

VILLAGE OF WESTERN SPRINGS, ILLINOIS

PLAN COMMISSION MEETING

October 28, 2025 -- 7:00 P.M.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS taken at the Western
Springs Village Hall, 740 Hillgrove Avenue, Western
Springs, Illinois, reported by Hailey M. Schoot, an
Illinois Certified Shorthand Reporter, License
Number 084-004897.

PRESENT:

PETER GLIMCO, Chairman
MICHELE JOHANN, Member
PATRICK TURNER, Member
RYAN DEPROSPERIS, Member
PETER HANSON, Member
STEVE WINEGAR, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

HEATHER VALONE, Director of Community Development
KELSEY FAWELL, Senior Planner
ANNE SKRODZKI, Village Attorney
ELLEN BAER, Village Manager
HEIDI RUDOLPH, Village President

1 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: I would call to order the
2 October 28th meeting of the Plan Commission. On
3 the agenda tonight we have -- I don't have the
4 agenda in front of me, but we have approval of the
5 minutes from last meeting.

6 DIRECTOR VALONE: Oh, I'm going to roll call
7 just really quick.

8 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Okay. We're going to --
9 okay. We'll do roll call first.

10 DIRECTOR VALONE: All right. Brumbaugh is
11 absent.

12 DeSprosperis?

13 COMMISSIONER DEPROSPERIS: Here.

14 DIRECTOR VALONE: Hanson?

15 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Here.

16 DIRECTOR VALONE: Johann?

17 COMMISSIONER JOHANN: Here.

18 DIRECTOR VALONE: Turner?

19 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Here.

20 DIRECTOR VALONE: Winegar?

21 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: Here.

22 DIRECTOR VALONE: And Chairman Glimco?

23 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Here.

24 DIRECTOR VALONE: We have a quorum.

1 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Excellent. Tonight we are
2 going to go through the minutes from last meeting,
3 we're going to open it to public comment for
4 anything other than the matter that we will
5 consider tonight, which is the public hearing on
6 PC 2025-04, The Village of Western Springs
7 Community Development Department Text Amendments,
8 we'll move on to other business and then we will
9 adjourn.

10 With that I would open it up to a
11 motion for an approval of the October 6th, 2025
12 minutes.

13 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Motion to approve.

14 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: All those in favor?

16 (Chorus of ayes.)

17 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Moving on to public comment.

18 If anyone from the public wishes to
19 make a comment about anything other than the matter
20 under consideration tonight, now would be the time.

21 Hearing none, I would move on to the
22 matter under consideration tonight.

23 Could I get a motion to open up the
24 public hearing on PC 2025-04 The Village of Western

1 Springs Community Development Department Text
2 Amendments?

3 COMMISSIONER JOHANN: Motion to open.

4 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Is there a second?

5 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Second.

6 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: All in favor?

7 (Chorus of ayes.)

8 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: I would assume, at this
9 point, we would hear from Staff.

10 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yes, but first off --

11 ATTORNEY SKRODZKI: Can I just state for the
12 record the hearing that we're here before tonight,
13 I have received the affidavit of notice, so we are
14 here for a public hearing regarding text amendments
15 to the Village's Development Control Ordinance and
16 those have been publicized in all of the ways
17 required by local and state law.

18 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Thank you, Anne.

19 ATTORNEY SKRODZKI: Thanks.

20 DIRECTOR VALONE: All right. Well I'll get
21 started out by also saying I want to thank the Plan
22 Commission for their commitment over the last
23 couple of years. I know we have had a lot of cases
24 come through in the last almost three years and you

1 guys have been really busy and you're a wonderful
2 group of volunteers and I just want to say thank
3 you. I know having a double meeting this month,
4 too, was a lot, so I just -- on behalf of myself
5 and Kelsey and, I think, Staff, we just want to say
6 thank you for your commitment and we appreciate you
7 guys being here with us tonight and chatting about
8 text amendments.

9 So Kelsey is going to start. She is
10 going to go through basically kind of a similar
11 overview as your memo, we're going to -- we'll stop
12 along the way with each one. So we'll kind of go
13 through each topic, stop along the way for each
14 one, we'll get a recommendation that way. It is
15 very possible -- there's a lot of text amendments
16 on here. We haven't done text amendments in a
17 while and there's some things on here that it's
18 very possible that we may need to go to a second
19 meeting. If we do, that's fine. I think we'll
20 also talk at the end of the meeting, too, about
21 kind of maybe some future meetings related to the
22 Plan Commission and kind of just what we look like
23 going into the new year.

24 So Kelsey is going to kick us off and

1 kind of chat about a few of out text amendments.

2 MS. DEN BESTEN: I'm sorry. May I ask a
3 question? Earlier you said public comment was for
4 things other than this.

5 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Correct.

6 MS. DEN BESTEN: Are you allowing for public
7 comment during this?

8 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: We will.

9 MS. DEN BESTEN: Okay.

10 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Yeah. After we hear from
11 the staff and after the commissions kind of talk
12 about each issue we'll open it up for public
13 comment.

14 MS. DEN BESTEN: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: And maybe that's a good
16 point, ma'am. Maybe we should swear people in
17 collectively now.

18 ATTORNEY SKRODZKI: Sure. I can do that.

19 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Anyone who thinks they might
20 be talking tonight and who does want to ask a
21 question, why don't you stand up now.

22 Anne, do you want to swear them in.

23 ATTORNEY SKRODZKI: I can do that.

24 (Members of the public sworn.)

1 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Thank you, Anne.

2 MS. FAWELL: All right.

3 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Kelsey, no pressure, but we
4 can get this done tonight.

5 MS. FAWELL: Yes. Well, let's aim high, shall
6 we?

7 Okay. So as Heather stated, this is
8 an application by the Community Development
9 Department. We are proposing a myriad of code
10 amendments to the Development Control Ordinance
11 related to general development, residential,
12 commercial, and mixed use regulations.

13 Our current DCO was adopted in 1993.
14 We amended it regularly since that date kind of
15 here and there for specific instances, but this
16 would be one of the more extensive overhauls in
17 recent years.

18 Okay. So first things first, we'll
19 talk about the residential amendments that are
20 proposed. So currently our code does not really
21 have anything for minor variations or minor
22 administrative adjustments is what we're referring
23 to it as. So this is a process that we are
24 proposing can be done administratively for minor

1 variations, which I will go through which specific
2 types of variations that would be for. This --
3 going through this process would not mean that the
4 community development director gets final say so,
5 it would require that notification go to
6 neighboring property owners within 150 feet to give
7 them the chance to comment on the application like
8 they would if it were a standard variation going
9 through the Board of Zoning Appeals.

10 So, again, this is proposed for just
11 minor variations. For replacement of existing
12 detached garages that are too close to the property
13 line, they can be replaced within the existing
14 location, provided they're not closer than one foot
15 to the lot line. Allowing porches to encroach six
16 foot into the required front yard as opposed to the
17 code's maximum of five feet currently, and then
18 also allowing for 100 square foot adjustments to
19 building coverage and gross floor area.

20 These situations are something that
21 Staff kind of sees regularly. We -- it's not
22 uncommon for us to see garages that an applicant or
23 a homeowner is trying to replace and they're too
24 close to the lot lines. This is also something

1 that is similar to our neighbors. We looked at
2 communities like La Grange that has a very similar
3 process. So this would be in line with some of the
4 variations that we have granted, this ordinance, so
5 trying to streamline this for residents.

6 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: And why don't we break these
7 down and get through them, like make a
8 recommendation on this item right now, open it up
9 to public comment, if that works?

10 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yeah, that's exactly --

11 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Were you done with your
12 presentation?

13 MS. FAWELL: For this one, yes.

14 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Commissioners, do you have
15 any questions about this particular one?

16 DIRECTOR VALONE: And just to clarify really
17 quick. So the replacement of the garages with
18 setbacks that are less than required feet would
19 only be if they're existing garages. It would not
20 allow somebody who is already code compliant to
21 then not be code compliant.

22 We have had instances where, as
23 Kelsey mentioned, that somebody has applied to
24 replace their garage, but then when they were

1 actually out on the field doing it, they put it
2 right back where it was supposed to be and then
3 they either had to tear them up or come through the
4 variation process.

5 So, again, the garages would only be
6 if they were existing. It wouldn't allow somebody
7 who didn't have the situation before to then have
8 it now.

9 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Yeah. I guess, you know, my
10 only question -- I think this is great and I think
11 making things that typically get approved
12 streamlined for our residents is efficient, we
13 should be doing that. I have no problems. I guess
14 what happens if you deny it and the resident
15 doesn't like it? Is there a due process or a
16 hearing then or do they just have to go back
17 through the normal channels?

18 DIRECTOR VALONE: They would just be able to
19 go through the Zoning Board of Appeals process.

20 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Okay.

21 DIRECTOR VALONE: And our Zoning Board of
22 Appeals is the final say on variations. So that
23 would -- there wouldn't be, like, another
24 intermediate step for them, they would go straight

1 to that process.

2 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Great.

3 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: I have a questions.

4 So, hypothetically, you have a garage
5 that is three feet from the property line and the
6 ordinance is five feet. Are you allowed to
7 completely tear that garage down, including the
8 foundation and put an entirely new structure in
9 that space that your old one occupied?

10 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Yeah.

11 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: Is that clear in the
12 way the ordinance is written? Okay. Are you
13 allowed to make it taller?

14 DIRECTOR VALONE: Mm-hmm.

15 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: Increase the volume?

16 DIRECTOR VALONE: Not above what the code
17 allows, which is a maximum of 14 to the mean point
18 of the hip or the gable roof, but it would allow
19 you, if you were building a taller garage, to meet
20 requirements.

21 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: So within the current
22 ordinance volume --

23 DIRECTOR VALONE: Correct.

24 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: -- would stay the same?

1 Okay. Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Any other questions,
3 Commissioners?

4 Is there anyone from the public that
5 wanted to talk about this particular text change?

6 MS. DEN BESTEN: Yes. The way it's --

7 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Would you do me a favor?

8 MS. DEN BESTEN: I'm sorry.

9 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Would you just state --

10 MS. DEN BESTEN: Yeah. It's Lisa -- Lisa --

11 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: -- your name and spell your
12 last name for the record?

13 MS. DEN BESTEN: It's capital D-e-n
14 B-e-s-t-e-n. First name Lisa. First name Lisa.
15 5305 Commonwealth.

16 I have been in your shoes, late 1990s
17 in the Plan Commission and then I was on the
18 Village Board after that, so I know your pain if
19 you're having two meetings in one month.

20 Anyway, so I am familiar with the
21 DCO, and maybe there have been some modifications
22 since then, I'm sure, but, in any case, the garage
23 thing, just -- it wasn't clear the way it was in
24 what I read. Okay? And I looked for garage

1 references in the DCO and I didn't come up with a
2 whole lot. So what I'm wondering about if it needs
3 to be clarified if the garage is currently less
4 than five feet from the property line, can they go
5 to one foot from the property line or is it to
6 whatever the existing garage is at?

7 DIRECTOR VALONE: It would be the existing.

8 MS. DEN BESTEN: Okay. Because, to me, that
9 didn't seem very clear. It just sounded like --

10 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Yeah. If you look -- are
11 you looking at Paragraph A under -- on page 191,
12 245, it says, "the required setback for detached
13 garage. An administrative variation to allow an
14 existing detached garage accessory to a single
15 family detached dwelling to be renovated or
16 replaced in it's existing location."

17 MS. DEN BESTEN: Okay.

18 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: "No closer than one foot" it
19 goes on to say.

20 MS. DEN BESTEN: Okay. So I was thinking
21 about a scenario where, let's say, two next door
22 neighbors both have nonconforming, so then it
23 sounds like, in that scenario, it's highly unlikely
24 they would both be one foot away, because that

1 would only be two feet between the two garages,
2 so --

3 DIRECTOR VALONE: Well, and additionally, too,
4 it would not allow them to encroach on their
5 neighbors property, like, from an air perspective
6 either. So, hypothetically, if they were putting
7 in something that was one foot from the garage and
8 they were going to include eaves, they would likely
9 have to move the property because then that would
10 be encroaching on the air rights of their
11 neighbors. So it would not allow any sort of new
12 encroachment on to a neighboring property. In that
13 case they would still have to likely move it back,
14 but it would still maybe then allow them to only be
15 shifting it a few feet where opposed to the
16 existing garage was. We have a lot of these
17 garages -- detached garages that are being replaced
18 now that don't really have eaves or gutters, but
19 they're becoming very attractive in having eaves
20 and gutters and things and so, even in that case,
21 they would still have to shift over, but it may not
22 necessarily mean they have to go the full five
23 feet, right, if their garage has been sitting,
24 let's say, two and a half feet from the property

1 line before.

2 MS. DEN BESTEN: Okay. Now, what if it is,
3 for example, one foot or even two feet and the
4 neighbor wants to the up a fence, so there would be
5 a fence, and then the garage would be one foot
6 away, and then who would take care of that, you
7 know what I mean? You wouldn't be able to get in
8 there to clean up and there would be leaves
9 collecting there and garbage and who knows what in
10 that one foot space. I mean, how do you handle a
11 possibility of that?

