

# MINUTES

**VILLAGE OF HINSDALE  
ZONING CODE REVIEW TASK FORCE  
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 15, 2008  
MEMORIAL HALL  
7:30 P.M.**

Task Force Member Finlay called the meeting to order at 7:36 P.M. Wednesday, October 15, 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, Task Force Member Anglin

**ABSENT:** None

**ALSO PRESENT:** Sean Gascoigne, Village Planner, Arista Strungys, Camiros Consultant

---

## Minutes

The Task Force discussed the minutes from October 1, 2008. Mr. Tuggle motioned to approve the minutes as corrected from October 1, 2008. Ms. Wood seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

## Discussion

### **Public Comments**

Mr. Bohnen questioned the ability to bond as discussed in previous meetings. Ms. Strungys, Camiros Consultant, stated the Village Attorney indicated that bonding is not a possibility because the Village cannot interfere with some types of ownership or with private property affairs. Mr. Bohnen disagreed and while it may not be able to be put in the Zoning Ordinance, it could be placed in the development agreement. The Task Force agreed to follow up on this subject when more information was available.

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

Ms. Wood asked where the Task Force Members stood on the subject of public meetings and public hearings. Discussion ensued regarding the process for a public hearing. Village Planner Gascoigne gave a detailed summary on the differences between each meeting and procedural steps taken for a public hearing and public meeting. The Task Force discussed the difficulty of notifying residents and businesses within 250 feet. Village Planner Gascoigne explained that the process for notifying neighboring properties involved notifying the taxpayer of record and stated this burden is on the petitioner. Mr. Bohnen disagreed and indicated that the mailing is far less complicated and also gave an example. Village Planner Gascoigne stated Mr. Bohnen's idea could work but he would have to check with the Village Attorney for legal reasons because he was under the impression the mailer needed to go to the taxpayer of the property and not just the occupant/resident of the property. The Task Force requested staff to confirm these legal questions.

The Task Force discussed signage on property required for public hearings and if these signs were adequate. They discussed if the date should be listed on the sign and if other details are necessary. Village Planner Gascoigne would confirm the details of the sign.

The Task Force discussed issues regarding specific language for traffic circulation and drainage plans and whether consideration should be given public utilities in addition to the Village and private utilities. Mr. Finlay requested that we have them indicate where public utilities will be located; he used power and telephone lines as an example. General discussion took place between the Task Force Members and staff over what jurisdiction the Village could have over each of these types of utilities.

The Task Force continued to discuss changes to the revised report Ms. Strungys prepared. Ms. Wood questioned the wording of certain sections of the detailed drawing portion of the document and asked for clarity regarding time frames. Ms. Strungys offered her thoughts and noted she would change the language to make it clearer.

Ms. Strungys recommended a year because the current time frame of 3 months is too short. The Task Force confirmed and stated most developers need a time extension in order to complete the final plan. Discussion continued over the time frame and length needed for denials and resubmittals. Ms. Wood questioned if it was a different plan could the petitioner bring it back sooner. Ms. Strungys confirmed this was true.

The Task Force discussed landscaping and the visual impact that can come from this section. Mr. Weil suggested removing the section, which states absolute plant species and numbers of each plant need to be provided in the landscape plan. Ms. Strungys stated she could add a provision that would allow the developer to be flexible but also maintain the general design in the landscape plan. Village Planner Gascoigne suggested that this flexibility is very important because in the case of large developments the supply of plants in nurseries may not be enough to satisfy the landscaping plan and alternatives will be needed to finish the job. Ms. Strungys stated she would make the necessary changes.

Ms. Wood expressed concerns with the Village Board Action and Final Plan. The Task Force discussed this section as well as the requirements in the PD conformance section. She discussed issues with changes that could take place between the preliminary plan and the final plan and the impact this could have on the Village. Discussion took place between the Task Force Members over this subject and they questioned what waivers and exceptions should be granted regarding building coverage and the wording that should be used in this section. Ms. Strungys stated she would make minor changes to the wording in order to clear up any confusion. She also stated despite these waivers the project would still need to follow all of the regulations of the Zoning Code. Discussion continued over the regulation and wording of this section to clear up any confusion. Using the Garfield project as an example, Mr. Bohnen questioned when a project is technically denied. He also requested that this language be cleaned up to avoid any contention; he used the Garfield project as an example again. Discussion continued as how to word this section. Mr. Bohnen questioned whether the development agreement is one in the same with the ordinance and should be complete by this point. Mr. Finlay summarized the discussion and the changes the ZRTF wanted to make.

Ms. Wood expressed concerns with major and minor changes to a planned development going the ZPS Committee rather than the Plan Commission. Discussion ensued regarding major and minor changes to a planned development. Mr. Finlay continued to discuss the procedural process and asked for elaboration in the “after construction” section. Ms. Strungys stated she would add the necessary text to clear up any confusion.

Mr. Finlay recommended to summarize the findings of the ZRTF and questioned when to schedule a meeting for the ZPS Committee. Discussion ensued regarding where to proceed and what steps will follow after this meeting. Mr. Bohnen expressed concerns with Trustee Orlor making comments on public hearings at ZPS. Mr. Finlay stated this process requires a public hearing and summarized the

findings of the meetings and documents Ms. Strungys presented to the Task Force. He also discussed items that should be on the agenda for the next ZRTF Meeting.

**Adjournment**

With no further discussion, Mr. Tuggle motioned to adjourn at 9:06 p.m. Mr. Weil Seconded.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sean Gascoigne,  
Village Planner