief overview of the public amenities and benefits section in the tech memo. She explained the changes made and provided feedback to the changes the Task Force requested. Mr. Finlay questioned if the rezoning process would take place before the planned development application. Ms. Strungys stated this would be illegal because the right to apply for rezoning can be done at any time. The only request would be to keep the planned development hearing and the rezoning hearings separate. General discussion took place over the timeframe of the planned development public hearing and also the rezoning public hearing. Mr. Finlay suggested this is logical because if the rezoning were denied than the planned development would not get approved. Ms. Strungys provided feedback and stated she did not have a problem with this but to keep the public hearings separate from each other because a developer cannot ask for exceptions in a zoning district when that district does not exist on that property yet.

Ms. Strungys continued to discuss the tech memo. She referenced all of the standards included within the planned development such as site plan, exterior appearance, special use, etc. The Task Force discussed the one year time frame of the final plan submittal and if it was long enough. General discussion took place between the discrepancies between the preliminary, concept, and final plan and if there were differences should an approval still take place. They also looked at the procedure if all of the plans are the same and if certain meetings will still be necessary or if changes are made and than

the process that would follow. General discussion took place over the wording of certain sections of the memo.

Ms Strungys discussed the section regarding changes during construction in a planned development. She touched on comments made by the Task Force and offered solutions to clean the section up. She looked at the process for changing the plan and timeframe and discussed what changes would qualify for a developer to need to go through the whole planned development process again. Mr. Finlay questioned how the Village would handle major amendments that might be needed or requested by the developer and suggested changes to the wording of the tech memos. General discussion began between Ms. Strungys and the Task Force regarding what changes should be made to this section. Mr. Finlay also questioned if these changes would alter the development agreement, which could create a larger problem. The Task Force stated they would look into this question.

Mr. Finlay offered a timetable as to when the Task Force would present a final draft to the Zoning and Public Safety. Community Development Director Bleuher stated this would be considered a major text amendment and went through the process and meetings that would follow after the Zoning Rewrite Task Force was finished with their meetings.

### **New Business/Old Business**

Mr. Finlay stated he would like the ZRTF to take another look at signage because he felt the ZRTF did not get the chance to analyze it thoroughly. He also stated the only other possible agenda items for the ZRTF was to make sure the tech memos were complete with all changes made as a result of the discussions between Ms. Strungys and the ZRTF.

### **Adjournment**

With no further discussion, Mr. Tuggle motioned to adjourn at 8:50 p.m. Mr. Weil Seconded.

Respectfully Submitted,

Timothy Bleuher,  
Community Development Director