12 DIRECTOR VALONE: Sure. I mean, we have
13 existing garages in town that are, in fact, less
14 than -- actually less than one foot from the
15 property, so we do have this existing condition.
16 Again, the process would allow the neighbor to
17 object. So if the neighbor have a reasonable
18 objection to something, say the drainage or a
19 concern like that, that would be something that
20 would then stop the process. Generally, though,
21 you know, what we're seeing a lot of people are
22 putting kind of -- when they don't have a lot of
23 area they're putting kind of low maintenance things
24 in that area, so things that don't necessarily need

1 to be trimmed all the time. We're also seeing,
2 occasionally, the use of stone, which does count to
3 our lot coverage, but we are seeing people also do
4 that.

5 So, again, neighbors would be allowed
6 to object and if they had a reasonable objection,
7 right, to the actual issue, then that would be
8 something that could stop a process, which is the
9 same of a BZA hearing as well.

10 MS. DEN BESTEN: Okay. If you guys are
11 comfortable with it. Okay.

12 MS. FAWELL: And also I want to point out that
13 this would not negate it going through the typical
14 building permit process, so it would be reviewed by
15 engineering and our building code officials, so if
16 there is a situation where the residential code
17 requires some additional improvements due to how
18 close it is to the property line, that will be
19 considered as part of --

20 MS. DEN BESTEN: Yeah, I saw that. Yeah.

21 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: I have another
22 question. Going back to eaves and gutters, your
23 measurement of where the current garage sits is to
24 the wall?

1 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Yes.

2 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: So is there any
3 provision on here -- and since we're allowing up to
4 one foot if they design a new structure, with eaves
5 and gutters, clearly that needs to stay within
6 their property line, but La Grange has a very
7 detailed eave restriction on detached garages. I
8 can't remember the details because it has been a
9 little while, but they did address that issue. So
10 do we want to allow new -- a new design to have
11 eaves that could -- and including the gutters --
12 potentially be right on the property line or not?

13 DIRECTOR VALONE: So, again, in that situation
14 they can't encroach on to their neighbors property.
15 Additionally, if they have an existing garage and
16 their design dictates that they would need to then
17 be further away from the line, again, that would be
18 something that would come through during permitting
19 process. When somebody were to submit an
20 application, for example, we would be reviewing it
21 as a building permit process, right? And so if
22 their design dictated it would have to be further
23 away, it would have to be further away then. They
24 wouldn't be able to, you know, cause any sort of

1 nuisance to the neighbor. And, again, the neighbor
2 would have the ability to be notified, get provided
3 a copy of the plans and make their request.

4 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Let me ask it a different
5 way, Steve's question, because you're going to be
6 the director of community development, presumably,
7 that will hear this request.

8 Is it likely that you're going to
9 grant a request where an eave is going to be at the
10 property line of its neighbor or would you have
11 reservations about doing so?

12 DIRECTOR VALONE: So it would also depend a
13 little bit on engineering as well, too. For
14 example, if there was a reason that additional
15 water being over there would be an issue, that
16 would be something we would have to look at. We
17 would have to look at the gutters as well, so
18 it's -- the --

19 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: I think it would be site
20 specific.

21 DIRECTOR VALONE: I think we're getting a
22 little bit pigeonholed on the one foot aspect.
23 What we're basically saying is that, you know,
24 we're allowing something that's less than five

1 because we have existing garages that are near the
2 property line. In the case of the eaves, too,
3 again, like if they were to generate a nuisance to
4 part of the neighbor or violate a different part of
5 our building code or engineering code, then that
6 would also impact their design and they would have
7 to shift it. But, again, it wouldn't necessarily
8 mean they have to go the full five feet, right, it
9 might be shifting them, you know, a foot over for
10 the gutter and eave overhang.

11 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: So where I was leading
12 is I was suggesting that maybe we make that one
13 existing building setback include any eaves and
14 gutters.

15 DIRECTOR VALONE: We could do that.

16 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: So, in other words,
17 like start with gutter line, figure out
18 architecturally what they want to see and maybe the
19 walls would have to move further in to accommodate
20 that design and still allow for at least one foot
21 between the edge of the gutter and the property
22 line.

23 DIRECTOR VALONE: We'll work up some language
24 on that. I think our building official would be

1 good to help us working on that just because I
2 wouldn't -- I also wouldn't want it to be -- if for
3 some reason someone had a really ornate -- let's
4 say somebody had an existing eave, like an 18-inch
5 eave, right, I wouldn't want them to think that
6 that would then be where they could further place
7 that structure, right, because that would be then
8 much closer to the property line but still meeting
9 the -- and they ended up going with someone that
10 didn't have eaves or gutters, let's say, for
11 example. So I wouldn't want somebody to be able to
12 exploit that either, but I do think it is a good
13 point --

14 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: Having been an
15 architect in this town for a long time, I know
16 exactly how -- you know, you have to manipulate
17 your design to accommodate the code restrictions,
18 so it wouldn't be unreasonable to ask the designer
19 to go no closer than arbitrarily one foot to the
20 property line with a new design.

21 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yeah. I think we could
22 update the language just to say the replacement of
23 garage setbacks including wall foundation and eave
24 and gutter.

1 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: And/or.

2 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yeah. Okay.

3 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: Yeah.

4 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: That works for me.

5 DIRECTOR VALONE: Anything else on the other
6 sections? The porch or the square footage of
7 building coverage or the adjusted gross square --
8 excuse me -- gross floor area.

9 Generally what we're trying to get at
10 there is we have a lot of our older homes are
11 looking to add like a mud room or a small addition
12 and they're already likely at our maximums and they
13 would have to make significant alterations to an
14 existing building to add a small addition. Also,
15 we get a lot of requests for six foot porches as
16 opposed to five. Five is hard to put furniture on,
17 six gives you a little bit more leeway to be able
18 to make that a more functional front porch.

19 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: Should we add some
20 verbiage about you only get one shot at 100 square
21 feet?

22 DIRECTOR VALONE: We could. We could, yes.

23 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: Because I can see
24 somebody taking their 100 feet, selling the house,

1 next owner wants to add another00 feet.

2 DIRECTOR VALONE: Well, so --

3 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: They can only go 100 over --

4 DIRECTOR VALONE: Right. 100 over the
5 calculation, right. So unless they increase the
6 lot size.

7 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: I don't think you need to
8 change that.

9 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yeah.

10 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: Okay.

11 DIRECTOR VALONE: I apologize. I thought you
12 were saying they could either only get building
13 coverage or only get gross floor area.

14 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Total of 100 beyond what's
15 allowed by code right now.

16 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: Right. I need to read
17 all the words.

18 DIRECTOR VALONE: It is long, which is why,
19 like I mentioned, if we --

20 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: So I'm going to pause here
21 and ask for a vote on this issue if there's a
22 motion.

23 Oh, I'm sorry.

24 MS. DEN BESTEN: I'm sorry. On the second

1 piece that Heather just brought up, if I may?

2 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Yeah. Please.

3 MS. DEN BESTEN: Does this include the part
4 about the first floor or second floor additions
5 with nonconforming --

6 DIRECTOR VALONE: Not there yet.

7 MS. FAWELL: No, this is a different section.

8 MS. DEN BESTEN: That's separate? Okay. All
9 right then. Sorry.

10 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: I would like to entertain a
11 motion if there's anyone so inclined.

12 DIRECTOR VALONE: So it would be a motion to
13 make some modification to include eave and gutter
14 and wall and there's an "or" in there to the garage
15 setbacks.

16 COMMISSIONER JOHANN: Motion to approve.

17 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Is there a second?

18 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: I second.

19 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: All those in favor?

20 (Chorus of ayes.

21 DIRECTOR VALONE: Do you want me to do a roll
22 call vote?

23 ATTORNEY SKRODZKI: Was there anyone opposed?

24 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: No.

1 ATTORNEY SKRODZKI: I thought I saw and heard
2 everyone there, but just for the record.

3 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Yes.

4 MS. FAWELL: Okay. Moving on to our next
5 residential amendment. So this is related to
6 non-conforming structures. So right now within our
7 code there's something called nonconformities. It
8 relates to use and also building and structure
9 where it essentially is referring to structures and
10 buildings that are not in compliance with the
11 zoning code, but may have been constructed prior to
12 the zoning codes development. So we have a number
13 of -- as Heather stated -- old homes in town that
14 were constructed long before our current DCO
15 regulations and --

16 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Kelsey, can you take it to a
17 page number?

18 DIRECTOR VALONE: I'll get you to a page
19 number when she's --

20 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Okay. I'm sorry.

21 MS. FAWELL: No worries.

22 And so as it relates right now in our
23 code where a property has a non-conforming wall
24 that encroaches into a corner yard, interior yard

1 or rear yard, any new encroachment, even if it's in
2 line with what's existing -- and I'll pull up a
3 graphic that will help clarify -- is required to go
4 through the Board of Zoning Appeals process because
5 it is a new encroachment into the yard that is
6 exiting and requires an approval of a variation.

7 So what Staff is recommending is that
8 vertical and horizontal extensions, when they are
9 constructed in line with a non-conforming wall for
10 the interior side, corner side, or rear yard, that
11 that is something that just can be approved via
12 Staff through the building permit process.

13 So here is an example on the screen.
14 This is an existing home in blue. That red line
15 that just appeared is the property's required 15
16 foot corner side yard. As you can see, the home is
17 within the corner side yard as it exists. If we
18 were to allow an addition to the home based off our
19 current code requirement, they would have to comply
20 with the required corner side yard and put that
21 addition in outside the corner side yard, so it's
22 not going to be in line with the house. What we
23 are proposing to amend the code is that this could
24 be granted an extension of that non-conforming wall

1 as long as it's in line with what's existing and
2 doesn't encroach further to the property line that
3 is existing. This would not apply for front yards.
4 This would only apply for interior side yards,
5 corner side yards and rear yards. If it is a front
6 yard extension it would require -- it would go
7 through the BZA process for a variation.

8 DIRECTOR VALONE: So in your red lines you're
9 going to go to the second to last page. So we're
10 looking at 10-93. It's right before Appendix B
11 gross floor area.

12 MS. FAWELL: And this is --

13 DIRECTOR VALONE: Let's pause and make sure
14 they get there.

15 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Page 219?

16 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yes, I believe it's 219.
17 We're going all the way back.

18 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Saying it another way,
19 you're grandfathering in existing setback
20 encroachments in the rear and side yards?

21 MS. FAWELL: Yes. So the property is already
22 technically grandfathered in, but it would be
23 allowing a new addition to follow in line with
24 that.

1 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: That is not unusual.

2 MS. FAWELL: Yes. That is probably one of our
3 more common variation requests is when people are
4 trying to add an addition that is extending their
5 side wall and into the side yard.

6 DIRECTOR VALONE: We would also propose it
7 would be first floor and then second floor as well.
8 So this --

9 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Commissioners, any
10 questions? I have no questions. This is pretty
11 straightforward. Does anyone -- this is the one
12 you wanted to comment on, I believe?

13 MS. DEN BESTEN: Yes. Thank you. I guess I
14 was just thinking about, okay, the neighbor on the
15 other side of the corner side yard, so when they
16 put the addition in, depending on sunlight and all
17 and trees and what not, couldn't that significantly
18 impede the neighbor's, you know -- what's the word
19 I want -- you know, well available sunlight, and
20 especially if it's closer?

21 DIRECTOR VALONE: I mean, there could be
22 impacts, but this does not allow them to deviate
23 from the rear setback, so they're likely still set
24 at least 20 to -- 25 to 30 feet away from that

1 neighbor. So it's probably -- I mean, there is
2 impacts, right, it does have closer, but I think
3 the actual amount of that impact is probably less
4 given how far of a setback away they would be.

5 This is one, too, that we had
6 considered could also be just an administrative
7 adjustment process if there were concerns about,
8 you know, situations somewhat like this if they
9 were very close. We have the benefit in kind of
10 looking at some of our aerial imagery in our
11 building footprints the County produces for us,
12 which have error in them, but, you know, are the
13 best data we can get our hands on. We don't
14 generally have a lot of homes that have an issue
15 with the rear setback. So we're not necessarily
16 seeing that so much, but we have a lot of older
17 homes that the lots got set down after they did or
18 we made changes to them after the fact, so -- or we
19 had people who buy neighboring lots and want to do
20 additions on the neighboring homes that were built
21 on 50 wide lots, but now are held to a ten-foot
22 setback. So...

23 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: So having to have had
24 to deal with this, small setbacks like six, eight

1 inches, maybe a foot, are a real pain to design
2 around when you encroach, you know, inches over,
3 but I'm not sure I want to give them carte blanche
4 for more significant setbacks. So if you have a
5 house that's within, say, three feet of the
6 property line, I'm not really wild about extending
7 that nonconformity or increasing that
8 nonconformity, I guess, with an addition. I do
9 think this (inaudible) owners for the neighbors.

