

*Village of Barrington  
Plan Commission Meeting  
Minutes Summary*

Date: April 17, 2019

Time: 7:00 p.m.

Location: Village Board Room  
200 South Hough Street  
Barrington, Illinois

In Attendance: Susan Ferry, Commissioner  
Anna Markley Bush, Chairperson  
Dan Hogan, Vice-Chairperson  
Kate Duncan, Commissioner  
Jeff Anderson, Commissioner  
Richard Ehrle, Commissioner

Staff Members: Jennifer Tennant  
Andrew Binder

**Call to Order**

Chairperson Bush called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll call noted the following: Richard Ehrle, present; Kate Duncan; present; Jeff Anderson, present; Susan Ferry, present; Joann Lee, absent; Vice-Chairperson Hogan, present; Chairperson Anna Markley Bush, present.

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

#####

**Old Business**

**New Business**

**PC 19-03: Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment- Public Hearing**

**PETITIONER:** Village of Barrington  
(Jeff Lawler, Village Manager)  
200 South Hough Street  
Barrington, Illinois 60010

**PROPERTY OWNER:** Village of Barrington  
200 South Hough Street  
Barrington, Illinois 60010

The Petitioner seeks approval of a text amendment to the Zoning Ordinance for the Village of Barrington for the purpose of amending Chapter 2 "Definitions", Chapter 3 "Ordinance Administration", Chapter 4, Part I "General Regulations", Chapter 4, Part II " Off-Street Parking and Loading", Chapter 4, Part IV "Signs", Chapter 5 "Zoning Districts", Chapter 6 "Residential Districts", Chapter 7 "Business Districts", Chapter 9 "Special Purpose and Overlay Districts", Chapter 11 "Planned Developments"

Chairperson Bush commences the meeting. Then gives the floor to Ms. Tennant, who provides a presentation on behalf of the Village of Barrington.

Ms. Tennant begins with the text regarding the historical district. Over the years, the Village Board believes the complaints of the rules and restrictions bestowed on the historic district have been accumulating. Therefore, in August of 2018, the Village Board directed Staff to assemble a survey for only the historical district residents composed of various questions on topics such as rules, boundaries, and etc. along with resident's option if they would like to see the district remain the same, go away, or be modified. Based on the results, sixty-two percent of residents living in the historical district are in favor of converting the historical district into an appearance district. If this were to happen, it would mean the Village of Barrington will no longer require residents to preserve the original material, which is a hallmark of a preservation district, instead, the Village will only require the residents to achieve an architectural appearance. The Board is not prepared to eliminate the historical district, it is a part of Barrington, but they are prepared to ask the plan commission to consider discarding some of the original material requirement.

Chairperson Bush asks Ms. Tennant if eliminating the requirement for original material would affect the historical district status on the national register.

Ms. Tennant states it does not affect our place on the register of historical places. However, if the text amendment is put into effect then Barrington will lose the Certified Local Government Status because the perseveration element of the ordinances will be gone.

Commissioner Duncan asks Ms. Tennant if a resident would have to replace or repair what is currently there if they wanted to do work on their siding

Ms. Tennant says currently they have would have to retain and restore.

Commissioner Anderson asks Ms. Tennant who will be purview of determining if the replicated material is accepted.

Ms. Tennant replies it will be a combination of the Architectural Review Commission and Staff.

Commissioner Duncan asks Ms. Tennant if the regulations will correspond to both contributing and non-contributing buildings.

Ms. Tennant says yes

Commissioner Anderson asks Ms. Tennant if any other community has anything similar to what is being proposed.

Ms. Tennant replies this is moderately unconventional. Lake Forest has an appearance district, but a majority of surrounding communities have preservation districts with some leniency. For example, Elgin has a regulation where if fifty percent of your siding is rotten one can take off all their siding and replace it.

Vice-Chairperson Hogan asks Ms. Tennant who on Staff will be in charge.

