

VILLAGE OF BURR RIDGE PLAN COMMISSION/ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF FEBRUARY 19, 2024

I. ROLL CALL

The meeting of the Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals was called to order at 7:00 p.m. at the Burr Ridge Village Hall Board Room, 7660 County Line Road, Burr Ridge, Illinois by Chairman Trzupsek.

ROLL CALL was noted as follows:

PRESENT: 8 – Irwin, McCollian, Parrella, Petrich, Broline, Stratis, Morton, and Trzupsek

ABSENT: 0 – None

Planner Ella Stern was also present.

II. APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES – FEBRUARY 5, 2024

Commissioner Petrich stated the petitioner's last name should be included on page 17.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Morton and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Petrich to approve the minutes of the February 5, 2024 meeting as amended.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 7 – Petrich, Broline, Irwin, McCollian, Parrella, Morton, and Trzupsek

NAYS: 0 – None

ABSTAIN: 1 – Stratis

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 7-0 with one absentee.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chairman Trzupsek introduced the public hearings on the agenda. Chairman Trzupsek requested to swear in all those wishing to speak on such matters on the meeting agenda and a swearing in of such individuals was conducted.

A. Z-01-2024: 101 Burr Ridge Parkway (RE/MAX); Special Use and Findings of Fact

Chairman Trzupsek introduced the case and asked for a summary. Stern stated the petitioner requested a special use to permit a real estate office in a B-2 General Business zoned district. Stern stated the proposed site was on the first floor of the Harris Bank Building. Stern noted the petitioner was Coya Smith of RE/MAX Properties. Stern stated RE/MAX Properties offers services and sponsorships to businesses and residents. Stern stated RE/MAX Properties had around 15 agents that worked remotely but came in and out of the office. Stern showed an image of the site plan. Stern stated the petitioner intended the hours of operation to be by appointment Monday through Friday, 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM, and Saturday and Sunday, 9:00 AM to 12:00 PM. Stern noted that 101 Burr

Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals
February 19, 2024 Regular Meeting

Ridge Parkway had approximately 93 parking spaces, and the petitioner intended to use 8 to 10 spaces. Stern stated as part of the application, the petitioner provided information regarding the proposed signage. Stern stated the proposed signage complied with the Sign Ordinance Regulations for window signs. Stern stated the petitioner provided findings of fact that could be adopted by the Plan Commission with their recommendation and were included in the staff report. Stern stated there were two recommended conditions if the Commission wished to recommend approval.

Chairman Trzupke invited the petitioner to speak.

The Petitioner, Coya Smith of RE/MAX Properties, stated they were looking to relocate to Burr Ridge.

Chairman Trzupke asked for public comment.

Alice Krampits, 7515 Drew Road, asked questions regarding the signage and current tenants in the space.

Smith stated Harris Bank used the first floor. The petitioner stated there would only be two window signs.

Chairman Trzupke asked for Commissioner discussion.

Commissioner Morton asked for clarification regarding the signage. Commissioner Morton asked the petitioner why they needed two signs on the same elevation. Commissioner Morton asked for clarification regarding the by-appointment only.

Stern stated that the two proposed signs would be permitted.

Smith stated the two signs would be more visible from both sides of the street. Smith stated that there would be appointments and walk-ins.

Commissioner Broline asked Smith about the separation between the offices.

Smith stated the offices had a separate door and space. Smith stated the hours of operation were different from RE/MAX Properties.

Commissioner Petrich asked questions regarding a street sign by the parking lot, the office space, and Sign Ordinance Regulations.

The petitioner stated there would be no street sign. Smith stated there were other tenants on the second and third floors of the building. Smith stated if other tenants had objections regarding the signs, they would take one down. Smith stated the landlord did not allow signage above the first floor.

Stern stated she would confirm the sign limit on a window.

Commissioner McCollian noted she knew the petitioner personally.