10 DIRECTOR VALONE: So, again, we could switch
11 it to be an administrative adjustment so that we
12 would allow it, it just would need to come through
13 the process where the direct neighbors would have a
14 chance to provide discussion.

15 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Do you have any homes that
16 have a three foot setback?

17 DIRECTOR VALONE: We more ran into this when
18 it's more along the lines of inches. I can't say
19 for certain because the data that we can get that
20 would actually give us interior side yards is
21 just -- there's too much error related to that, but
22 in reviewing permits since I have been here and
23 since Kelsey has been here, it typically is more
24 along the lines of a foot. It's not necessarily

1 that we're seeing so many feet under it. We're
2 more seeing the inches.

3 COMMISSIONER DEPROSPERIS: Well, as it stands
4 now, if somebody wants to permit for an addition
5 and they already in a non-conforming zone and they
6 want to permit into this non-conforming zone, is
7 that 150 foot rule where the neighbors are
8 notified, does that apply?

9 MS. FAWELL: It goes through the variation
10 process.

11 COMMISSIONER DEPROSPERIS: Right.

12 MS. FAWELL: So -- and that would be a 250
13 foot notice requirement because it's a public
14 hearing.

15 COMMISSIONER DEPROSPERIS: So the neighbors
16 would know about this in the event that someone
17 would extend something on to a non-conforming --

18 DIRECTOR VALONE: Right. Currently, yeah,
19 they would have to go through the BZA process. We
20 have no other process.

21 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: I haven't read the DOC
22 in a while. Wasn't there a limitation in the
23 variance request of up to ten percent nonconforming
24 or something along those lines, one of the seven

1 things they have to meet?

2 DIRECTOR VALONE: There are limitations on
3 some of the variations that are -- BZA are
4 permitted to give, but if somebody wanted something
5 greater than that, they could always seek that from
6 the Village. Going through the BZA just like you
7 would see something from a --

8 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: So you're basically
9 making that ten percent a staff decision, but
10 beyond that I think I want them to go through the
11 variance process.

12 DIRECTOR VALONE: Okay. We could easily make
13 that update that it would be an administrative
14 adjustment of up to ten percent of the required
15 interior -- interior or corner side yard and then
16 they would get notice to the neighbors -- the
17 direct neighbors, right, 150 feet is probably about
18 three lots, kind of a three lot buffer, right?
19 Would that be --

20 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: Yeah, if it make it
21 easier for them to get -- not have to go through
22 the variance process to get that decision.

23 DIRECTOR VALONE: Right. It's much cheaper
24 and quicker.

1 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: And faster.

2 DIRECTOR VALONE: Okay. So we will make a
3 note to go back and add it to the administrative
4 adjustment process. If we could get -- if you want
5 to -- if you want to make a -- the recommendation
6 that you would recommend it being rolled into the
7 administrative adjustment process as discussed with
8 the ten percent, then we can make those changes.

9 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Steve has got this motion.

10 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: Uh...

11 DIRECTOR VALONE: So moved. So moved.

12 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Move to recommend.

13 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: So moved.

14 DIRECTOR VALONE: Can I get a second?

15 COMMISSIONER DEPROSPERIS: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: All those in favor --

17 DIRECTOR VALONE: Sorry. Was it --

18 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Who seconded it?

19 DIRECTOR VALONE: Ryan did?

20 COMMISSIONER DEPROSPERIS: Yeah.

21 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: All those in favor?

22 (Chorus of ayes.)

23 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Opposed?

24 (No response.)

1 ATTORNEY SKRODZKI: Thanks. Thank you.

2 DIRECTOR VALONE: All right. Give Kelsey just
3 a second. She is making some notes on her draft so
4 that we can go back and make those.

5 MS. FAWELL: Okay. So more with our
6 residential, our last kind of part of residential.

7 We did propose some minor amendments
8 to the accessory use table. Those are in your
9 packet related to rear yard accessory -- or rear
10 yard air conditioning units and fireplace
11 allowances. So those are standard and those are
12 more kind of came about with our building code
13 official about what he reviews.

14 DIRECTOR VALONE: So 10-4, that's going to be
15 in the start of your red lines.

16 MS. FAWELL: And then Staff has been
17 approached -- I did not mean to say it was the last
18 one.

19 DIRECTOR VALONE: We have a lot of them.

20 MS. FAWELL: We have a lot.

21 So we also are proposing some
22 regulations related to beekeeping on single-family
23 residential properties within the R1 and R2
24 district.

1 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Before we move on to
2 beekeeping, do you want us to make a recommendation
3 on the last one? It's very minor.

4 DIRECTOR VALONE: Sure. So essentially what
5 you're looking at in the start, so that's table
6 10-4 that's marked up. There are a lot of -- so
7 you're going to be heading to --

8 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Page 191, I think.

9 DIRECTOR VALONE: I believe 191, yes. I
10 apologize. For some reason on the digital one it's
11 not giving me the number right now, but, yeah, so a
12 number of those are just clean up items. So just
13 as an example, the first one that's listed there is
14 about air conditioners. We have a whole other
15 section below it that actually really regulates air
16 conditioners, but you don't know it, so we're
17 trying to update it to make sure that you have
18 those cross references. Also, there has been just
19 some minor changes in construction that we're
20 making recommendations to, like, for example, the
21 chimneys, for example, like no one has a 12 --
22 18-inch chimney anymore. They're having us direct
23 that fireboxes are at least, you know, 24 inches,
24 we don't really have fire escapes so much anymore

1 and when we have those it's also related to the
2 fire code and so we have requirements based on
3 that. So there are just some minor things within
4 here to kind of clean up a few items that are just
5 confusing. These are just really clarification
6 items.

7 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: I don't think these are
8 controversial.

9 DIRECTOR VALONE: Okay.

10 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: I would entertain a motion.

11 MS. DEN BESTEN: May I?

12 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Oh, go ahead.

13 MS. DEN BESTEN: Sorry.

14 The air conditioning one, if somebody
15 has an air conditioner, condenser, compressor in
16 their side yard or corner side yard, what happens?

17 DIRECTOR VALONE: So the 10-4(G) that we're
18 trying to add, that actually goes down to our
19 entire section on air conditioning units. So under
20 the current code if you have an existing air
21 conditioner in the side yard that does not meet the
22 side yard requirement and you can prove it was
23 there prior to when they changed the code related
24 to that, you can keep it, you got to screen it,

1 though. In theory, you could have an air
2 conditioner on the side of your house if you had
3 extra area outside of your setback. We have that
4 frequently, actually, where people will build in a
5 couple extra feet on the side to be able to tuck
6 those in or they'll build a little nook. So it is
7 possible they could and so actually --

8 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: This is the only one that
9 gets into the setback.

10 DIRECTOR VALONE: Right. So this is actually
11 precisely why we want to reference the lower code
12 section because it's far removed from it and we get
13 people all the time going I know we can do this, I
14 swear I saw this somewhere, and you're going, like,
15 six pages down from this table, so that's why we're
16 trying to just kind of put that reference in so
17 that people can find their way to whatever
18 requirements are.

19 MS. DEN BESTEN: That's excellent. Yeah.
20 Good. Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Is there a motion to clean
22 up Section 10.4 relating to air conditioners and
23 fireplaces?

24 COMMISSIONER TURNER: So moved.

1 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Second?

2 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: All those in favor opposed?
4 (Chorus of ayes.)

5 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Opposed?
6 (No response.)

7 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Thank you.

8 DIRECTOR VALONE: All right. Kelsey is going
9 to move on to beekeeping, and we actually -- I
10 believe we have somebody in the audience here who
11 is interested in speaking on this one.

12 MS. FAWELL: So Staff has been approached
13 within the past year from a resident, Tom, about
14 beekeeping. Tom provided public comment that was
15 included in your packet. Tom is also here if he
16 would like to speak, but as it stands the Village
17 does not allow residential beekeeping. So as part
18 of this application we did some research on
19 surrounding communities to find what was in line.
20 Some of our neighbors are a little bit more extreme
21 in their beekeeping like Clarendon Hills where you
22 can do it wherever, anywhere, which is interesting,
23 but this is only proposed for single family --
24 detached single family. There are proposed setback

1 requirements, requirements related to fencing and
2 flyway in case the bees escape, maximum quantity of
3 colony/hives, registration with the state and
4 building permit process.

5 DIRECTOR VALONE: So it's at the front of your
6 red lines. It's just below the --

7 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Page 194, I believe.

8 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yes.

9 So we kind of modeled this a cusp 3.
10 A little bit from Clarendon Hills, a little bit
11 from Elmhurst, a little bit from Lisle, and a
12 little bit from -- who am I forgetting? Skokie?

13 MS. FAWELL: Skokie.

14 DIRECTOR VALONE: Skokie.

15 So -- we allow chickens, and so,
16 again, we have had some interest in folks keeping
17 bees. This is just a proposal out of some
18 interest. Happy to, you know, chat a little bit
19 more about it. I have not worked for a community
20 that has kept bees, but, like I said, we reached
21 out to our peers and kind of chatted with them
22 about their process. Their process is very similar
23 to our chicken keeping where they get a permit to
24 have their hive and then they renew it every year.

1 This does require some additional monitoring and
2 registration with the state and then, of course,
3 there's the safety features Kelsey mentioned about
4 the hives.

5 So thoughts on this one? I know this
6 one is -- I mean, this one is very different from
7 our other ones, right? This is -- this would be a
8 change in our code.

9 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Has there been any noise
10 generated by the chickens that you know of?

11 DIRECTOR VALONE: You know, I have worked here
12 for three years and I have yet to receive a chicken
13 complaint.

14 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Oh, good.

15 DIRECTOR VALONE: I did hear, at one point,
16 one was loose, but it was caught very quickly, but
17 I -- I don't know. Actually, our former Village --
18 Deputy Village clerk notified us that there was a
19 loose chicken, but by the time we got there it had
20 gone home, it had been collected.

21 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: I would open it up to
22 commissioner questions. I'm not sure I even know
23 what to ask.

24 DIRECTOR VALONE: Any thoughts? Do we have

1 any -- you know, do we have any interest in bees,
2 folks?

3 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: I mean, the obvious
4 thoughts. I think this is just going to expose my
5 naivety, but there's people with bee allergies and,
6 like, kids and I guess if I had a child and they
7 had a bee allergy, I'm not so sure I would want
8 bees next door to me or even three doors down, but
9 I also don't have any knowledge of the hobby.

10 DIRECTOR VALONE: We do include getting
11 approval from the neighbor, being sensitive to the
12 fact that --

13 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: How far are you requiring --

14 DIRECTOR VALONE: The direct neighbor.

15 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Okay. Direct neighbors?

16 DIRECTOR VALONE: Right.

17 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: I would say we open it up to
18 be educated.

19 MR. KELLEHER: Hi. I'm Tom Kelleher. I live
20 at 4424 Clausen. I have been a Western Springs
21 resident for 39 years, probably longer than some of
22 you have been alive.

23 But, anyway, I am not a beekeeper.
24 Okay? I have friends who are and know people who

1 are. The closest guy was retired, but he had
2 bees -- three beehives in his backyard in Downers
3 Grove for years without any issues whatsoever and I
4 kind of got into what it is and I became
5 interested. I retired earlier this year, I thought
6 it would be something to do in retirement. My wife
7 raises monarchs, so something to counter her. And
8 I -- but I thought, first of all, it's Western
9 Springs, I better find out if it's legal and I
10 reached out last year and had some interaction with
11 Kelsey back and forth and I think it was
12 unofficially not allowed. Okay? I don't know if
13 there's any ruling on the books, but it was told
14 that anytime anybody asks they were told no, and if
15 I wanted to pursue it I was going to have to front
16 some money and, you know, come here, and I just
17 thought all right, if I have to fight the City
18 Hall, forget it, you know? And I kind of gave up
19 on the idea and then Kelsey reached out to me a few
20 weeks ago and said that it was going to be on the
21 agenda and I said oh, okay, well, that's
22 interesting, now I don't have to pay to come here
23 and talk.

24 So way back when I reached out to

1 the -- it's called the Cook Dupage Beekeepers
2 Association, so it's pretty much towns in Western
3 Cook County and Dupage of beekeepers and I talked
4 to the president of that association and he's a
5 very passionate guy who was all into it, you know,
6 willing to support the cause, and he talked about
7 coming here tonight, but he did not. He told me --
8 he said, "don't you try to talk about it because
9 you don't know anything about beekeeping" and I
10 said, "okay, neither does anybody here. I could
11 probably say anything I want here." But, anyway,
12 he was all passionate about it and he says, you
13 know, they got members in LaGrange and all over the
14 place. So he is very familiar with the whole
15 thing. He could probably answer all your
16 questions. I mean, that's a new one I heard,
17 anybody who ever talked about having an allergy to
18 a honeybee that's going to be an issue, but I don't
19 know enough about it to say --

20 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: I don't either.

