

MINUTES OF THE NORTH BARRINGTON PLAN COMMISSION MEETING WHICH WAS HELD JUNE 13, 2005 AT THE NORTH BARRINGTON VILLAGE HALL, 111 OLD BARRINGTON ROAD, IN SAID VILLAGE

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

At 7:38 P.M. Vice Chairman Banach called the meeting to order and the Clerk called the roll:

Present: Vice Chairman Terry Banach, Bill Bishop, Eleanor McDonnell, Denis Taillon

Absent: Chairman Martin Pais, Daniel Nass, Jason Hagen, Jim Archer

Also Present: Kathy Nelander, Village Clerk
Kent Venema, 418 S. Cook St., Barrington
Trustee Jim Moran
Trustee Al Pino

2. Approve Minutes: Plan Commission Meeting, May 9, 2005

The Minutes of the 5/9/05 Meeting were made available to the Commission.

Motion: Denis Taillon moved that the Minutes of the 5/9/05 Meeting be approved as presented; seconded by Eleanor McDonnell.

Discussion: There was no discussion.

Vote on Motion

By Roll Call: Ayes: Vice Chairman Terry Banach, Bill Bishop, Eleanor McDonnell, and Denis Taillon

Nays: None

Absent: Daniel Nass, Chairman Pais, Jason Hagen, Jim Archer

Abstain: None

Chairman Pais declared the Minutes of the 3/14/05 Meeting approved and put on file.

3. Appearance Review – Talon Development, Proposed Signs for North Barrington Professional Center at Wynstone

Kent Venema, Construction Manager for Talon Development, addressed the Commission. Mr. Venema displayed a site plan for the project in Wynstone North Commercial and pointed out the area for the main sign on the lot. The free-standing sign will be located on the north side of the entrance driveway, approximately 30 feet from the property line along Rand Road and approximately 67 feet from Building #1. He explained that it was a double sided sign which would be perpendicular to Route 12 in a retention/detention area on the lot and would be part of a terraced and landscaped area. Mr. Venema explained that the sign's stone columns complimented the stonework used on the buildings. He explained that the freestanding sign

would never have tenant names on it; that it would merely identify the development as North Barrington Professional Center at Wynstone and would be lit by two, 175 watt metal halide lights. He noted that the five buildings would require sixteen individual tenant signs, which would be located above the doorways to the buildings, and were minimized rather than fully filling the space allotted for the sign. Mr. Venema gave further information on the materials, design, and colors used for the signs and how the signs would be installed.

There were many questions from the Commission and extensive discussion. Commission member Eleanor McDonnell did not prefer the gray, metal signs to be used as tenant signs. She said she would prefer something that was more fitting to North Barrington. She also said that she had not had time to personally visit the site. After lengthy discussion about addresses, the Commission asked that the number 400 be added to the main signage as it was the address to the site. Mr. Venema noted that each tenant would have a different address.

There were questions about the two submitted styles of landscaping for the sign and who would be maintaining the retention area and the sign's landscaping. Mr. Venema explained that the buildings were condo units, and there would be an association to maintain the entire site. There were also questions about the sign's lighting as well as the relationship in size and distance to the Village Bank's sign. After lengthy discussion, the Commission asked that Mr. Venema return for the next Plan Commission meeting scheduled for July 11th, and add "400" to the main sign, indicate what the landscaped area around the sign would look like, as well as the materials which would be used in landscaping the area around the sign, as well as prepare a sample of a "softer" sign for the tenant signs.

4. Commission Member Denis Taillon – Report on Arlington Height's Ordinance Review Committee

Commission member Denis Taillon explained that he had attended a meeting of the Arlington Heights Ordinance Review Committee. He explained that the meeting was held to consider whether any minor rules or changes on current rules for teardowns are appropriate. Denis Taillon explained that the Ordinance Review Committee members also belong to the plan commission. Topics for discussion were whether to reduce the permitted floor area ratio, reduce the amount of the lot the building can cover or reduce the size a second story as compared to the first story. There were also discussions about historic preservation and tree preservation. Denis Taillon pointed out that most lots in Arlington Heights are smaller than lots in North Barrington. It was also noted that even though they have an ordinance on the books, they are still working on how to apply the ordinance. Vice Chairman Banach asked that Commission member Taillon write up a synopsis of the meeting.

5. Commission Member Bill Bishop – Proposed Teardown Policy

Commission member Bill Bishop explained that he, with fellow commission members Dan Nass and Jason Hagen, had finalized the Redevelopment Policy, and outlined the policy for the

Commission members. He explained that the policy had been developed in order to give homeowners and real estate developers guidelines which they could use to plan expansion of existing homes in North Barrington. He explained that his committee had felt that it was imperative to allow for the expansion and/or modernization of homes without completely changing the “personality” of our community. He noted that the committee tried to take into consideration the fresh ideas and enthusiasm of new members of the community while attempting to maintain the quaint, rural appearance of North Barrington.

Bill Bishop explained that the policy included a chart with suggested maximum lot coverage ratios for lots ranging in size from ¼ acres to 5 acres. He noted that smaller lots will, of necessity, have a higher floor area ratio than larger lots, and that the ratios have been developed based on a one story ranch style home. He explained that they used a ranch home as the basis since that type home would have the largest footprint and have the most effect on “curb appeal”.