Chairman Trzupke questioned the necessity of requiring a special use for the real estate office or an office. Chairman Trzupke discussed different businesses and the generation of sales tax. Chairman Trzupke suggested the Plan Commission review the special uses

Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals
February 19, 2024 Regular Meeting

for the B-2 General Business District in the future as an amendment to see if some of the special uses could be permitted use.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner McCollian and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Parrella to close the public hearing for case Z-01-2024.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 8 – McCollian, Parrella, Irwin, Petrich, Broline, Stratis, Morton, and Trzupsek
NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 8-0

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Petrich and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Morton to approve case Z-01-2024, with Findings of Fact, and with the following conditions:

1. The special use shall be limited to Coya Smith and her business partners and shall expire at such time that Coya Smith and her business partners no longer occupy the space at 101 Burr Ridge Parkway, Unit 150, or at which time there is an assignment or termination of the lease for the space at 101 Burr Ridge Parkway, Unit 150.
2. The special use shall be limited to RE/MAX Properties and operated in a manner consistent with the submitted business plan included as Exhibit A.
3. The special use shall be limited to the 2,700 square feet of floor area shown within the business plan at 101 Burr Ridge Parkway, Unit 150, included as Exhibit A.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 8 – Petrich, Morton, Irwin, McCollian, Parrella, Broline, Stratis, and Trzupsek
NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 8-0.

B. V-01-2024: 15W765 80th St. (LaConte); Variation and Findings of Fact

Staff requested the case be continued to the March 4, 2024 Plan Commission meeting.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner McCollian and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Irwin to continue V-01-2024 to the March 4, 2024 Plan Commission meeting.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 8 – McCollian, Irwin, Parrella, Petrich, Broline, Stratis, Morton, and Trzupsek
NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 8-0.

C. Z-15-2023: Zoning Ordinance Amendment for Architectural Entrance Structures and Driveway Gates (Village of Burr Ridge); Text Amendment and Findings of Fact

[CONTINUED FROM DECEMBER 4, 2023 & FEBRUARY 5, 2024]

Chairman Trzupek introduced the case and asked for a summary. Stern stated on November 13th, the Board of Trustees directed the Plan Commission to hold a public hearing on potential Zoning Ordinance text amendments pertaining to architectural entrance structures and driveway gates. Stern stated the direction from the Board focused on residents within the residential districts and considered the permitted size of a parcel for a driveway gate. At the February 5th Plan Commission meeting, staff presented information regarding speed limits, traffic counts, different residential zoning districts and acreage, and neighboring municipality research. Stern stated the driveway gate provisions have changed over the years. Stern reviewed the current regulations for driveway gates and architectural entrance structures. Stern stated staff provided new information based upon the Commission's direction at the February 5th Plan Commission meeting. Stern noted the definitions of different street classifications from the Comprehensive Plan. Stern showed a map from the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT). Stern stated staff provided proposed language, changing the section pertaining to the required acreage and location on arterial roads based upon the Commission's direction at the February 5th meeting. Stern read the proposed driveway gate language.

Chairman Trzupek asked for public comment. There was none. Chairman Trzupek asked for Commissioner discussion.

Commissioner Irwin stated concerns about permitting a driveway gate on an arterial street with no size limitation. Commissioner Irwin suggested having additional limitations for an arterial street. Commissioner Irwin suggested naming the streets in the proposed language instead of saying arterial streets. Commissioner Irwin stated he did not support gates and fences.

The Commissioners clarified the proposed driveway gate language.

Stern clarified that the arterial roads were Plainfield Road, Route 83, and north of County Line Road.

Commissioner Petrich noted that the IDOT map did not accurately reflect the traffic counts presented at the February 5th Plan Commission meeting. Chairman Trzupek agreed with Commissioner Petrich.

Chairman Trzupek asked for clarification regarding the definitions.

Stern stated the definitions were from the Comprehensive Plan and the map was from IDOT.

Commissioner Stratis discussed the definition of arterial streets.

Commissioner McCollian agreed with specifying the language to reflect County Line Road north of 79th Street.

Commissioner Parella agreed.

Commissioner Petrich stated he did not support amending the driveway gate regulations. Commissioner Petrich noted that amending the driveway gate regulations could potentially change the character of the Village of Burr Ridge. Commissioner Petrich discussed traffic and safety. Commissioner Petrich reiterated the IDOT map did not accurately reflect the traffic counts. Commissioner Petrich stated if the Commission chose to move forward, he suggested naming the specific roads in the driveway gate regulations instead of referring to IDOT.

Commissioner Broline stated the proposed language lacks definition. Commissioner Broline discussed the effects on different-sized properties, limitations, and traffic counts. Commissioner Broline suggested removing the word general from general arterial streets. Commissioner Broline agreed with naming the specific roads in the driveway gate regulations.