21 MR. KELLEHER: -- good or bad. I got to say
22 it's good because otherwise I think it would be
23 outlawed everywhere. But, anyway, once again,
24 don't take that as the final answer, but I think --

1 and I saw this and I saw the list of rules. I
2 would like to defer to the association and see what
3 they collectively think of that before it actually
4 goes on record and how -- you know, what's there or
5 what's not there according to what they experience
6 all the time with the design. So I'm glad it's
7 being considered.

8 I gave Kelsey public comments, so I
9 went to the internet, did some research, and came
10 up with five pages of why beekeeping is good and
11 then there's pages also in there about what you
12 should do with your neighbors, and you can all read
13 it, it's all part of this, but it's pretty clear,
14 pretty understanding about the whole thing in
15 itself. I think, you know, people hear about
16 swarms, they hear about the bad things, but there's
17 really so many good things about it, you know, I
18 think you all know that. It's an endangered
19 species, et cetera, et cetera, so every little bit
20 any one person can do certainly adds up.

21 My wife released 200 monarch
22 butterflies this year. They say the population in
23 the country doubled last year, not just because of
24 her, but in good part because a lot of people like

1 her. Obviously everybody loves monarchs, they
2 don't sting, and usually honeybees don't either
3 unless you, you know, get in their way.

4 So, anyway, I thank you for your
5 time. I think it's something that should be
6 considered. I think it's overall a good thing.
7 And, like I said, I think -- Kelsey, I think I'll
8 take this information that you have in here and
9 pass it on to the association to see what they have
10 to say for some feedback to give to you. And, if
11 necessary, maybe we could get them to come and talk
12 if that meant something.

13 DIRECTOR VALONE: So under this we are
14 recommending, again, a restriction on number, a
15 setback, so they're not permitted to be inside.
16 They -- again, this flyway, this safety component.

17 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Can you describe what that
18 consists of, a flyway, is that a net? What are we
19 talking about?

20 DIRECTOR VALONE: It's almost like a fence
21 panel, essentially. What you want them to do is
22 have to force them to fly up in the air and not
23 just cut across, right? You want to force them up
24 in the air so they disburse and so that they don't

1 create a problem. That's why it's required to be a
2 certain six feet high -- oh.

3 COMMISSIONER DEPROSPERIS: It looks like a
4 silk fence type of --

5 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Okay. So there's --

6 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yeah, there are a number of
7 different ones you can do, but, again, the idea is
8 to force it up into the air so they can't swarm and
9 they disburse.

10 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Okay.

11 DIRECTOR VALONE: So it has to be a minimum of
12 six feet high, again, so you get them up high
13 enough, and they are not permitted to be closer to
14 the property lines at ten feet anywhere either, so
15 try to kind of keep them inside. General
16 maintenance, they have to keep them in good
17 condition, they can't just, you know, let them go
18 into disrepair. They have to -- if they have any
19 queens that are aggressive they have to manage that
20 themselves. It can't be for commercial generation
21 of honey, right, it should just be your own home.
22 They have to have water, that's more for the bees
23 than anything else.

24 Registration, so they must maintain

1 registration with the state of Illinois. The state
2 of Illinois has some requirements related to
3 beekeeping, so we would require them to show that
4 they are in compliance with that. Signage to let
5 the neighbors know they have hives, right?

6 Additionally, they would have to get a permit from
7 us to put some of these things in and make sure
8 that they're compliant with it and then, again,
9 within that, they have to submit written notice
10 from neighbors that about the property that they do
11 not object to having this there.

12 MR. KELLEHER: That's what the Downers Grove
13 law was, that it was legal unless you had neighbors
14 who took issue with it.

15 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yeah. So we looked at a
16 number of them. Like I said, we kind of saw some
17 that were, you know, I'll just say, less
18 restrictive and then some that were very
19 restrictive. We kind of leaned a little bit more
20 just toward more restrictive, more because we
21 don't -- you know, we don't have a lot of it yet.
22 Again, the DCO is a living document that we hope to
23 be more frequent in updating, not going three years
24 between, so it's something that could change, this

1 really could just be a pilot program if folks are
2 interested in allowing it.

3 COMMISSIONER JOHANN: Are there inquiries for
4 beekeeping from the town?

5 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: One.

6 COMMISSIONER JOHANN: Okay. Oh, that's right.
7 Yes. Yes. Yes.

8 DIRECTOR VALONE: But I will say that we do
9 know of at least two others that had bees, I don't
10 want to say "had." One may still have, I'm not
11 totally clear on. I think had.

12 COMMISSIONER DEPROSPERIS: Illegal bees.

13 MR. KELLEHER: ICE is going over there.

14 DIRECTOR VALONE: It's possible that we do
15 have some. I will say -- and I'll let Kelsey talk
16 about this because she did a ton of research on
17 this --

18 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Yeah, you guys did a lot of
19 research. Thank you for that.

20 DIRECTOR VALONE: Well, and she did a lot of
21 research into our current code, and the reason that
22 we didn't believe that bees were currently allowed
23 is because -- and I'm going to let Kelsey talk
24 about this because it's one of her favorite topics

1 of how they can be identified as being yours is
2 really a high requirement in our code.

3 ATTORNEY SKRODZKI: No, this is the funniest
4 thing you'll hear.

5 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yeah.

6 MS. FAWELL: The requirement for it to be
7 considered a domestic animal, it has to have a
8 collar identification and only domestic animals are
9 allowed on a property, so since the bee does not
10 have a collar, they are not allowed under the
11 current code.

12 DIRECTOR VALONE: So along with this we have
13 some minor modifications to the animal keeping part
14 of the code that doesn't require a public hearing,
15 that's just inside our code, so if you can
16 recommend it, we have some accompanying language to
17 go with that chapter to bring to the Board just to
18 show that they reflect each other.

19 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: And Staff is recommending
20 that we try this pilot program?

21 DIRECTOR VALONE: We are. We reached out to
22 Clarendon Hills and generally they have not really
23 had any complaints, and I would say they had the
24 least restrictive one that we looked at and they

1 have a number of registrations.

2 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Do you know how many bees
3 are in a colony, Tom?

4 MR. KELLEHER: Hundreds. I don't have an
5 exact answer, but I do know this: There are wild
6 hives all over town.

7 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Sure.

8 MR. KELLEHER: You got bees probably in trees,
9 maybe even in attics, you know, get in a house.

10 DIRECTOR VALONE: Hopefully not attics.

11 MR. KELLEHER: So, they're there.

12 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: They are.

13 Any discussion, Commissioners? Any
14 thoughts?

15 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: I think it's worth
16 trying. And I do know that there is at least one
17 person who probably still has a hive.

18 DIRECTOR VALONE: Okay.

19 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Adjacent neighbors that
20 receive notice or you require their permission --

21 DIRECTOR VALONE: Right. Notification is part
22 of the permit process.

23 COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- on the side, rear,
24 and across the street in the front?

1 DIRECTOR VALONE: So it would be what touches
2 the property lines. We didn't do across the
3 street. We could include across the street.

4 COMMISSIONER DEPROSPERIS: Probably has it as
5 the rear, right?

6 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Just rear and the sides.

7 ATTORNEY SKRODZKI: It's -- the language is
8 defined as "abutting." So anything that touches
9 the property line.

10 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Even that little corner.

11 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: If you're walking down
12 the sidewalk and you're allergic to bees, you might
13 want to know.

14 DIRECTOR VALONE: Well that's why they're
15 required to have signage.

16 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: At the front?

17 DIRECTOR VALONE: Well, right, they're
18 required to have signage on all sides notifying
19 that they have the area, that's correct.

20 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: Okay. Including the
21 front?

22 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yes.

23 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: Okay. Sorry. I
24 misunderstood.

1 MR. KELLEHER: That's better than a guard dog.

2 MS. DEN BESTEN: I just have --

3 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yeah, it must be posted on
4 all property -- oh, I'm sorry, Lisa.

5 MS. DEN BESTEN: No. No. It's okay.

6 DIRECTOR VALONE: It must be -- so it says
7 I -- or, excuse me, J, signage. Weather proof sign
8 no greater -- we should correct that. No
9 greater --

10 MS. DEN BESTEN: That's what I was going
11 to point out.

12 DIRECTOR VALONE: -- than 12 inches by 10
13 inches, must be posted on all property lines facing
14 abutting properties and outside of the (inaudible)
15 stating that they have a state registered beehive.

16 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: The way I read that
17 would be you have a rear neighbor and two side
18 neighbors, but you don't have an abutting neighbor
19 in the front.

20 DIRECTOR VALONE: Well, if it was a corner --
21 we have got a couple of these pie lots that this
22 would apply to, but we can easily just say --

23 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: You could clarify that.
24 That the would be a good --

1 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yeah.

2 MR. KELLEHER: I think from a practical point
3 of view they go up and out, and they don't go up
4 and out as a swarm, and I think -- and this is in
5 the details -- they'll go within, like, a three
6 mile radius, so, you know, they go up and they
7 spread out. So they're not, you know, necessarily
8 even in your yard, you know, when they're out
9 pollinating.

10 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: That's great.

11 DIRECTOR VALONE: Okay. So we'll clarify just
12 the abutting property with the signage.

13 Was there anything else we wanted to
14 modify in this one?

15 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: I don't think so. Motion?

16 COMMISSIONER DEPROSPERIS: So moved.

17 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Motion to approve.

18 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Second?

19 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: All those in favor?

21 (Chorus of ayes.)

22 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Opposed?

23 (No response.)

24 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Thank you.

1 Thank you, Tom.

2 MR. KELLEHER: Thank you.

3 MS. FAWELL: Okay. Now on to our next --

4 MR. KELLEHER: Excuse me. I don't mean to be
5 rude, but there's a world series going on. Thank
6 you.

7 MS. FAWELL: Thank you.

8 Okay. So now on to our last
9 amendment related to residential properties.

10 So currently our code has a
11 requirement of related to accessory uses and
12 structures that restricts the maximum coverage
13 within a rear yard to 35 percent of the rear yard,
14 and that applies to all properties within our
15 single family district. So if someone is going to
16 put a shed or a patio or a detached garage, all of
17 those contribute to the maximum coverage within a
18 rear yard.

19 Again, this also applies the same to
20 our corner and reverse corner lots and on the
21 screen you can see that with an interior lot the
22 rear yard runs the full width of the property, so
23 there's more rear yard area, there's more of that
24 35 percent coverage. With a corner property, the

1 corner side yard extends the width of the corner
2 lot line except for that front yard area and it
3 extends past that rear yard, so the rear yard does
4 not go all the way to the property line, so
5 effectively that overall rear yard area is
6 significantly smaller than what our interior lots
7 are seeing. So with our corner properties this is
8 something that I have kind of run into issues with
9 over the past year and a half is that when our
10 corner properties want to install a detached garage
11 on their property, they can't do it in the corner
12 side yard, that's against code, they have to move
13 it into the rear yard. When you implement that
14 35 percent coverage requirement, it effectively
15 fits the standard 50 foot, 100 foot lot. They're
16 barely going to fit a two car garage. And, again,
17 that's not going to exclude any other structures
18 they have back there or the driveway.

19 So Staff is recommending that that
20 coverage restriction be removed from the code as it
21 applies to corner and reverse corner lots. There
22 are still coverage requirements related to maximum
23 lot coverage for the entire property, 50 percent
24 maximum coverage related to driveways on the

1 property, those are still going to be in place, so
2 they're still going to have to meet that maximum
3 lot coverage, but since we have been running into
4 some issues with our corner lot properties meeting
5 this requirement, we're proposing that it be
6 removed.

7 DIRECTOR VALONE: So this is -- in your red
8 lines this is 10-4-4 accessory uses and structures
9 just below the table 10-4.

10 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: 193.

11 DIRECTOR VALONE: So we're just proposing to
12 exempt them. It does not change the fact that they
13 cannot put garages in the corner side yard, it just
14 means that -- effectively we did the math and
15 essentially it reduces the rear yard area by about
16 40 percent on a standard lot and so it makes it
17 really difficult for those folks to have the same
18 kind of accessory structures as the interior lots.
19 Doesn't change where the garage is going to be
20 placed, it likely isn't going to change what they
21 would put back there anyways, it would just make it
22 a little bit easier for them to be putting the same
23 structures their neighbors are but still hold the
24 coverage, still hold the setbacks, all the other

1 items.

2 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Commissioners, any questions
3 on this one?

4 DIRECTOR VALONE: I'm dying to know what Steve
5 has on this one because this is the one I thought
6 Steve would be really interested in.

7 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: Since we're encouraging
8 people to build garages and I know there are a
9 couple lots in town where the garages are too small
10 for two cars in this exact scenario, I would
11 suggest that instead of giving them -- except this
12 provision shall not apply to require rear yards and
13 corner (inaudible) lots 35 percent restriction.
14 You might want to put a limit of, say, 440 square
15 feet, which is a 22 X 20 two-car garage, you know,
16 up to a maximum of 440 square feet.

17 DIRECTOR VALONE: So what we could do --

18 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: Because this gives them
19 carte blanche.

20 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Well, they still have the
21 gross floor, right?

22 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: Right. But --

23 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: So -- all right.

24 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: Right. But you can

1 still -- you can bode more in to the backyard.

