

**VILLAGE OF HINSDALE
VILLAGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING
May 26, 2021**

The specially scheduled meeting of the Hinsdale Village Board of Trustees (conducted electronically and in person) was called to order by Village President Tom Cauley on Tuesday, May 26, 2021 at 6:33 p.m., roll call was taken.

Present: President Tom Cauley, Trustees Matthew Posthuma, Laurel Haarlow, Luke Stifflear, Michelle Fisher, Neale Byrnes, and Scott Banke
Participating electronically: None

Absent: None

Present: Village Manager Kathleen A. Gargano, Assistant Village Manager/Director of Public Safety Brad Bloom, Village Planner Bethany Salmon and Village Clerk Christine Bruton
Participating electronically: Finance Director Andrea Lamberg

CITIZENS' PETITIONS

SECOND READINGS / NON-CONSENT AGENDA – ADOPTION

Zoning & Public Safety (Chair Stifflear)

- a) **Approve a referral of a Text Amendment to Section 3-106(B)(1), and concurrent Planned Development Concept Plan, Special Use Permit, and Site Plan and Exterior Appearance Review for Heather Highlands by McNaughton Development for consideration by the Plan Commission, OR;**

Deny a Text Amendment to Section 3-106(B)(1) and concurrent Planned Development Concept Plan, Special Use Permit, and Site Plan and Exterior Appearance Review for Heather Highlands by McNaughton Development

President Cauley introduced the item that is a concept plan for a development opportunity at part of the Institute of Basic Life Principles (IBLP) property, between Adams and Madison. A referral would result in a public hearing that would allow review of the scope, character and nature of the development proposal, and is the basis on which the public would make comments. He explained that should the Board find this proposal merits a hearing and consideration, it requires four affirmative votes. If the motion is denied, it has the same legal effect as a public hearing, and the applicant cannot come back with a similar proposal for two years. He clarified that if the Board decides to refer the concept plan, it is not an approval, only agreement that at a high level, the project is worthy of further consideration. He made note of the 50+ emails the Board has received from Hinsdale and Oak Brook residents, all of which oppose the plan, stating their concerns that, among other things, the project is too dense.

He has spoken to each of the Trustees individually, and will use his prerogative to frame the issues for discussion to be more efficient. When analyzing the project it is important to first consider what can be built by right without any zoning code relief. He and Trustee Stifflear have worked on this; it is easier said than done as these are odd properties. The Madison Street side will need a street to access the homes, as will the Adams side, but more than half

are wetlands. An outside engineering firm, James Benes & Associates was hired to do an analysis of what could be built by right. He illustrated three different options. The first shows 9 code compliant homes on the Adams and Madison Street sides each. The second shows the location reconfigured, but the same number of homes result. The third, as configured by the Village Planner, shows 10 homes on the Adams side. These code compliant options allow for 18-19 homes total. The McNaughton proposal has 11 homes on Madison, which is two more than code allows in an R2 development. These homes are not age restricted. However, on the Adams side, they propose 15 homes, code allows 9-10, and these would be age restricted. He added that although there are more homes, the age restriction reduces the traffic impact. They were able to add the 6 additional homes because they reduced the 66' foot required right-of-way of the new roadway in the area. On the Adams side the street is much more narrow, and impassable by a fire truck. President Cauley believes this is a non-starter. They are asking for some height relief, but this could be a result of the topography, and to allow for walk-outs and such. They are asking for 10' feet of setback relief from the required 35" feet. He said this is more relief than was provided to the developer of Hinsdale Meadows, which is an island onto itself. This property is in a residential community.

He reported that following his conversation with each Trustee, none of them favor referral to the Plan Commission. All of them agreed the proposal was too dense, and most pointed out that no resident spoke in favor of the proposal. Most see the benefit of an age-restricted development, but some noted there are still properties available in Hinsdale Meadows.

As he sees it, the developer has two options, to try to convince the Board to vote for a referral tonight, or solicit the Board and residents as to what would be acceptable and come back with a revised concept plan.

Mr. Paul McNaughton addressed the Board stating it does not make sense to present tonight, and requested the Board continue this to a future date. In the meantime, he would set up meetings with Trustees for more direct feedback. He stated his company does not have an appetite for a straight R2 conforming subdivision. Mr. McNaughton does not believe there is a huge demand for 20,000' square foot lots, and that age-restricted properties serve more of a need in town. There are more lots in the proposal, but this density is in exchange for other benefits this development would bring, including less traffic, fewer school age children, park improvements, public access easement, a pedestrian path, and private development with low municipal burden. With respect to the letters the Village has received, this is a concept level referral only, he could find just as many people who would speak out in support of the work his company does. He believes the Trustees are only seeing one side.