Commissioner Stratis agreed with Commissioner Irwin and Commissioner Petrich. Commissioner Stratis stated he would want the roads delineated. Commissioner Stratis stated imposing a minimum lot size regulation specifically for properties located along arterial roads might not be necessary because it was self-regulating.

Commissioner Morton agreed with Commissioner Irwin, Commissioner Petrich, and Commissioner Stratis. Commissioner Morton stated that the allowed lot size has decreased over the last twenty years. Commissioner Morton stated that he was more in favor of not recommending adoption.

Commissioner Petrich noted Wolf Road, between 70th Street and Plainfield, had a large traffic count, which was not on the IDOT map.

Commissioner Stratis discussed traffic counts, speed limits, barriers, and how roads had different amounts of lanes.

The Commissioners discussed roads throughout the Village.

Commissioner Petrich noted that few homes were for sale on minor or major arterial roads due to concerns about residing on an arterial road.

Chairman Trzupek supported a 2-acre minimum lot size unless the property was on an arterial. Chairman Trzupek noted an arterial should be defined. Chairman Trzupek agreed with naming the specific roads in the driveway gate language. Chairman Trzupek stated the Plan Commission does not need to amend the driveway gate regulations. Chairman Trzupek noted the Plan Commission has not found a hardship in the case.

Commissioner Stratis noted that the Plan Commission was not required to make an amendment; rather they provided a recommendation and evaluated the proposed text

amendment.

Commissioner Irwin stated he was unaware of a community demand for driveway gates.

Commissioner Petrich discussed traffic counts.

Chairman Trzupsek stated that traffic counts were a concern, but speed limits were likely more important. Chairman Trzupsek mentioned an accident by Fieldstone Club on the south side of Plainfield Road.

Commissioner McCollian confirmed if the Plan Commission did not approve the text amendment, residents would apply for a variance. Commissioner McCollian suggested the amendment be a special use so the Plan Commission could review a case property by property instead of a variance that held a higher standard.

Stern stated she would need to confirm if a special use for driveway gates would be permitted.

The Commission supported reviewing the driveway gate regulations as a special use.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Irwin and **SECONDED** by Commissioner McCollian to continue Z-15-2024 to the April 1, 2024 Plan Commission meeting.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 8 – Irwin, McCollian, Parrella, Petrich, Broline, Stratis, Morton, and Trzupsek

NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 8-0.

D. Z-16-2023: Zoning Ordinance Amendment for Residential Fences (Village of Burr Ridge); Text Amendment and Findings of Fact [CONTINUED FROM DECEMBER 4, 2023 & FEBRUARY 5, 2024]

Chairman Trzupsek introduced the case and asked for a summary. Stern stated on November 13, 2023, the Board of Trustees directed the Plan Commission to hold a public hearing regarding fences in residential districts, specifically for corner lots and permitting fences in the practical rear yard of homes when the home faces the corner side yard. Stern reviewed the current fence regulations and showed an illustration of the current fence regulations. Stern noted at the February 5, 2024 Plan Commission meeting, staff provided draft language and an illustration. Stern stated that based upon the discussion at the February 5, 2024 Plan Commission meeting, staff provided additional diagrams illustrating a corner property and a neighboring interior lot. Stern stated before staff proposed draft language, staff sought direction from the Plan Commission on how to address situations where permitting a fence in the rear yard of a corner lot permits the fence to be located within the side yard or front yard of the adjacent home.

Chairman Trzupke asked for public comment. There was none. Chairman Trzupke asked for Commissioner discussion.

Chairman Trzupke asked where the text amendment derived from.

The Commission discussed a previous zoning case pertaining to the fence text amendment.

Commissioner Morton and Commissioner Irwin asked for clarification regarding the illustration. Commissioner Irwin confirmed that the smaller width of the lot was the front.

Stern stated the illustration to the right noted the proposed Zoning Ordinance regulations and the illustration to the left reflects the current Zoning Ordinance regulations. Stern stated at the February 5, 2024 meeting, the Plan Commission had concerns regarding the adjacent properties and permitting a fence in the side yard of the neighbor's property.

Commissioner Irwin suggested implementing a setback off of the property line if a fence was adjacent to the side yard of a neighbor's home.

Commissioner Morton stated he struggled with finding a more suitable solution than what was currently in place.