2 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Right.

3 DIRECTOR VALONE: I think alternatively we
4 were thinking about we would just exempt detached
5 garages from the 35 percent.

6 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Which is already limited in
7 size.

8 DIRECTOR VALONE: Right. So everything else
9 would still be held to it, but the detached garage
10 would not be. The driveway still would be. That
11 was our other alternative. Thoughts on that?

12 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: I'm open to that.
13 Yeah.

14 DIRECTOR VALONE: Or we -- or they're not
15 restricted. Thoughts?

16 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: So --

17 DIRECTOR VALONE: I know this is a hard one.

18 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: I'm thinking. So
19 there's actually a couple of things going on.

20 One, what happens on that particular
21 corner lot and, two, how it affects their neighbors
22 in terms of size of structure that can be built
23 closer to their homes.

24 DIRECTOR VALONE: Honestly, what it ends up

1 being --

2 COMMISSIONER DEPROSPERIS: It's garage on
3 garage.

4 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yeah. And, honestly, what
5 it ends up being for a lot of these folks, and
6 maybe you want to talk about Jim Sorka (phonetic)
7 just as a general one, but what ends up happening
8 is they just have to move it really close to the
9 house then, kind of like truncates their yard.
10 They still have to be ten feet from the house to
11 the detached garage, but essentially what they do
12 is they just try to move the garage into like the
13 building envelope area and it just kind of presses
14 their garage and their house closer together and it
15 kind of impacts the usability of the other part of
16 the yard is kind of why we're really thinking about
17 most of our garages.

18 Do you want to talk about Jim Sorka
19 just generally? He's a little different. He's
20 looking for something to be very accessible for his
21 spouse, so he's looking for something very big, but
22 I think he's a good example.

23 MS. FAWELL: Yeah. I mean, he's a 50-foot
24 wide lot, and this is just off the top of my head,

1 but I think what I remember is that the maximum
2 area for garage he could have within the rear yard
3 was about 367 square feet based on the 35 percent
4 coverage, which did not meet what he needed for his
5 property. And then also, again, that comes into
6 the fact that you have sidewalk leading up to the
7 garage door or if the driveway is in that yard.
8 Because, again, as Heather pointed out, it's just
9 the required rear yard, it's not necessarily the
10 rear yard from the location of the house. So in
11 this graphic on the screen, that home is located
12 just against the rear yard, but a lot of the
13 properties are actually located about 60 feet from
14 the rear lot line, so that's what Heather is saying
15 when they have that ability to move into the
16 buildable area for the garage, they will do it.

17 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: (Inaudible) Park
18 there's not 135-foot deep lots.

19 MS. FAWELL: Yes.

20 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: So they come very
21 close.

22 MS. FAWELL: And then -- yes. And this is
23 just for the corner lots. Again, they're still
24 going to be held to our other coverage requirements

1 and standards and they're still going to be held to
2 the setback locations for garages and accessory
3 structures.

4 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: I still lean to the 440
5 square foot max. That's a full two car garage.

6 MS. FAWELL: Yeah. And that -- and I think
7 we -- I mean, we can tweak the language, but this
8 requirement is for any coverage in the rear yard,
9 so it's not just garage, but we can tweak it to say
10 440 square foot garage.

11 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: Right. But you're
12 going to -- so if you're only -- as written
13 currently, you can only build 300 and how many
14 square feet in the rear yard?

15 MS. FAWELL: 35 percent.

16 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: No. No. The garage we
17 were just talking about with Jim Sorka.

18 MS. FAWELL: It was 367 for his specific
19 property.

20 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: Right. So he could
21 build a full two car garage the way the ordinance
22 is written.

23 MS. FAWELL: No. Correct.

24 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: All right. So that's

1 why I'm suggesting that we give them enough leeway
2 to build a full two car garage without giving them
3 any sort of restriction otherwise.

4 DIRECTOR VALONE: I think it might be cleaner
5 to just say that we exempt -- so we can say except
6 this provision shall not apply to detached garages
7 on corner and reverse corner lots. I think that
8 one might be a little bit clearer. The 440, I
9 mean, most of the garages that we're seeing coming
10 in are looking for two cars and then some storage.
11 So...

12 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: So you get to the point
13 where you need to get a bigger lot.

14 DIRECTOR VALONE: Well, I mean, we also have a
15 lot of very older structure older garages, too,
16 that exist here that don't comply because, you
17 know, the -- if you look at The Sidwell across
18 Western Springs, if they were going to short a lot,
19 they shorted the corner lot. So they're already at
20 a disadvantage, and then we have -- we have
21 provisions related to the reverse corner where some
22 of our neighbors do not either. So we're
23 relatively regulatory on our corner lots and, for
24 example, too, the garage, the detached garage

1 cannot be further forward either than the
2 neighboring house that fronts on that side either.
3 So they have quite a number of restrictions to
4 really locate these and so, you know, we haven't
5 run into a situation where we have had -- again,
6 the one that Kelsey is discussing is somebody who
7 is looking to build a detached garage that would be
8 accessible for their spouse, but we haven't
9 necessarily run into a situation quite that large,
10 but we have had a number of people who have just
11 been right under having, you know, like, a 23 by 23
12 where they can actually open the door when they get
13 out of the car and have a little bit of storage for
14 the lawn mower. So it may be cleaner just to
15 exempt the garages because, again, they're still
16 going to be held to gross floor area and building
17 coverage, so it's likely the bulk of that is not
18 going to get too out of whack with the size
19 requirement of the lot anyways. It would just be
20 how they're trying to locate, right? They're not
21 pushing it so far up, you know, or so far in that
22 it kind of makes the rest of their yard
23 unmanageable.

24 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: All right. I can get behind

1 that. Is that --

2 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: Yeah. I can get behind
3 that.

4 MS. DEN BESTEN: If I may? To Steve's point
5 about shallower lots, like Springdale has a lot of
6 unusual dimensioned lots. Has anybody looked at
7 Springdale properties to see if this would be --

8 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: I think they require
9 attached garages in Springdale.

10 MS. DEN BESTEN: I'm sorry?

11 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: I believe they require
12 attached garages in Springdale.

13 MS. DEN BESTEN: Oh, do they?

14 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Most of them are attached.

15 DIRECTOR VALONE: Well, most of them are
16 attached because of the age of the structure.

17 MS. DEN BESTEN: Oh, okay. So for a shallower
18 lot I think, you know, it might be hard to work in
19 even if there's is this exception, you know,
20 without hurting neighbors.

21 DIRECTOR VALONE: I mean, if there was
22 something that, you know, they were going to need
23 to seek a setback variation or a size or et cetera,
24 they would be able to valance swap the BZA process.

1 You know, we have -- we really do have true
2 separate neighborhoods in town, especially when you
3 move south, and so we do see differences in
4 architecture and, you know, style of homes. So we
5 have not yet had a detached garage in Springdale
6 come through since I have been here. We have seen
7 additions, but we have not had detached. But on
8 the shallower lots it does just make this, you
9 know, a bit worse as well, too, because then it
10 really, you know, constrains where they're going to
11 be able to put this garage. It's probably going to
12 have to go in the corner anyways, but if a little
13 bit of it, instead of a lot of it, being need to be
14 pushed toward the house, right, where they're
15 shortening up that usable yard between the two
16 buildings, right, it's allowing them to give the
17 more flexibility to put it somewhere where they
18 have a useable yard. I think that's kind of the
19 goal that we have been hearing from folks, that
20 they're trying to make sure that they can still
21 have a two car garage, but then have functional
22 spaces outside as well like their counterparts that
23 are interior lots.

24 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Any other --

1 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: I have another idea.
2 So we have the ten foot separation between detached
3 garages and houses and you can't build any of your
4 house within the rear yard, but in this case would
5 it make sense to make an exemption that you can
6 build an attached garage in the rear yard, free up
7 that ten foot space for a larger garage.

8 DIRECTOR VALONE: Hmm. I think we have to
9 take a little look at that. We really considered
10 this more related to detached garages because
11 that's what you see on the corner lots more. I
12 think we would have to do some research and come
13 back on that one. I don't know that I can speak
14 intelligently on the attached garages. We have
15 had -- there have been variations where we have
16 reduced the separation, the ten foot separation and
17 required certain building components to make up for
18 that, but the attached garages, we would -- I don't
19 think we can speak on that tonight.

20 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: But this is a living
21 document, you can --

22 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yeah. We can bring that
23 back. Yeah, we can easily bring that back with the
24 next set.

1 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: I would entertain a motion
2 if anyone is so inclined.

3 DIRECTOR VALONE: So are we deciding on
4 just --

5 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Well I think Steve -- I
6 think we got back to this existing language in the
7 end. It took us a minute and I think that was good
8 discussion.

9 DIRECTOR VALONE: This was the one I
10 thought -- I was like for sure -- I was like Steve
11 is going to be right on this one. This is the one.

12 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Motion to approve with
13 the existing language.

14 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Is there a second?

15 COMMISSIONER JOHANN: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: All those in favor?
17 (Chorus of ayes.)

18 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Opposed?
19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Kelsey, we're in your hands.

21 MS. FAWELL: Sorry. We took a -- one second.

22 Okay. There's a text amendment proposed to the
23 general development within Section 8 of the code,
24 and this should sound familiar to you all from --

1 you recently, maybe almost over a year now,
2 reviewed the application for 5600 Wolf, which was a
3 planned development. That development requested a
4 deviation from our code's requirement for five-acre
5 minimum development for planned developments. You
6 can see on the screen that these are our most
7 recent planned developments. Since the 90s, the
8 only planned development that actually met our
9 five-acre minimum requirement is Timber Trails. We
10 don't have a property of that size within our
11 Village currently, unless someone consolidates. So
12 Staff is proposing that this five-acre requirement
13 be removed and the reference to "large scale
14 development" be removed this is in line with the
15 development trends of the Village. It's in line
16 with --

17 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Page 218, Commissioners.
18 I'm sorry.

19 MS. FAWELL: No worries.

20 -- Plan Commission and Village Board
21 recommendations for reductions in these large scale
22 developments.

23 I'll take any questions.

24 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: No, I think many of us were

1 here for a lot of those five acres. I mean, it
2 made sense that it was planned development, but it
3 didn't make sense that five acres was an arbitrary
4 kind of requirement.

5 DIRECTOR VALONE: Well, and I think what we
6 have seen, right, is we don't really have anything
7 left that's going to be that size.

8 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: But you are going to have
9 potentially another planned development somewhere.

10 DIRECTOR VALONE: And I think -- you know,
11 Kelsey brought up a recent case, but I think a lot
12 of the discussion related to that thought that it
13 was somehow related to like density, but this is
14 the general requirement across every single zoning.
15 It really -- you know, I think what it thought it
16 was doing was this is a sizable enough piece of
17 property to trigger, right, in Western Springs to
18 need a planned development, but we have kind of run
19 out of those, but we're going to need, likely,
20 planned developments for some infield development,
21 maybe it does get five, maybe it's not shy of --
22 not quite there, but I think it's -- it's something
23 that necessarily just doesn't fit with our current
24 trend of development.

1 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: I agree. Any debate?

2 COMMISSIONER JOHANN: No debate.

3 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Entertain a motion?

4 COMMISSIONER JOHANN: Motion to approve.

5 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Second?

6 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Second.

7 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: All those in favor?

8 (Chorus of ayes.)

9 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Opposed?

10 COMMISSIONER JOHANN: Aye.

11 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Those were in favor, yes?

12 COMMISSIONER JOHANN: Right. Yes.

13 DIRECTOR VALONE: All right. So this one is
14 mine and Anne's favorite topic of the night. So I
15 think a lot of you remember in 2014 medical
16 cannabis became something that was allowed in
17 Illinois, and at that time there was a certain set
18 of regulations that came down related to medical
19 cannabis. The Village, you know, kind of put
20 together some things, but didn't really move
21 forward on a number of things, and then -- and then
22 in 2020, right, we had the new recreational
23 cannabis act come into the affect, so we really
24 need to address medical cannabis. It's -- Staff is

1 not proposing recreational cannabis based on the
2 referendum results, it's clear that that's not of
3 interest, but we are required, by the state, to
4 have some provisions related to medical cannabis.
5 So a number of years ago, a number of -- as
6 Attorney Jurusik likes to call them, bubble maps,
7 were put together looking at sites that were far
8 enough away from churches and schools and other,
9 you know, sensitive uses, and a few areas were
10 determined, but the problem really relates to we
11 have to be far enough away from a sensitive use,
12 but we have to have more than one opportunity for
13 them to locate. It doesn't say how many, it just
14 says more than one. So this was one that had been
15 identified a long time ago and not kind of moved
16 forward with. We run the risk that the state
17 requires us to allow it, but we don't have any
18 local requirements.

19 However, in saying that, since 2020,
20 a medical only license has not been issued. It's
21 just not lucrative, right, for somebody to just get
22 a medical only when they can apply for
23 recreational. So Staff is proposing -- and I
24 believe -- did you -- thank you for being our page

1 finder. I --

2 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: 185. 185. I won't take
3 credit.