Bill passed out a report from the subcommittee entitled “Redevelopment Policy”, with attachments explaining:

1. Redevelopment Policy
2. Definitions
3. Suggested Amendment to Height Ordinance
4. Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio

Bill Bishop outlined the Redevelopment Policy. He explained that homeowners need to have the ability to upgrade their property to satisfy their personal needs and lifestyle and to keep up with surrounding real estate markets. Overly restricted teardown/redevelopment ordinances may result in a gradual decline in the desirability of the community. Also, a determination needs to be made as to what the existing building/land ratio is and whether it is in the best interest of the community to increase or decrease that ratio and then be prepared to explain the rationale. The committee recommended that separate architectural committees for each community be formed with members from that community to encourage “neighbors influencing neighbors”. There was further discussion by the Commission. Bill Bishop also explained some of the definitions as presented. There was lengthy discussion.

As part of the Redevelopment Policy, a “Suggested Amendment to Height Ordinance” to have the maximum height of a house to be 35 feet was presented. In the wording of the suggested amendment, there were descriptions of roof styles and locations on roof that the Commission did not fully recognize, for instance “coping on a mansard roof”. Bill Bishop explained that Commission/Committee member Dan Nass had written the amendment and was not present to explain these roof styles and specific locations. Eleanor McDonnell did not feel that she could vote on the height topic, or the entire Redevelopment Policy, until further information was provided to her. Suggestions included having the text read “The vertical distance, as measured from the pre-development grade for a property, at a maximum height of 35 feet”, with no further

explanation. It was noted that the “Suggested Amendment to Height Ordinance” used terms that are typical of most Village’s ordinances and are familiar to contractors and architects. There was lengthy discussion.

As the Commission’s intent was to send the Redevelopment Policy to the Board for review, it was suggested that clarification on the “Suggested Amendment to Height Ordinance” be secured within a few days. This clarification, in the form of a drawing, would be forwarded to all members of the Commission via. facsimile. If the Commission members were in agreement on these definitions, this portion could also be forwarded to the Board. If the “Suggested Amendment to Height Ordinance” was not approved by the Commission members, only the three portions (Redevelopment Policy, Definitions, and Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio) of the Policy would be forwarded to the Board and the height issue would require additional discussions at the Commission level.

Trustee Jim Moran explained that the Policy would be going to Village Staff for review before it was passed on to the Board. He urged the Commission to make a decision in order to move forward with the documents, with the knowledge that additional input could be submitted.

Motion: Denis Taillon moved to forward the three portions of the Redevelopment Policy to Village Staff and ultimately the Village Board for review (Redevelopment Policy, Definitions, and Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio), and if the Commission has agreed, after the fact, on the “Suggested Amendment to Height Ordinance”, that this final portion would also be included along with a drawing indicating these roof styles, with the aforementioned materials; seconded by Bill Bishop.

Discussion: There was extensive discussion.

Vote on Motion

By Roll Call: Ayes:	Bill Bishop, Terry Banach, and Denis Taillon
Nays:	Eleanor McDonnell
Absent:	None
Abstain:	None

Vice Chairman Banach declared the motion approved. (At the time of the meeting, Commission member Eleanor McDonnell voted “Abstain” but then changed her vote to “No” without clarifying this with the Clerk. The Clerk realized this change in vote after listening to the tape.) The motion required a majority of the members of the Commission, or four votes, and the votes were “three to one” in favor, thus the motion did not pass.

6. Fence Ordinance Update

Trustee Jim Moran addressed the Commission. He explained that he had met with Plan Commission Martin Pais, Village President Bruce Sauer and Building and Zoning Officer Kelly Rafferty with regard to the proposed Fence Ordinance. Trustee Moran explained that the meeting, which lasted a few hours, resulted in some revisions being made to the draft

ordinance. He explained that not only would the Zoning Ordinance be amended with the Fence Ordinance, but the Village Code as well. Trustee Moran explained that Ordinance was currently being reviewed by the Village Attorney. Trustee Moran explained that there would be a Public Hearing for the Fence Ordinance at the next regularly scheduled Plan Commission meeting on July 11th at 7:30 p.m. He also noted that Village Board would discuss, at the June Village Board Meeting, how the Village should require homeowners to bring existing pools into compliance. Trustee Moran explained that after the Board decides on a policy issue regarding existing pools, this would be incorporated into the proposed Ordinance. Trustee Moran invited the Commission to attend the June 27th Village Board Meeting. There were some questions from the Commission for Trustee Moran and further discussion.

7. Old/New Business

There was no old or new business to discuss.

8. Adjournment

Motion: Bill Bishop moved the meeting be adjourned; seconded by Eleanor McDonnell.

Discussion: There was no discussion.

Vote on Motion:

The voice vote was unanimous in favor.

At 9:32 P.M. Vice Chairman Banach declared the meeting adjourned.

These Minutes were approved at the Plan Commission Meeting held July 13, 2005.

ATTEST:

Kathy Nelander, Village Clerk