Commissioner Stratis agreed with Commissioner Morton. Commissioner Stratis questioned whether the Plan Commission considered the location of the exit from the home.

Chairman Trzupke discussed fence locations on a corner property.

Commissioner Morton suggested it may be beyond the Plan Commission's ability to define the case as a text amendment and a variance may be the best option.

Commissioner Broline stated confusion regarding the fence illustrations. Commissioner Broline stated adjacent neighbors would be affected and that neighbors should have input.

Commissioner Petrich noted he would be interested to know what was to the left of the illustration. Commissioner Petrich stated the adjacent neighbors would be affected. Commissioner Petrich stated if an adjacent neighbor had built a house before today, a fence would be prohibited where the proposed language allowed a fence, which was unfair. Commissioner Petrich suggested a special use instead of a text amendment or variance.

Commissioner McCollian stated there were setbacks in every neighborhood that could help with the fencing issue. Commissioner McCollian noted the fence in the illustration was to a wall of the adjacent property, not an entrance. Commissioner McCollian stated she did not have an issue with the aspects of a fence from the adjoining neighbor's

standpoint.

Commissioner Irwin suggested that a corner lot homeowner could choose which fence layout they wanted, but if the fence was adjacent to the side lot of their neighbor, the fence could be no further out than the required setback.

Commissioner Stratis noted the homeowner may not have enough space to build a fence if there were setbacks. Commissioner Stratis supported the idea of the homeowner being able to have both options as to the location of the fence.

Commissioner Petrich clarified a homeowner could currently build a fence to the property line. Commissioner Petrich stated if a homeowner were allowed to build a fence in the side yard of their property, a neighbor should be allowed to as well.

Commissioner Morton noted there would always be an encroachment on the front of the house. Commissioner Morton supported Commissioner Irwin's idea.

Chairman Trzupke noted with both options, a fence would most likely encroach into at least one of the neighbor's side yards. Chairman Trzupke noted the Plan Commission had denied a previous zoning case for a fence where the homeowner wanted to connect the rear yard fence to the front of the home for security purposes. Chairman Trzupke noted the Plan Commission had not found a clear-cut text amendment and suggested looking into a special use where there's not a threshold of a variance.

Commissioner McCollian suggested utilizing the maximum allowable square footage where a fence was currently permitted and allowing homeowners to distribute the square footage between both sides of their property. However, the total square footage of fencing on both sides combined would not exceed the maximum allowable square footage.

Chairman Trzupke clarified Commissioner McCollian's suggestion.

Commissioner Petrich noted that the idea could mitigate the impact on the adjacent neighbors while allowing the homeowner to utilize their space.

Robert Haley, 8461 Carlisle Ct. in Cambridge Estates, discussed the proposed illustration and fences on a corner property.

Chairman Trzupke summarized the Commission's comments. Chairman Trzupke noted the Plan Commission could look into a special use where there's not a threshold of a variance. The Commissioners agreed.

Stern stated she would need to confirm if a special use would be permitted.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Irwin and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Parella to continue Z-16-2024 to the April 1, 2024 Plan Commission meeting.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 8 – Irwin, Parrella, McCollian, Petrich, Broline, Stratis, Morton, and Trzupek
NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 8-0.

IV. CORRESPONDENCE

Stern noted on February 12th, the Board directed the Plan Commission to hold a public hearing regarding year-round outdoor dining. Stern noted the Board denied an Ordinance for the Great American Bagel's awning.

V. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

A. PC-01-2024: Annual Zoning Review

Stern stated the Plan Commission requested that the Board direct them to hold a public hearing regarding the outdoor storage of vehicles and equipment, the definition of family, the definition of boarding, rooming, and lodging homes, and the height of a detached garage door. Stern stated staff would also like direction from the Plan Commission regarding a text amendment for outdoor storage of equipment and vehicles. Stern stated in the G-I zoned district, outdoor storage required a special use with additional regulations.

Chairman Trzupek asked the Commissioners if there were any items on the annual zoning review that the Commission wanted to ask the Village Board for the Plan Commission to hold a public hearing on.

Commissioner Irwin stated he thought the Plan Commission would eventually hold a public hearing for everything on the list. Commissioner Irwin discussed residents removing trees on their property and whether or not the trees were in the building area.