4 DIRECTOR VALONE: We put together, generally,
5 just the same recommendations about distances and
6 security requirements that are included on the
7 state's provision, and then also were originally
8 proposed. This would just make us whole with the
9 state then if someone did -- in the unlikelihood
10 that somebody does come in, you know, they would
11 have to adhere to standards, otherwise they would
12 be permitted to really locate anywhere that the
13 state standard would allow, so this would give us a
14 little bit more control, but, again, a medical
15 license has not been issued by the state of
16 Illinois since 2020. Medical only.

17 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Makes sense to me.

18 DIRECTOR VALONE: And, again -- and we can
19 walk through it, but there is security
20 requirements, right, they have to have certain
21 lighting requirements, parking requirements, they
22 have to show that they, you know, are meeting the
23 requirements and the standards.

24 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Just cleaning it up so that

1 we're in better compliance. I get it.

2 DIRECTOR VALONE: We're making us whole and
3 making sure that if in the unlikelihood it happens,
4 it's somewhere that the Village would -- would
5 allow it if it happened. I just think it's very
6 unlikely.

7 ATTORNEY SKRODZKI: Better to have something
8 than nothing.

9 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Right.

10 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Better to have a place you
12 want it than somewhere else that you wouldn't want
13 it. It's never going to happen.

14 COMMISSIONER TURNER: No.

15 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: I would entertain a motion.

16 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: I move to approve.

17 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Is there a second?

18 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Second.

19 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: All those in favor?

20 (Chorus of ayes.)

21 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Opposed?

22 (No response.)

23 DIRECTOR VALONE: Well, thank you. That has
24 been my stick for, like, two years now.

1 MS. FAWELL: Okay. We are close to being
2 done, but Staff is proposing an overlay district be
3 added to our downtown called "The Downtown
4 Pedestrian Overlay District." It is seen on your
5 screen in the patched blue. This is the result.
6 In February the Village adopted -- or approved, I
7 should say, our downtown market assessment that was
8 done by Teska. And in that market assessment Teska
9 had some recommendations in their findings and
10 identified the Village's core downtown and made
11 some recommendations related to commercial uses of
12 our C1 and C2 district. So the idea with our
13 downtown pedestrian overlay district -- sorry.
14 What page?

15 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: 198.

16 MS. FAWELL: 198.

17 DIRECTOR VALONE: 198. Yeah.

18 MS. FAWELL: With downtown pedestrian overlay
19 district is that this would restrict some of the
20 first floor uses in those blue patched areas, so
21 they're more -- teal -- so they're more retail and
22 pedestrian oriented friendly. So it would restrict
23 offices to the second floor, it would require some
24 retail components, use certain service uses. What

1 our goal here is to create a more pedestrian
2 friendly environment, encourage retail. Our market
3 assessment identified that we have a number of our
4 first floor office spaces, retail medical spaces in
5 our downtown, and, as Heather can speak to more, we
6 do have a number of retail users that reach out
7 often about moving in to our downtown, so we think
8 that this will promote that.

9 DIRECTOR VALONE: So we found that we -- you
10 know, we have interest in Western Springs, but
11 rarely do these come on the market, and when they
12 come on the market, what we're seeing is that
13 office spaces are the ones who are investing money
14 to upgrade the spaces to make them usable because
15 they have the money and they're paying the higher
16 rent, so that's why we're seeing that. And so what
17 we're just proposing is that if an office use wants
18 to come in that has kind of a different impact,
19 right, than some of our retail, that they would
20 need a conditional use. As of right they could go
21 on a second floor, but they would need a
22 conditional use. We routinely have issues with
23 some of our medical offices having different needs
24 than our downtown designed parking, which is

1 designed for retail, and we're relatively
2 landlocked. So those people could still come in,
3 we're not saying those folks can't, but they would
4 need to come in and show that their impacts would
5 fit the downtown. We do have employee parking, but
6 what we see frequently is that some of the folks
7 who don't want to park on kind of the periphery
8 where we put the employees will have their office
9 staff park kind of closer in, too, and then, you
10 know, end up with other issues. So what we're
11 really trying to do is these core blocks, right,
12 these core blocks that really are our walkable
13 downtown, we're trying to make sure that they have,
14 you know, lively entertainment based, retail based
15 service uses, right, so it really feels like a
16 pedestrian downtown, kind of go back to where we
17 were because we have these uses that people have
18 lost that they would love to have back. I mean,
19 our bakery, our hardware store, our deli, right?
20 Like these uses are gone in other places and we are
21 lucky to still have them, but we could foster more
22 of that, right? And it's not to say that we
23 couldn't have service uses, right? We can still
24 have salons, it's just we're trying to put some of

1 that retail front up there so that people can
2 window shop and people feel like they can move from
3 store to store. We're trying to make the physical
4 area feel more like our walkable downtown that we
5 want to be.

6 So it would just be these blocks.
7 Again, it would be restricted of office use for
8 conditional use on the first floor. They would
9 come through a process, you have seen the
10 conditional use process, they would show they meet
11 the standards, right, they're not going to
12 negatively impact our downtown and that they fit
13 into the area. Existing uses, they stay until --

14 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: That was --

15 DIRECTOR VALONE: -- they change ownership,
16 right.

17 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: They don't need a
18 conditional use, they don't do anything?

19 DIRECTOR VALONE: Right.

20 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Okay.

21 DIRECTOR VALONE: They stay where they are,
22 but, you know, if -- if Fawell Podiatry moves out
23 and Valone Accounting moves in, they're going to
24 have to -- I'm going to have to get a conditional

1 use, right, to show that my use isn't going to
2 impact our downtown in a negative way.

3 Thoughts?

4 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: I like it.

5 COMMISSIONER HANSON: I like it.

6 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: A lot of real estate,
7 insurance things, you know, people can't walk in
8 and go shop there.

9 DIRECTOR VALONE: I know. And we have this
10 beautiful downtown and I would love to get more
11 people to come here. We're a hidden gem, but they
12 end up kind of walking big distances, right,
13 between some of our retail uses. And, I apologize,
14 I should have said this, too. This really
15 modernizes our use list. So I know -- and we'll
16 pull up the page in a second -- but I know this
17 table looks really big, but in our code right now
18 it's like -- oh, thank you, Kelsey -- it is -- you
19 have to go in to each individual one, look at the
20 list, see if it's there. We're proposing just to
21 consolidate this too, right, and make this easier
22 for people who want to move here to say oh, this is
23 my use, this is where I want to go, oh, I can do
24 it, you know, or oh, I need a conditional use.

1 We're not trying to make this hard for folks. We
2 are also modernizing the use list. We still have a
3 number of things that really aren't
4 representational anymore or we have things that we
5 want that we don't actually have uses for. A great
6 example is our neighbor over here, it's partial
7 entertainment use, it's partial eating and drinking
8 establishment. Our code doesn't contemplate that.
9 Our code contemplates single uses in a single
10 building. We don't see that anymore, right? We
11 see people who are doing more than one thing at
12 once, too, so we really need to bring our
13 commercial use list up so that we can keep doing
14 the use. And we can do it. People are very
15 interested. I have got lists of people that I send
16 out all the time just trying to find a little
17 spot --

18 PRESIDENT RUDOLPH: A lot of our neighbors do
19 this, too, right?

20 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yeah.

21 PRESIDENT RUDOLPH: La Grange, others.

22 DIRECTOR VALONE: That's right.

23 MS. FAWELL: Yes, their retails are very
24 similar.

1 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: And this a long term play,
2 right? This is --

3 DIRECTOR VALONE: Right.

4 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: There is also sales tax
5 revenue that we're not having with service
6 businesses.

7 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Right. Correct.

8 DIRECTOR VALONE: Also it will -- it will also
9 kind of put a renewed vibrancy in our downtown in
10 more than one way; sales tax, but also if we're
11 having changes of uses, that also means that our
12 spaces are going to have to come up to code, too,
13 and that's what we see frequently is somebody comes
14 in and says the landlord has not invested in the
15 space and I can't move in here because I can't fix
16 up their building to then move in and do my own
17 improvements, right? And we have started a
18 property improvement grant program, right, to
19 assist with that, and we have our tip districts to
20 also help us with that, but this would be another
21 way, too, to, you know, get those uses that we want
22 and get just renewed vibrancy in the downtown,
23 right, in general. We still might see, you know,
24 people move in and they still need to make upgrades

1 to the building, but, you know, it's a way for us
2 to play the long game and start moving towards, you
3 know --

4 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: And some of these businesses
5 that are there will stay for a long time.

6 DIRECTOR VALONE: They might.

7 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: That's just the way it is.

8 DIRECTOR VALONE: I hear all the time, too, "I
9 can't believe you let another real estate agent,"
10 well, I can't restrict that right now. I can't.
11 Just like I couldn't -- I mean, I couldn't -- also
12 like if, you know, multiple delis wanted to move
13 in, too, I couldn't restrict that either, but this
14 would give us a little bit more ability to say, all
15 right, hold on, you know, you're going to have
16 office employees that are going to be there, you're
17 going to use the building differently, you know,
18 like how does this fit in with the fabric of where
19 you are, and if it fits in, it fits in, right? If
20 it comes through your process and it meets that
21 requirement, then it does, but it allows a more
22 streamline approval process for the more vibrant
23 pedestrian friendly entertainment downtown.

24 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: And, again, you have hired

1 consultants to help you with this and this was
2 their recommendation, so it's not -- it's based on
3 the expert.

4 DIRECTOR VALONE: It's not just us, yeah.
5 It's not just us.

6 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Right.

7 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yeah, the attachment in
8 their packet, it's called Memorandum Commercial
9 Districts, Teska took a look at it for us given
10 that they also do our market study, too, it made
11 sense that they kind of helped us implement part of
12 that.

13 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Questions, anyone?

14 COMMISSIONER DEPROSPERIS: It's a great idea.

15 MS. DEN BESTEN: Sorry. I'm making your
16 meeting longer, right?

17 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: No, that's okay.

18 MS. DEN BESTEN: So, can you explain, like so
19 this says the district promotes et cetera, so the
20 district reserves first floor commercial. How firm
21 is that the way this is worded? In other words,
22 let's say nine months goes by and we have an empty
23 storefront and it's because we can't find anybody
24 who meets these conditions, then does the Village

1 loosen up or, you know, we don't want a bunch of
2 empty storefronts either, right?

3 DIRECTOR VALONE: No, we don't. That's
4 correct. We don't. We do want to make
5 opportunities, though. I think we are lacking in
6 that. We learned that through quite a bit of data
7 from our consultants that we are lacking the
8 opportunity for people to do that. But those
9 purpose statements are really to give more guidance
10 to this table. This table is really, right, what
11 people can and cannot do. Those purpose
12 statements, they do give us, you know, direction
13 and things like that, but this table is really
14 what's going to hold us to it. And the reason it's
15 written that way, too, is to give minute
16 flexibility to some of those categories, too,
17 right? Like some of these categories say like a
18 30 percent accessory use on another retail use,
19 right? Like what is that use though, right? Like
20 is it -- I'm sorry. I had a really good example of
21 this. If that 30 percent is like, you know,
22 30 percent accounting in the front and they're
23 shoving a storefront in the front to, like, be able
24 to put their accounting business there, that

1 doesn't really feel like it, right? So the purpose
2 statements are guiding us, but this table really
3 is, you know, what is permitted and what isn't, but
4 they go together, right, to kind of --

5 MS. DEN BESTEN: Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Good job.

7 Is there a motion?

8 COMMISSIONER JOHANN: Motion to approve.

9 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Second?

10 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: All those in favor?

12 (Chorus of ayes.)

13 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Opposed?

14 (No response.)

15 MS. FAWELL: Okay. And, finally, last but not
16 least, we are proposing regulations within our
17 temporary use permit section, same section that the
18 bees were proposed. I don't have a page number in
19 front of me. I'm sorry.

20 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yeah, so you're going back
21 to, I believe it's -- is it 208?

22 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: I'm looking at page 196.

23 DIRECTOR VALONE: I was close. I was close.

24 MS. FAWELL: So the Village is proposing

1 regulations allowing food trucks. The restrictions
2 are related to hours of operation, required
3 permitting and fees, right of way approval and
4 confirmation and notification with the Village,
5 health and safety requirements, quite an extensive
6 list, but right now the Village does not have any
7 formal codes on food truck vendors. We do have
8 some businesses and also some of our events in town
9 that do like to utilize food trucks that their
10 property, so this is the result of that.