President Cauley stated he views the zoning code as sacrosanct, changes can be made for special situations, such as an age-restricted proposal. However, given the proposed number of units, the width of the roadway, the height and the setback, it is too inconsistent with the code.

Trustee Posthuma stated that on the Madison side he is concerned about the right-of-way and the elevations. On the Adams side, he is sympathetic to age-restricted housing, but thinks more study into how Hinsdale Meadows is proceeding, and whether there is continuing need for this type of housing. He would argue that seniors would prefer a more walkable location than this section of town offers. He believes Hinsdale Meadows has set the standard for that type of development.

Mr. McNaughton explained how the elevation requirement is computed; it is not because the buildings will be taller, but because it is calculated on average grade. This is, in part, a quirk of the zoning code.

Trustee Haarlow expressed concern regarding the reduced perimeter open space and increased bulk generally, resulting in a different neighborhood feel than currently exists. With regard to the look-outs and walk-outs, if relief were granted for these things, she warned against future adjustments to the plans. She would like more specificity about the age restriction designation. The open space needs to be for the public, not just a walking path for homeowners, it should be accessible and usable by the public.

Trustee Stifflear noted certain restrictions could be relaxed for certain benefits. In this case, less traffic and fewer school age children, but the brunt of the relaxing falls on the neighbors. The neighbors will be dealing with this for years to come. He would like to see the 20 acres of non-buildable area donated to the Village as parkland. This is a tangible public benefit. Otherwise, it could end up being a private park, with no benefit to the public. He believes there is a compromise, but that residents also need to realize that something will be built there.

Trustee Fisher commented that she was on the Plan Commission that reviewed the first submission in 2020. Some problems still exist, including density, and the homes are too similar which is not in keeping with the character of the neighborhood. She stressed the importance of community feedback and meeting with the neighbors. There cannot be a meeting of the minds without developing a relationship before there is another submission to the Board. She echoed concern regarding the public benefit: what is being enhanced, created, and improved. A park would be a beautiful idea, and something people could support.

Trustee Byrnes added that the Fullersburg area is special and unique, changes need to be made carefully. He believes the trend is large homes on large lots. He is concerned about the front yard setback, the lot width, and the narrow road. He suggested a lower price point, but acknowledged that the number of units impact pricing for a developer.

Trustee Banke recommended better community outreach. He feels there is almost a general contempt for the residents and their feedback, and that taints his view of voting in the affirmative. The Board represents residents, their homes are the largest investment of their lives, and a proposal such as this has a lifelong impact. He recommended Mr. McNaughton approach the residents in this area to receive consensus from the neighbors. A development is a benefit to the community only if residents think so. He believes a yes vote to move this forward would be tacit approval of the project. He encouraged more effort to reach out to the families who live in this area, and align a project that brings their support.

Mr. Eric Missil, Oak Brook resident, addressed the Board stating that, for the record, residents met last fall with McNaughton and gave them feedback. They tried to collaborate with the developer.

Mr. Bob Lindgren, Oak Brook resident, stated their house is closer to the Adams side development. He wanted to remind the Board of the major flooding and water management issue in the lowlands in this area. The proposed site plan has 9 houses at flood plain level. President Cauley explained all projects in the Village receive the benefit of water management efforts, and DuPage County regulations will likely have to be met in this area as well. Mr. Lindgren said he is not speaking on this just because of the possible impact to his property, but also the general degradation of the water benefit of that area.

Mr. Dan Hemmer of 424 Glendale thanked the Board for their consideration. He said hardly anyone in the area is anti-development. He thanked the Board for providing the R2 baseline illustration. He agreed park land would be wonderful and something to consider. He would like the Village to work with IBLP owners to develop a master plan, but they are selling to the highest bidder. Residents do not want track housing, and would prefer custom homes that fit the setting. They are not afraid of more kids in a single-family home.

Mr. Armando Travelli of 521 Bonnie Brae, pointed out that age-restricted homeowners are desirable because of less burden on schools, but they do not vote in favor of referendums for school improvements. Area residents want an involved community.

Mr. McNaughton thanked everyone for their feedback; they will try to come up with something more suitable based on comments.

TRUSTEE COMMENTS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Board, President Cauley asked for a motion to adjourn. Trustee Banke moved to **adjourn the specially scheduled meeting of the Hinsdale Village Board of Trustees of May 26, 2021**. Trustee Stifflear seconded the motion.

AYES: Trustees Posthuma, Haarlow, Stifflear, Fisher, Byrnes, Banke

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 8:11 p.m.

ATTEST: _____
Christine M. Bruton, Village Clerk