

**VILLAGE OF BANNOCKBURN
PLAN COMMISSION/ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
NOVEMBER 7, 2016
MEETING MINUTES**

1. Commissioner Laures moved, seconded by Commissioner Morris, to appoint Commissioner David Elston as the Pro-Tem Chairman for the meeting. On a voice vote, the motion was approved. Ayes: Four (Laures, Morris, Feeney, Ryan); Nays: None; Abstain: One (Elston); Absent: Two (McShane, Peters).

2. 01-11/07: **Call To Order.** Pro-Tem Chairman David Elston called the meeting of the Plan Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals to order at 7:00PM.

Chairman: David Elston

Commissioners Present: Louise Feeney, Gerald Laures, Glenn Morris, John Ryan

Commissioners Absent: Richard Peters, Chairman James McShane

Also Present: Village Counsel Betsy Gates, Village Manager Maria Lasday, Assistant to Village Manager Ryan Mentkowski, Village Forester Todd Sinn

Visitors: None

3. 02-11/07: **Pledge of Allegiance.** Pro-Tem Chairman Elston led everyone in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. 03-11/07: **Visitor's Business.**
No visitors spoke.

5. 04-11/07: **Approval of the October 17, 2016 Plan Commission & Zoning Board of Appeals Regular Meeting Minutes.**

Commissioner Laures moved, seconded by Commissioner Feeney, to approve the October 17, 2016 Plan Commission & Zoning Board of Appeals Regular Meeting Minutes, contingent on adding language to line 79. On a voice vote, the motion was approved. Ayes: Five (Elston, Feeney, Laures, Morris, Ryan); Nays: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Two (McShane, Peters).

6. 05-11/07: **Discuss a Referral by the Village Board of Trustees of Modifications to the Village's Tree Regulations.**

Pro-Tem Chairman Elston and the Commissioners discussed what the best methodology would be for continuing the review of this referral. The PCZBA Commissioners identified and outlined the issues that needed to be addressed, including the following:

- Definition of a bufferyard
 - Size of bufferyard.

- Where does bufferyard begin? Should foundation plantings count? Should there be different Bufferyard requirements in the different zoning lots (Commercial lots vs Residential A lots vs Residential B lots)?
- Trigger
 - When bufferyard requirements are triggered, should it affect all sides or visible sides?
 - Should there be a different requirement for new construction vs existing homes?
 - Scale of project in relation to size of property, etc. Should there be any exceptions? Currently, bufferyard requirements are triggered if a structure being proposed is at or greater than 200 square feet.
 - Should there be an incentive to landscape visible sides? Should there be a trade-off requirement for landscaping on front side of property? Need to remember Village character approved with the Comprehensive Plan.
 - Should a person have to comply with bufferyard requirements in front yard, if the improvement is in the backyard?
- Substantive requirements
 - Multiplier: We should reduce the number of plants required and extend amount of time to plant. Therefore, the bufferyard requirements will be more affordable and will not need to differentiate.
 - Opacity percentage and time frame.
 - Opacity definition.
 - What type of plant material?
 - Reforestation requirements after removing invasive buckthorn.
 - Incentives vs dis-incentives.
 - All sides vs visible sides.
 - Lot size / scale / existing conditions.
- Procedural requirements
 - Need for civil plan.
 - Need for landscape plan (bush example - Does removal of a bush trigger requirements?)
 - Enforcement, penalties, escrow/bond.
 - Safe harbor.
 - Exceptions (variance).
 - Independent professional reviewer paid for by the homeowner.
- Buckthorn
 - Reforestation requirements
 - Incentives? Removal of invasive specie

One or more of the PCZBA Commissioners, the Village Forester and Staff noted the following discussions related to this subject:

- That the Comprehensive Plan provides for heavy landscape at the bufferyard. There is a perimeter landscape requirement at all lot lines. The general consensus was to stick with the perimeter landscape bufferyard approach.
- They inquired whether the Building Commissioner should solve open issues regarding alternative widths, as noted above in the proposed regulations.
- For purposes of opacity requirements, the Commissioners inquired whether existing trees on right of ways count toward the resident's bufferyard requirements.

The Village Forester commented that residents cannot affect existing trees' critical root zone. Village Counsel noted that the current code counts trees in right of way. The Commissioners noted that we should continue with the current code.

- They inquired whether there were problems with small lots. They are more challenging. If bufferyard length is less than a hundred lineal feet, we need to codify Village Forester's current practice of proportionately measuring based on how many feet is available.
- The Village Forester commented that small lot depths are not a problem. Small lot widths are the problem because of the size of the driveways sometimes.

No further discussion took place and the general consensus of the PCZBA was to continue the discussion regarding opacity and bufferyard requirements to the December PCZBA meeting.

Adjournment.

Commissioner Morris moved, seconded by Commissioner Laures, to adjourn the meeting. On a voice vote, the motion was approved. Ayes: Five (Elston, Feeney, Laures, Morris, Ryan); Nays: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Two (McShane, Peters).

The meeting was adjourned at 9:13PM.