11 DIRECTOR VALONE: So this wouldn't just allow
12 anybody to come in, right? This requires you to be
13 in connection with an existing brick and motor
14 business and just be using this as a supplement.
15 It still puts restrictions on how many times you
16 can bring it, right? We don't want to make any
17 kind of, you know, competition for our local brick
18 and mortar restaurants more than we need to. If
19 you're going to do it on public property it's more
20 restricted and you need to have certain things in
21 place so that if, Heaven forbid, something happens
22 we know you're properly insured, you have safety
23 equipment on site and the you're going to be
24 following the Village's requirements and letting us

1 know you're there, right, so that if we're coming
2 to an emergency situation, we know what's happening
3 there. We did call it "mobile food vending" just
4 because -- I mean, food trucks are popular, right,
5 but we also see other things that aren't a hotdog
6 cart, but, like, for example, there's a neighbor in
7 La Grange who has, like, a pizza oven he trails, so
8 we wanted to open it up a bit. But, again, this
9 isn't carte blanche, and this isn't just anyone can
10 just, you know, pull up on the green and start
11 selling hotdogs, right? They would have to
12 actually be attached to one of our businesses here
13 for a reason. It also would help us with our
14 licensing of mobile food vendors that we use for
15 special events, both the Village, the Park District
16 and some of our other local agencies. Right now if
17 you want to be a french market vendor and also like
18 sell food at a little league tournament, you have
19 to register each individual time, and that's a
20 little cumbersome, not just for the applicant, also
21 for us because we're getting the same documentation
22 again, we're getting the fee again. We're
23 proposing it's a one time a year registration and
24 then you would be able to participate, right? It

1 does have a higher value on it because it would
2 allow you to do more than one event, but, again, it
3 still restricts that it can't just be anybody
4 rolling up, it has to be attached to an actual
5 business and there are sill regulations on the
6 number of times that they can be in town, right?
7 We want to, you know, allow interesting food
8 options and have, you know, our local businesses be
9 able to have, what I'm going to call, "mini
10 events," right, like something that's not normal
11 for them to draw additional attention to them, but
12 we also want to make sure that, you know, we're
13 still being cognisant of our existing brick and
14 mortar eating establishments as well, and it will
15 make French Market easier for me.

16 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Yeah.

17 DIRECTOR VALONE: So, thoughts? I mean, you
18 know, this is -- this is newer. We did have Teska
19 help us look at this because everybody has got a
20 different version. Like La Grange Park just
21 adopted one. Hinsdale has a really restrictive
22 one. Clarendon Hills has kind of a middle of the
23 road, Westmont has a middle of the road. We had
24 them just take a look at some of our neighbors,

1 also kind of in the context, right, that we're
2 really not looking to do this carte blanche, we're
3 really looking to do it just to kind of boost our
4 existing businesses, and then there's French
5 Market, you know?

6 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: So you went with the middle
7 of the road approach?

8 DIRECTOR VALONE: We did, yeah. If they're on
9 the street that have to tell us 14 business days in
10 advance, right? We got to know they're there. We
11 got to know they have insurance. You know, we're
12 the landlord in that situation, so that's why it's
13 a limited number of times, too, because it's
14 burdensome for us and we're the landlord then
15 giving them somewhere to set up shop, right? Even
16 though they're servicing a different business.

17 PRESIDENT RUDOLPH: Does this include the
18 parks or how does it apply to the parks other than
19 events?

20 DIRECTOR VALONE: It would just be events at
21 the park. So, like, for example, Little League has
22 a couple of food trucks that will come to some of
23 their bigger events because there's really nothing
24 over there that they can get ahold of really

1 quickly. We have had a couple of people who have
2 rented out the Village Club -- yes, Village Club,
3 excuse me, who have, like, wanted to bring, like,
4 the mobile pizza guy. So it -- again, in those
5 instances, public property, it's going to be
6 limited. So Little League is only permitted to
7 have -- I think it's, like, two or three vendors
8 for their whole season, and because they're within
9 the parks parking lot, they're off Waldo Emerson,
10 we haven't necessarily treated that like if they
11 were on the street, but this would give us
12 permissions that if they did want to impact it,
13 they could. So it opens it up. I mean, it does.
14 But, again, it would have to be attached to an
15 actual use. They couldn't just roll up to the park
16 on a Saturday for no reason.

17 COMMISSIONER HANSON: And how many times a
18 year are you allowing the vendors to...

19 DIRECTOR VALONE: So on the private property
20 we're proposing more than public property, right,
21 because if it's private property they're using
22 private property, it's going to be relatively
23 unimpactful to our streets, right? And then for
24 public property we're proposing a more restricted

1 number. I apologize. I haven't looked at this
2 in --

3 MS. FAWELL: It's two days per month for
4 public right of way, one day per month for private.

5 DIRECTOR VALONE: No. I think that's --

6 MS. FAWELL: Did I reverse it? Other way
7 around.

8 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yes, other way around. Yes.

9 MS. FAWELL: Two days if adjacent to private
10 property --

11 DIRECTOR VALONE: Right. Yes.

12 COMMISSIONER TURNER: So can an outside vendor
13 that's not attached to an existing business, can
14 they come in and operate their food truck?

15 DIRECTOR VALONE: No. Unless they were
16 participating in French Market or gathering on the
17 green or something where they would have to be --

18 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: They would have to be
19 invited for some reason.

20 DIRECTOR VALONE: Right. Yeah. They couldn't
21 just roll up with a hot dog truck.

22 ATTORNEY SKRODZKI: So that would be part of
23 current special event process, which requires, you
24 know, an event to be -- an event plan to be

1 submitted, to have a temporary use permit. If it's
2 on public property there's a whole process with
3 regards to an event, so you can either be connected
4 to an event or to a brick and mortar business.

5 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Steve likes to have a lot of
6 parties and he's wondering if he does he can only
7 have a vendor truck one day a year.

8 DIRECTOR VALONE: In your residential
9 neighborhood you're looking for more than one day?

10 COMMISSIONER JOHANN: Is that two per month
11 for residential?

12 MS. FAWELL: In a commercial district.

13 COMMISSIONER DEPROSPERIS: Two in a
14 commercial --

15 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: I mean, once a year seems
16 kind of weird.

17 COMMISSIONER DEPROSPERIS: -- but one per year
18 in residential.

19 DIRECTOR VALONE: I mean, we have gotten a
20 couple of requests, actually, for Halloween that
21 somebody wants to bring in a taco truck while the
22 kids are trick or treating they can stop by. We
23 have no provisions for that either, so that's why
24 we have included this.

1 PRESIDENT RUDOLPH: Cool.

2 ATTORNEY SKRODZKI: Which neighborhood?

3 PRESIDENT RUDOLPH: I want to go there.

4 DIRECTOR VALONE: It's Ridgewood. Come on you
5 guys, the Ridgewood people know how to party.

6 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: One day a year just seems
7 kind of restrictive. I mean, I'm not saying I'm
8 going to violate that or need to have more, but I
9 think there are people that like to host parties
10 there.

11 DIRECTOR VALONE: I mean, Steve, clearly
12 you're living a better life than me. How many
13 times are you hosting parties? I have a four year
14 old, I don't do anything.

15 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: It's time that people
16 throw me under the bus.

17 COMMISSIONER JOHANN: Is that number per
18 vendor? One time per --

19 DIRECTOR VALONE: No. Like per property
20 essentially.

21 COMMISSIONER JOHANN: Well then what about the
22 commercial? What is the number on that?

23 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Twice.

24 DIRECTOR VALONE: That's two days per month.

1 COMMISSIONER JOHANN: Two days per month.

2 COMMISSIONER HANSON: So how does that work
3 with the football games? Because they have food
4 trucks all the time.

5 DIRECTOR VALONE: So -- well, so, again,
6 they're part of, like, more of an event process.
7 So, I mean, candidly we have just kind of allowed
8 them because they are on -- I mean, they're not
9 technically private property, but they're not on
10 the street, right? So that's how we have allowed
11 them in the past. Under this --

12 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Seems like we should allow
13 that.

14 DIRECTOR VALONE: I mean, I think we just add
15 an exception related to -- I mean, the problem is
16 the parks are zoned residential, so we need to tie
17 it to a use and not necessarily a type of zoning,
18 but we can update that.

19 COMMISSIONER HANSON: A school use or...

20 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yeah. Exactly. Yeah. I'm
21 sure LT probably has, like, the ice cream truck
22 pull up for graduation or --

23 PRESIDENT RUDOLPH: And people want to stay at
24 the game. I mean, it's not like it's detracting

1 from any other business that's coming in. I mean,
2 it's nice.

3 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Is the ice cream man a food
4 truck?

5 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yes. He's a mobile food
6 vendor.

7 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: He's out every day.

8 MS. DEN BESTEN: Yeah. The ice cream guys are
9 out all the time.

10 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Are you going to limit the
11 ice cream man now?

12 ATTORNEY SKRODZKI: Well he never stops, so
13 technically he's always moving. If he just goes
14 one mile an hour --

15 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: And the music never stops
16 either.

17 DIRECTOR VALONE: Although, he pulled up and
18 parked at French Market and I was like what? That
19 was bold. Nice guy, though. Very nice guy.

20 ATTORNEY SKRODZKI: I was kidding for the
21 record, too.

22 COMMISSIONER DEPROSPERIS: Also in special
23 events, do you define the area where these food
24 trucks can be?

1 DIRECTOR VALONE: Right. So we're tieing it
2 currently based on zoning district and then if it's
3 in the right of way or not, but I think we can
4 easily amend it to include --

5 COMMISSIONER DEPROSPERIS: Downers was street
6 specific, I know, because they were very specific
7 with their downtown.

8 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yes. I think we're not
9 looking to be as restrictive on that because we
10 have people like Steve who like to --

11 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Sorry, Steve.

12 DIRECTOR VALONE: But actually, I mean, I have
13 gotten a couple requests where, you know, we have
14 had folks who have been able to park them in their
15 driveways then and then we have -- it's not the
16 public can walk up to them, right, and it's just
17 people who are invited to theirs. I think that's
18 kind of more of our concern is just making sure
19 we're regulating those -- just anybody could walk
20 up to, right, we want to make sure they meet our
21 health code requirements.

22 COMMISSIONER DEPROSPERIS: And the hours were,
23 what, 9:00 to 9:00?

24 DIRECTOR VALONE: Mm-hmm. Yeah. So they're

1 not here late, they're not here early, they're not
2 impacting our businesses early or late.

3 So we could -- I think we could
4 easily add -- if you're all right to give us some
5 direction to draft that we could include provisions
6 related to our institutional uses, yeah?

7 ATTORNEY SKRODZKI: Schools and parks.

8 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yeah. Institutional? Yeah.

9 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Football --

10 ATTORNEY SKRODZKI: Right. Right.

11 DIRECTOR VALONE: That maybe somewhat mimic
12 the commercial, right? Yeah?

13 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Yeah.

14 ATTORNEY SKRODZKI: Sort of a hybrid of the
15 commercial and the then the event usage --

16 DIRECTOR VALONE: Right.

17 ATTORNEY SKRODZKI: -- because it will be for
18 ongoing events.

19 DIRECTOR VALONE: Mm-hmm. Yeah.

20 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: You guys put a lot of work
21 into this. Nice job.

22 DIRECTOR VALONE: Thank you. Seriously,
23 Kelsey has been like -- she has been doing a lot of
24 this and this is kind of what she likes to do, too.

1 She's a zoning code person. I know, perfect, so we
2 appreciate it.

3 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Were you born in 1993 when
4 the code was written?

5 MS. FAWELL: After.

6 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: DCO is older than you.
7 Sorry, Kelsey.

8 DIRECTOR VALONE: I think that's going to come
9 up after the comp claim when we fully overhaul it.

10 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Lisa has a question.

11 DIRECTOR VALONE: Lisa?

12 MS. DEN BESTEN: I have a few things.

13 One question I have is like Davanti I
14 think is part of what I'll call a restaurant
15 enterprise, I don't know what they call it, but a
16 lot of other restaurants, so how does their entity
17 compare to the term "vendor" or what if the vehicle
18 is shared across three restaurants or something?
19 It's still the same enterprise, so how does that
20 apply for the license not transferable? I mean, a
21 little different scenario.

22 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yeah, so really what it is
23 is, what we're trying to get at there -- and our
24 health inspector gave us some guidance on this

1 because she deals with this in other places -- what
2 she's trying to say is that for licensing a
3 specific food truck in the fleet, if they're going
4 to use a different one they got to give us the
5 information that we know it still complies with the
6 health requirements, so that's what it really
7 means.

8 MS. DEN BESTEN: Okay.

9 DIRECTOR VALONE: Also, too, if,
10 hypothetically, we had somebody who was, like,
11 selling pizza and now they're going to sell sushi,
12 right, we need to get back in there and make sure
13 that it's going to be compliant for that type of
14 food risk, so that's really what that's trying to
15 get at.

16 MS. DEN BESTEN: Okay.

17 DIRECTOR VALONE: Not necessarily, like,
18 trying to be restrictive, it's just trying to make
19 sure if there's a triggering change in ownership
20 we -- just like a restaurant, we can get in there
21 and make sure they're still compliant with the
22 health requirements.

23 MS. DEN BESTEN: Okay. Then next item is on
24 this page 196 we have 1B8 Village listed as

1 certificate owner. In this section they talk about
2 food handling certification, driver's license and
3 operations and then some insurance. I think it
4 would be worthwhile to specify what certificate
5 you're talking about.

6 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Insurance certificate,
7 right?

8 MS. DEN BESTEN: Yeah.

9 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yeah.