Ms. Tennant says it will be herself and Greg Summers, Director of Developmental Services.

Vice-Chairperson Hogan asks Ms. Tennant what criteria they will be utilizing.

Ms. Tennant replies the criteria that will be utilized is based on if the purposed material has the same design, dimension, profile, and texture as the original. There is no real standard for what the makeup of those materials will be because some products are wood pulp, some are fiber cement boards and some products are like a molded plastic blend, so for that reason it would be difficult to have the Village label what certain products are accepted.

Commissioner Duncan asks Ms. Tennant how interested buyers become aware that the house is in the historical district.

Ms. Tennant replies the buyers have to do their own research.

Commissioner Anderson voices his dislike on the survey results being the only argument used to want to make a drastic alternation to the historical district. In his option, the survey should be made broader so that the community as a whole has a say on what they would like to see happen to the historical district.

With being present when the historical district was established, Chairperson Bush describes how the plan commission worked really hard and long to get this established. The historic district was originally created because people were fearful about the preservation of the homes and community being destroyed and if these text amendments are approved that fear will become a reality. In general, she agrees with Commissioner Anderson. The plan commission has a job to preserve the Village and cannot put emotions before that.

Commissioner Duncan agrees with Chairperson Bush and Commissioner Anderson. It is easy to want to be sympathetic to the homeowners because it is a big responsibility to maintain those homes, however, those homes and the preservation of them contributes to the character of Barrington, but is open to negotiate ways to make the burden easier for homeowners.

Commissioner Anderson asks Ms. Tennant how they determine if a material is not restorable on a home.

Ms. Tennant says an Architectural Review Commission member and Staff go out and do an inspection.

Vice-Chairperson Hogan asks Ms. Tennant if she can elaborate on the cost and energy efficiency on this text amendment.

Ms. Tenant states in some respects there is not a lot of cost difference. It is more about people being upset about having to spend the same amount on the old windows as they would on new windows.

Vice-Chairperson Hogan asks Ms. Tennant if people have the assumption that the old windows are less durable.

Ms. Tenant explains how, in her opinion, people complain that they have to keep the old stuff and that their problem of it being drafty in their home will not change unless they get new windows.

Commissioner Ferry voices how the language appears too loose and her concern on builders coming in to purchase homes in the historic district just to tear them down and remodel them.

Chairperson Bush states this is a delicate balance because she does not want to drive people away, but Barrington has worked really hard to establish.

Vice-Chairperson Hogan acknowledges that both sides have valued points.

Commissioner Duncan asks if the changes have been before the Architectural Review Commission.

Ms. Tennant responds that the changes to the design guidelines and the changes to the standards of a certificate of appropriateness for contributing structures have been before the Architectural Review

Commission. The reactions of the Architectural Review Commission members was mixed with having one member in full support to another being very against the changes.

Chairperson Bush swears those in attendance in and opens up the floor for them to speak.

Mr. John Hards, approaches the podium and states he is one of few residents who was present during the establishment of the historical district. Recently, the home across the street from his house was permitted to put in fiberglass columns and when he was doing work on his home he was not allowed to utilize fiberglass columns. For this reason, he does not think the rules are consistent. Even though Mr. John Hardies has some issues with the rules and restrictions of the historic district, he does not want to see builders come in and tearing down the homes, he just wants consistency.

Next, Mr. Paul Hamm approaches the podium and asks if Staff has a new way of approaching situations that are similar to the problem he had when dealing with the Architectural Review Commission. Mr. Paul Hamm experienced a fire a few years ago and the Village held him up for two months because of restrictions. In the end, it took thirteen months to be able to move back into his home.

Ms. Tennant replies to Mr. Hamm by saying in his case the original material was moved without consent. Overall, no changes have been made unless the text amendments are put into effect.

Mr. Hamm responds he was obligated to replace his windows because they did not meet the fire code.