Commissioner Petrich noted a property that removed every tree on their five-acre property.

Commissioner Morton stated the Village of Burr Ridge has a regulation where one needs a building permit if they were removing more than four trees.

The Commissioners discussed tree regulations and permits.

Commissioner Petrich asked if a resident had multiple R-3 zoned lots and if the resident could build a home across multiple R-3 lots to create a large residence. Commissioner Petrich stated he was aware of a house built across multiple properties.

Commissioner Stratis stated the lots would need to be consolidated, which was a public process. Commissioner Stratis noted they would still be subject to the R-3 zoning regulations and setbacks.

Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals
February 19, 2024 Regular Meeting

The Commissioners discussed looking at the process and regulations pertaining to lot consolidation.

Commissioner Broline discussed the definition of family and the definition of boarding, rooming, and lodging homes.

Commissioner Petrich noted Commissioner Stratis's comment regarding government law mandating certain things to happen regardless.

Commissioner Stratis discussed a case regarding a colleague.

Stern asked the Plan Commission for direction regarding a text amendment for outdoor storage of equipment and vehicles.

Commissioner Petrich noted the Plan Commission had approved many cases for sales of automobiles and believed there may need to be a text amendment if the Plan Commission was going to allow it all the time. Commissioner Petrich discussed Coda Motors and UR Boss.

Chairman Trzupke noted that was a zoning violation and enforcement issue. Chairman Trzupke noted a text amendment would regulate the outdoor storage to be consistent with what the Plan Commission had approved.

Commissioner Irwin stated the Plan Commission should review how big an issue outdoor storage could become and the number of potential businesses there would be in Burr Ridge if the Plan Commission kept allowing outdoor storage of vehicles associated with automobile repairs and sale businesses.

Chairman Trzupke recalled a case on 83rd Street for a truck parked outside overnight, and the Plan Commission denied the case until they proposed a fence around the area.

Commissioner Irwin noted he was not in favor of fences and car lots. Commissioner Irwin stated concern and suggested looking into how big an issue outdoor storage could lead to.

Commissioner Petrich stated concerns and questions regarding an administrative variance.

Chairman Trzupke stated the Plan Commission would hold a public hearing regarding the administrative variance to assess whether or not to make amendments or grant administrative variances.

Alice Krampits, 7515 Drew Road, asked about CILA homes.

Commissioner Morton stated that CILA homes were community-integrated living arrangements. Commissioner Morton states they were federally regulated group homes. Commissioner Morton stated that CILA homes were developmentally disabled homes to bring functional adults back into the community so the person could live independently with some supervision. Commissioner Morton mentioned Alsip had been sued twice, successfully, for trying to prevent CILA homes.

Chairman Trzupke noted there were no regulations specific to CILA homes.

Stern stated a motion was needed to ask the Board to direct the Plan Commission to hold a public hearing regarding the remaining items on the list. Stern stated the remaining items were the location of masonry piers, definition and classification use for CILA homes, administrative variation, and decibel level regulations for swimming pool equipment and generators.

Commissioner Irwin stated the Plan Commission discussed reviewing whether the building permit allows one to raise all the trees on your property, consolidation of lots, and the potential issues associated with outdoor parking.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Parella and **SECONDED** by Commissioner McCollian to direct the Board to hold a public hearing regarding the location of masonry piers, definition and classify use for CILA homes, administrative variation, decibel level regulations for swimming pool equipment and generators, tree regulations, consolidation of lots, and outdoor parking.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 8 – Parrella, McCollian, Irwin, Petrich, Broline, Stratis, Morton and Trzupek

NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 8-0

B. By-Laws Amendment - Virtual PC Meeting Attendance

Chairman Trzupek introduced the consideration regarding a potential by-law amendment to permit virtual Plan Commission meeting attendance. Chairman Trzupek discussed the rules and procedures regarding the Village Board meetings and noted a difference was the Plan Commission held public hearings. Chairman Trzupek supported permitting virtual Plan Commission attendance but stated concerns regarding the public hearings and permitting the Plan Commissioners to attend virtually but not the public. Chairman Trzupek discussed a written public comment.

Commissioner Morton questioned whether or not the public could virtually attend if one or more Commissioners were permitted to participate virtually. Commissioner Morton stated the Village Board allowed Trustees to attend virtually.