10 MS. DEN BESTEN: Well, I know that, but I
11 think there are other things, like food handling
12 certification is in here too, so...

13 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yeah, we can update that. I
14 think what we need to do is -- I think we might --
15 I think it might be easier for us to, like, say
16 kind of the certificate piece and then kind of
17 indent, I think, and then say under that
18 certificate --

19 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Insurance. Yeah.

20 DIRECTOR VALONE: We can update that.

21 MS. DEN BESTEN: Then on C1 I think you want
22 to get rid of the "N" under -- for and licensing.
23 I think you want A licensing. Just a typo.

24 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Yep.

1 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yeah.

2 MS. DEN BESTEN: And then C -- the main C
3 there says that the license is valid for 12 months
4 from date of issuance. I don't know how many food
5 trucks might be candidates, but like other license
6 we have in town like the vehicle license, and, you
7 know, what we were discussing before where you had
8 the license says March 31st it expired. Do you
9 really want to be keeping track of the licenses all
10 year or would you rather -- since food trucks
11 probably aren't going to be very prevalent in the
12 winter, have an April 1st start date or something
13 like that?

14 DIRECTOR VALONE: I think for now we have
15 decided to just do the issuance date because we
16 probably won't have very many. If I remember
17 correctly, too, and I was trying to find it, I
18 thought we also referenced that they had to follow
19 along with our business licensing requirements,
20 which are a calendar year.

21 MS. DEN BESTEN: Okay.

22 DIRECTOR VALONE: But much like the air
23 conditioners, I don't want people to have to go
24 ping pong back and forth, so I think that's a --

1 MS. DEN BESTEN: I mean, just to ease the
2 Village's work.

3 DIRECTOR VALONE: Well, and, again, I don't
4 want people to have to be ping pong back through
5 code sections, right, because we referenced that
6 they need to --

7 MS. DEN BESTEN: That's true, too.

8 DIRECTOR VALONE: -- do that, but, again, just
9 like the air conditioners, I don't want them to
10 have to go six pages south just to find it's a
11 calendar year.

12 ATTORNEY SKRODZKI: I also had a reason for
13 that, though, because if it's valid for 12 months
14 on date of issuance and there's no issue with
15 regards to proration, if someone were to come in in
16 August and say, hey, you're year started in April,
17 I only want to pay \$50.

18 MS. DEN BESTEN: Well nobody does that for,
19 like, a vehicle sticker, do they?

20 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yeah, they do.

21 ATTORNEY SKRODZKI: I have -- proration is a
22 very real issue if they come in and say I didn't
23 get my full year, I don't want to pay for a full
24 year. So 12 months from issuance makes it simpler

1 and it eliminates that possible complaint.

2 MS. DEN BESTEN: I see. Okay.

3 DIRECTOR VALONE: But I think an update that
4 essentially says application January 1, and then 12
5 months from date of issuance.

6 ATTORNEY SKRODZKI: Sure. I don't mind. I'm
7 jut pointing out that was one of the reasons why we
8 went that route.

9 MS. DEN BESTEN: Thank you for explaining.

10 ATTORNEY SKRODZKI: Yeah.

11 DIRECTOR VALONE: Thoughts?

12 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Is there a motion related to
13 mobile food trucks?

14 COMMISSIONER JOHANN: Motion to approve.

15 DIRECTOR VALONE: And, just to clarify, so
16 that includes updates for the institutional uses --

17 COMMISSIONER JOHANN: Yes.

18 DIRECTOR VALONE: -- and then update to the
19 COI and then Kelsey has got the typo.

20 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Yes.

21 DIRECTOR VALONE: Okay. And then I apologize,
22 Johann was first.

23 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Second.

24 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: All those in favor?

1 (Chorus of ayes.)

2 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Opposed?

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Motion passes.

5 MS. FAWELL: Okay. We already addressed the
6 public comment section, it was our beekeeping -- or
7 advocate, not a beekeeper, beekeeping advocate, and
8 then, finally, last but not least, I do just want
9 to make sure we at least directly mention the text
10 amendment standards, there are five.

11 The first one is that it is not
12 intended to benefit a specific property. Within
13 the Staff report, Staff did comment that a lot --
14 that these amendments are applicable to all
15 commercial property, C1, residential, whatever that
16 respective zoning district is, it's not specific to
17 a specific property.

18 B, the consistency of the proposed
19 amendment with the objectives of the ordinance and
20 intent of the zoning district regulations. Again,
21 Staff responded to this in the report. We feel
22 that our commercial use regulations foster a
23 commercial environment and a retail friendly
24 downtown and, also, our residential amendments are

1 consistent with some variations, it also helps
2 eliminate some nonconformities and helps our
3 residential properties have a streamline process.

4 Letter C, the degree, if any, to
5 which the proposed amendment would create
6 nonconformity. Again, I think most of our
7 amendments address -- or actually result in less
8 nonconformities specifically related to our single
9 family residential properties.

10 The consistency of the proposed
11 amendment with the comprehensive plan. We feel
12 that our residential amendments reflect the
13 residential neighborhoods and try to support those
14 residential neighborhoods in the design as well as,
15 again, we're supporting a pedestrian friendly
16 downtown district and making sure our uses are
17 up-to-date with industry norm and user friendly.

18 And then, finally, the degree, if
19 any, to which the proposed amendment contradicts
20 Village policy as established in previous rulings
21 on petitions in similar circumstances.

22 So we feel that this is intended to
23 support our Village's current policy, it complies
24 with our downtown market assessment and downtown

1 pedestrian plan, it supports our comprehensive
2 plan, we don't feel it contradicts Village policy.

3 Happy to go into these with more
4 detail if you may.

5 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: No. I'm sure all the
6 Commissioners read them prior to the meeting.

7 One question for you, Kelsey. You
8 made some changes in the definition section. Do
9 you want us to --

10 MS. FAWELL: Yes. Yeah.

11 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: -- remove those?

12 MS. FAWELL: I think --

13 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: They were well done and they
14 were straightforward, but I just know we haven't
15 talked about them yet and I don't know that we have
16 to talk about that much.

17 DIRECTOR VALONE: If there are no objections
18 to them we can make a motion --

19 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: I don't think there are --

20 DIRECTOR VALONE: -- related to acceptance --

21 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: -- I'm just trying clean it
22 up --

23 DIRECTOR VALONE: -- of the proposed -- yep.

24 MS. FAWELL: Yeah, they're very general that

1 they provide clarification on what commercial uses
2 have been created and modified as well as some
3 clarifications on the cannabis -- medical cannabis
4 definitions.

5 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: And I know the commissioners
6 studied all that before we got here and I would
7 entertain a motion.

8 COMMISSIONER TURNER: So moved.

9 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Second?

10 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: All those in favor?

12 (Chorus of ayes.)

13 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Opposed?

14 (No response.)

15 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Motion passes.

16 DIRECTOR VALONE: So I think we just -- we
17 have had our motions along the way.

18 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Yeah.

19 DIRECTOR VALONE: The only thing that we would
20 need to do is just get a motion to modify your
21 draft recommendation based on tonight's meeting,
22 including the modifications to the markups.

23 COMMISSIONER DEPROSPERIS: So moved.

24 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Second?

1 COMMISSIONER WINEGAR: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: All those in favor.

3 (Chorus of ayes.)

4 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Opposed?

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Motion carries.

7 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Ryan's motion. Whose
8 second?

9 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Steve.

10 COMMISSIONER DEPROSPERIS: Food truck Steve.

11 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: With that, I would entertain
12 a motion to close the public hearing section of the
13 meeting.

14 Anything else before the I do that?

15 DIRECTOR VALONE: Nuh-uh.

16 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Motion to close the
17 public hearing.

18 COMMISSIONER DEPROSPERIS: Second.

19 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: All those in favor?

20 (Chorus of ayes.)

21 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Opposed?

22 (No response.)

23 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Okay. We're going to move
24 on to the others business section of the meeting.

1 I would say if you have upcoming meetings or things
2 you wanted to warn us about, now would be the time.

3 DIRECTOR VALONE: Well, I think Pete has
4 something he would like to let us know.

5 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Oh, is it now?

6 It has been a pleasure serving with
7 you all. I'm getting kicked off.

8 DIRECTOR VALONE: No. No. Pete is actually
9 doing a huge service to us. We have lost our
10 chairman on liquor and he has agreed to go back to
11 liquor where he started and be our chairman there.
12 We have a newer commissioner --

13 COMMISSIONER DEPROSPERIS: Controlling the
14 liquor? Oh.

15 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: I was on liquor for five
16 years before I was on this for 12 years and -- I
17 don't know.

18 DIRECTOR VALONE: No. He's really --

19 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: It's my -- you know, Peter
20 principle. I'm way above where I belong.

21 DIRECTOR VALONE: Honestly, he is doing us a
22 huge favor. Liquor, like Plan Commission, does
23 things differently than our other commissions,
24 right? Like it looks at text amendments, it talks

1 about, like, a specific liquor license, right?
2 There are things that, like a planned development
3 that you reviewed, that liquor does, and so we
4 really appreciate him helping us out. It just took
5 us months to fill just a regular seat, and so the
6 chairman there is leaving after 12 years of being
7 the chairman, and so he is doing us a huge favor by
8 shifting, and we have somebody already lined up to
9 take over -- is that all right?

10 PRESIDENT RUDOLPH: Yeah.

11 DIRECTOR VALONE: Okay. So Jim Tyrrell has
12 offered to come back and be our chair starting
13 December 1, so it will switch over December 1. It
14 seems like we won't have a November meeting, so --
15 and then we'll be reaching out. It has been a
16 really long time --

17 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Jim has been on this before
18 with your Plan, right?

19 DIRECTOR VALONE: I think a few of you know --

20 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Yeah, he was a trustee.

21 DIRECTOR VALONE: Yes. But I thought -- no
22 maybe it was Brumbaugh who was on when he was also
23 on. Right.

24 So, anyway, so he's a former trustee.

1 He also was the Chair before Pete --

2 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Right. Right.

3 DIRECTOR VALONE: -- and so he has offered to
4 come back and help us out so we don't have any
5 absences in the Plan Commission.

6 And then Kelsey and I will be
7 reaching out after the first of the year. It has
8 been a really long time since we have done, like, a
9 training workshop, and I think, you know, given
10 having this change, it's time, you know, just to
11 kind of do that and be able to kind of sit, you
12 know, and talk through our DCO that's older than
13 Kelsey and our standards, you know, and just do
14 some of that.

15 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Sorry, Kelsey.

16 MS. FAWELL: Thank you.

17 DIRECTOR VALONE: We may bring on maybe the
18 American Planning Association, the Illinois chapter
19 to do some things. We're probably going to have
20 some -- you know, some other things that we put
21 together. Anne will be there also to kind of talk
22 about kind of, like, procedural things and like,
23 you know, the law things, about public hearings and
24 letting -- you know --

1 ATTORNEY SKRODZKI: Keep those planners on
2 track.

3 DIRECTOR VALONE: So, anyway, so kind of stay
4 tuned for that, but we don't have any other
5 applications at the moment.

6 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Oh, good. Holidays are
7 coming, no one wants to meet.

8 DIRECTOR VALONE: I know. Well, my own
9 personal --

10 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Do you have any liquor
11 applications pending?

12 DIRECTOR VALONE: What?

13 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Does the Liquor
14 Commission --

15 ATTORNEY SKRODZKI: Any liquor pending right
16 now?

17 DIRECTOR VALONE: No.

18 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Okay, good.

19 DIRECTOR VALONE: You want a little bit of a
20 break.

21 COMMISSIONER DEPROSPERIS: Immediate second
22 guessing.

23 COMMISSIONER JOHANN: Can we join the -- are
24 there public meetings?

1 DIRECTOR VALONE: Oh --

2 ATTORNEY SKRODZKI: Yes. Yes.

3 DIRECTOR VALONE: There's public comment, yes.
4 Oh, no.

5 COMMISSIONER JOHANN: Maybe we can go to that
6 and see how it goes.

7 DIRECTOR VALONE: I'll make sure to send a
8 link for his first meeting back.

9 ATTORNEY SKRODZKI: Feel free to attend.

10 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Thank you for that.

11 I would move on to Item F on the
12 agenda, adjournment, if there was a motion.

13 COMMISSIONER JOHANN: Motion to adjourn.

14 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Second?

15 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: All in favor?

17 (Chorus of ayes.)

18 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Opposed?


19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN GLIMCO: Motion passes.

21 Thank you, everyone.

22 (Whereupon the meeting was
23 adjourned at 9:00 p.m.)
24

1 I, Hailey M. Schoot, CSR, RPR, being
2 first duly sworn, on oath says that she is a court
3 reporter doing business in the State of Illinois;
4 and that she reported in shorthand the proceedings
5 of said meeting and that the foregoing is a true
6 and correct transcript of her shorthand notes so
7 taken as aforesaid, and contains the proceedings
8 given at said meeting.

9
10
11
12 
13 Hailey Schoot, CSR, RPR
14 Illinois CSR License 084-004897
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