Ms. Tennant expresses her understanding and says the windows were approved, but on the permit, no trim work was permitted.

Before stepping away from the podium, Mr. Hamm says he would want to see some changes made because he would not want to see someone go through the same ordeal.

Lastly, Mr. Joe Coath, member of the Architectural Review Commission approaches the podium. He begins by noting that the central reason he moved to Barrington was for its large quantity of historical property. He explains that there are very few places in the United States like Barrington that has all these historical structures. For that reason, it is vital to preserve the historic district because it educates the future generations to not only on how to build better, but also sustain the beauty of the town. As for the survey, in his opinion, it was insignificant. The survey did not include serious enough questions where it informed the residents on the positive aspects of having a historical district and what the consequence would be if they changed into an appearance district. To his belief, the survey seemed more of a political cover-up by someone or a group of people who are trying to push their agenda. If the plan commissions motions these text amendments, it would be an assault to all the people who put in a lot of effort in establishing the historic district. In general, he knows the rules and restrictions of preserving the original material can be a strain, but having a "pretend district" would be far worse.

After the three gentlemen are done speaking, Chairperson Bush asks if anyone else has any more questions for Staff.

Commissioner Duncan asks Ms. Tennant how people were notified about this special plan commission meeting.

Ms. Tennant says originally a letter was mailed out, but on April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2019 the quorum was not meet so the meeting was rescheduled for today, April 17<sup>th</sup>, 2019. Notifications were put out on NextDoor, Facebook, and the Village website.

Before advancing to other topics, the Commissioners decide to vote on the historical district subject, so those in the audience can leave if they wish.

Based on the dialogue, the Commissioners unanimously vote against the changes to the text amendments concerning the historical district. All the Commissioners see both sides to the argument and would be open to discussing ways to lighten the burden of maintaining the historic properties, but the language appears too loose for them at the point.

With getting a sense on this topic, Ms. Tennant advises to move forward with the other amendments and states they can motion the text amendments less the historical district component.

Commissioner Anderson asks Ms. Tennant if the Village Board is still going to move forward with voting on the changes to the historical district.

Ms. Tennant replies yes.

Moving forward, Ms. Tennant explains the changes being proposed for the additional text amendments. For Definition, Staff came across some conflicts. For example in the building code, there was an issue on the distances between an outdoor fireplace and the structure. For automobile stations, Staff realized it grants not only tobacco sales, which Barrington no longer permits but also auto repair uses. When it comes to auto repair it is a separate special use, however, given Staffs problem with the gas station on Northwest Highway it would be best to make it apparent that no more auto repair shops can be established at a gas station without special consideration. Staff has also added a new definition for dormers and new language was affixed to the special use section. Currently, the text amendment does not state what happens if a special use if abandoned so adding this will make it clear that if abandoned, one can reverse back to their original zoning. Next, Chapter 4 part I concerning solar collectors. Right now, the Village does not specifically address them. Solar collectors are considered under the roof mounted satellite section, but Staff wants to make it more specific. If approved, the requirements for solar collectors will be more lenient because currently, the Village does not allow residents to install satellite dishes in the front of your house, but Staff is going to allow for solar collectors to be placed the front of

their home. Flush mounted installations that are tiltable and automated solar collectors will be allowed, and based on this Staff believes this is a good middle ground.

Commissioner Duncan asks Ms. Tennant if this applies to only residential districts or all the districts.

Ms. Tennant says it applies to all the districts.

Commissioner Anderson asks Ms. Tennant if a sub-division does not like the solar collectors in the front of a home, can they overrule the regulation.

Ms. Tennant says under state law homeowner associations are not permitted to make stricter regulations on solar panels, but the Village is not a part of that enforcement. It would have to be between the homeowner association, the resident, and the state to figure it out.