Chairman Trzupek noted the Plan Commission held public hearings, not the Village Board. Chairman Trzupek stated staff would confirm with the Village attorney that virtual attendance for the Plan Commission attendance was permitted, but not the public.

Commissioner Broline mentioned the Village Board held closed sections.

Chairman Trzupek discussed the difference between the Village Board and the Plan Commission.

Commissioner Stratis supported virtual attendance at Plan Commission meetings but recognized the potential issues. Commissioner Stratis discussed the proposed language

and pointed out that it did not account for situations like vacations. Commissioner Stratis discussed quorums at the Plan Commission meetings.

Chairman Trzupek supported virtual attendance at Plan Commission meetings but recognized the potential issues. Chairman Trzupek suggested if the Chairman attended remotely, the Vice Chairman should hold the meeting in person.

Commissioner Petrich suggested a Commissioner could attend the Plan Commission meeting virtually, if the Chairman and Village Planner felt it was a valid reason. Commissioner Petrich noted that the Commissioner should be prepared and able to contribute virtually. Commissioner Petrich discussed different situations where a Commissioner may not be able to attend the Plan Commission meeting.

Chairman Trzupek noted the Commissioners received the meeting packets before a Plan Commission meeting, and the Commissioners could send their comments to the Chairman or Village Planner to be in the record. Chairman Trzupek noted the difference between submitting comments and discussion at a meeting.

Commissioner Petrich stated that a petitioner presented a hard copy of a document at the previous Plan Commission meeting, noting if a Commissioner attended virtually, they would not have received the document. Commissioner Petrich stated in the past, Commissioners had trouble hearing the petitioners even when the Commissioners attended in person.

Commissioner Morton asked questions regarding broadcasting and the cost associated with it.

Chairman Trzupek stated there would be an additional cost for broadcasting. Chairman Trzupek discussed the fairness of broadcasting the Plan Commission meetings but not the other recommending bodies such as the Stormwater Commission, Pathways Commission, etc.

Commissioner Parrella stated virtual attendance limits interaction and participation but could be helpful in certain situations.

Commissioner McCollian discussed the proposed language. Commissioner McCollian noted in-person attendance for a full quorum was required, and the Commission would not be transitioning to an entirely virtual meeting. Commissioner McCollian suggested adding a maximum amount of times per year a Commissioner could attend virtually. Commissioner McCollian supported notifying the Chairman and Village Planner at least 48 hours before the Plan Commission meeting.

Chairman Trzupek discussed the fairness of permitting a Commissioner to attend virtually but not a petitioner.

Commissioner Petrich noted a Commissioner or petitioner could send their comments to the Chairman or Village Planner to be in the record. Commissioner Petrich mentioned an example of a Trustee attending the Village Board meeting virtually.

Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals
February 19, 2024 Regular Meeting

Commissioner Morton noted in the past two and a half years, he had never seen a meeting not occur because there was an inadequate number of Commissioners for a quorum. Chairman Trzupke noted around two meetings were canceled in the last twenty years due to a lack of Commissioners to form a quorum.

Commissioner Morton supported virtual attendance at Plan Commission meetings but recognized the potential problems. Commissioner Morton suggested a Commissioner could audio into a meeting but not vote.

Chairman Trzupke stated concerns regarding participation in voting.

Commissioner Stratis mentioned a situation where a community allowed a Commissioner to phone into a meeting only if the Plan Commission did not have the required amount of Commissioners to form a quorum.

Commissioner Irwin stated there were previous zoning cases that may have gone a different direction if a Commissioner who could not attend had been able to attend the meeting virtually. Commissioner Irwin stated he did not support broadcasting the Plan Commission meetings. Commissioner Irwin supported virtual attendance and wanted to confirm with the Village attorney that virtual attendance for the Plan Commission attendance was permitted but not for the public.

The Commissioners discussed technology.

Chairman Trzupke reiterated his concerns.

Commissioner Irwin stated the public could perform its entire function without showing up, but not a Commissioner. Commissioner Irwin noted the public provides input, and one could send in public comments. Commissioner Irwin noted a Commissioner could not vote if they were absent from the meeting.

Chairman Trzupke and Commissioner Irwin discussed the roles of the public versus a Commissioner.

Chairman Trzupke stated staff would need to confirm with the Village attorney that virtual attendance for the Plan Commission attendance was permitted and did not allow virtual participation to the public. Chairman Trzupke stated if virtual attendance for the Plan Commission attendance was permitted and did not allow the public to participate virtually, he would still not support the amendment.

Commissioner Petrich suggested a Commissioner could attend the Plan Commission meeting virtually without presenting an excuse. Chairman Trzupke agreed with Commissioner Petrich. Chairman Trzupke suggested the first condition of the proposed language be revised. Chairman Trzupke suggested if the Chairman attended remotely, the Vice Chairman should hold the meeting in person. Chairman Trzupke agreed with providing a maximum amount of times per year that a Commissioner could virtually attend a meeting.

Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals
February 19, 2024 Regular Meeting

Commissioner Irwin supported providing a maximum amount of times per year that a Commissioner could virtually attend a meeting.

Commissioner Stratis questioned the need to have the other Commissioners vote on whether or not that Commissioner could virtually attend. Commissioner Stratis suggested gauging the Commissioner's consensus to determine if the Commission should move forward.

The Commissioners discussed virtual Plan Commission meeting attendance.

Commissioner McCollian raised questions regarding technology procedures if the Plan Commission chose to permit virtual attendance.

Commissioner Broline stated the County of DuPage required the public to identify which issue they wanted to give input on, and when that issue came up, they would receive a call telling them they could listen at that point in the meeting.

Commissioner McCollian stated the City of Chicago gave the person of the public a time range and told them when to call in.

Commissioner Stratis noted the Village of Burr Ridge had a much smaller population.

The Commissioners discussed the procedures and potential issues of technology. The Commissioners discussed how the Board of Trustees called into the Village Board meetings. The Commissioners reiterated their comments.

Chairman Trzupke noted the Commissioner's consensus. Chairman Trzupke noted staff would confirm with the Village attorney that virtual attendance for the Plan Commission attendance was permitted, but not the public. Chairman Trzupke suggested referencing the public hearings in the proposed language. Chairman Trzupke suggested removing the language requiring a Commissioner to state the reason for attending virtually. Chairman Trzupke suggested having a maximum amount of times per year a Commissioner could attend a meeting virtually.

Commissioner Stratis noted that if a Commissioner repeatedly misses the meetings or the virtual attendance gets abused, the Village Board could remove the Commissioners at any time. Commissioner Petrich questioned if a petitioner brought new information on the day of the public hearing and if the Commissioners could continue then.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner McCollian and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Morton to continue the consideration regarding a by-law amendment to permit virtual Plan Commission attendance to the April 1, 2024 Plan Commission meeting.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 8 – McCollian, Morton, Irwin, Parrella, Petrich, Broline, Stratis, and Trzupke
NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 8-0.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

Alice Krampits, 7515 Drew Road, stated support of the Plan Commission having the opportunity to participate virtually because there were occasions when one was overseas or could not attend an in-person meeting. Krampits stated concern regarding virtual attendance for the public because it would be difficult to know who was joining the meeting, their reasons for attending a virtual meeting, or if they were residents. Krampits stated a few concerns regarding technology pertaining to permitting the public to participate virtually.

VII. FUTURE MEETINGS

Stern noted the March 18, 2024 Plan Commission meeting was not scheduled due to the primary election. Stern stated Z-10-2023: 212 Burr Ridge Parkway and Z-12-2023: 114 Burr Ridge Parkway were continued to March 18, 2024 at a previous meeting and will need to be continued to a different date. Stern recommended continuing the cases to April 15, 2024.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Irwin and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Stratis to continue Z-10-2023 to the April 15, 2024, Plan Commission meeting.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 8 – Irwin, Stratis, McCollian, Morton, Parrella, Petrich, Broline, and Trzuppek
NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 8-0.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Irwin and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Stratis to continue Z-12-2023 to the April 15, 2024, Plan Commission meeting.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 8 – Irwin, Stratis, McCollian, Morton, Parrella, Petrich, Broline, and Trzuppek
NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 8-0.

Commissioner Irwin asked a question regarding the Building Reports.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner McCollian and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Petrich to adjourn the meeting at 9:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:


Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals
February 19, 2024 Regular Meeting

AYES: 8 – Irwin, McCollian, Parrella, Petrich, Broline, Stratis, Morton and
Trzupek

NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 8-0.

Respectfully Submitted:



Ella Stern
Planner