Moving along, Ms. Tennant proceed by saying an item that has been coming up lately is unattended collection boxes. The Village has not allowed them in the past, but Staff received a letter from an attorney representing a collection box company claiming the donation boxes have been ruled in court as a type of freedom of speech. With that being the case, the Village attorney spent a lot of time researching this matter and ultimately did conclude that the donation boxes are considered a freedom of speech. Therefore, Staff researched sample ordinances and determined they would be allowed in the business districts and they have to be one thousand feet apart from one another.

Vice-Chairperson Hogan asks if there is a dimension limitation.

Ms. Tennant says no. There is a limit for two per property and if contacted by the Village they have forty-eight hours to response.

Next, Ms. Tennant moves onto driveways. In the past, Staff has come across a few circle driveways. The width of driveways are regulated by having them have a twenty feet maximum unless a resident has a three or four car garage then it can be widened, but they have to come back to twenty feet when they reach property line. This regulation was applied to circle driveways by requiring a person to have a ten feet per leg at the property line. After various people have approached Staff on this subject, Staff went out to take some measurements and decided the width was a little tight for circle driveways. Based on the field examples, Staff is proposing to widen by two feet on each leg which will take the overall driveway width to twenty-four feet.

Commissioner Duncan expresses how twenty-four feet seems like a really wide driveway and asks if it can be limited to each side getting twelve.

Ms. Tennant tends to agree, however, the tricky part is that at some point every circle driveway becomes a single driveway, so Staff was trying to find something that is uniformly enforceable. Along with this,

Staff is hoping to establish a minimum driveway width. It has been noticed, that with a few new home constructions people are omitting to go with the grass strip option to save on impervious surface coverage. The Village does allow the grass strip option, but people are attempting to make it as narrow as possible and based on a proposition they received not too long ago Staff has decided to have a bare minimum of 3x3x3. Moreover, when it comes to a parking stall and overhang encroachment, we will ask people to overhang their parking stalls on the concrete bumpers, and not of the landscape bumpers. As for Chapter 6, the Village currently exempts covered porches from floor area requirements and would like that reverse. In Chapter 11, Staff is asking for a discretion for the establishment of any planned development for zoning districts B-4 and B-5t. A miscellaneous topic that applies to multiple chapters is the lessening of demolition requirements for properties. There are some key properties in the Village Centers that if demolished could be devastating, therefore, Staff is proposing that any property in the B-4 and B-5 or BR district listed on the national register to be required to obtain a planned development to demolish and an approved reused plan for their property. Lastly, when it comes to material restriction, Staff would like to reduce the restrictions on multi-family home and commercial building because it has become aware that if the text amendments are approved for the historical district, Staff would hold multi-family home and commercial building to a higher standard that would be unjust.

Since the Commissioners were against the changed to the text amendments regarding the historic district, it is decided to put on a pin on the topic relating to material restriction

Unanimously, the Commissioners found the rest of the proposed amendments met the standards and were acceptable.

Commissioner Ehrle asks Ms. Tennant if she is going to revise the proposal based on tonight's discussion.

Ms. Tennant says it will go before the Village Board on Monday, April 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2019 and the Board will either accept or reject the plan commission's recommendations. If accepted, it will come back to the plan commission with revised language.

Vice-Chairperson Hogan motioned and Commissioner Ferry seconded the motion to approve PC 19-03 less the historical district preservation components for approval of a text amendment to the Zoning Ordinance for the Village of Barrington.

*Roll call Vote: Mr. Ehrle, yes; Mr. Anderson, yes; Ms. Duncan, yes; Ms. Ferry, yes; Ms. Lee, absent; Vice-Chairperson Hogan, yes; and Chairperson Bush, yes. The vote was 6-0; the motion carried.*

# # # # #

Minutes

# # # # #

Planners Report

*Adjournment*

Vice-Chairperson Hogan made a motion and Commissioner Anderson seconded to adjourn the meeting at 8:38 p.m. Chairperson Bush declared the motion approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Esmeralda Nava  
Administrative Assistant

Approved: