

# MEETING MINUTES



Village of Homewood  
Planning and Zoning Commission  
Thursday, June 23, 2022  
7:00 p.m.

Village Hall Board Room  
2020 Chestnut Road  
Homewood, IL 60430

---

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Sierzega called the meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:** Members attended: Alfonso, Cap, Johnson, O'Brien, Castaneda, and Chairman Sierzega. Member Bransky attended via Zoom; Present from the Village were Economic and Community Development Director Angela Mesaros, Village Planner Valerie Berstene, and Building Department Secretary Darlene Leonard. There were four people in the audience. The public was able to listen to and watch the meeting via zoom webinar.

**Village of Homewood Zoning Code Update – Diagnostic Report & Preliminary Recommendations Framework.**

Chairman Sierzega stated tonight we will review the revisions first and then open discussion to questions.

Staff Liaison Mesaros stated the consultant will present chapters 6, 7, & 8, take questions from the commission and then take audience questions.

Jackie Wells stated after this, the only chapter of the code left to update is chapter 9, definitions. Ms. Wells stated the definitions need a rewrite, to simplify, and make them more user-friendly.

Ms. Wells stated they have received 221 responses to the questionnaire.

Ms. Wells presented Chapter 6, *Planned Development Standards and Procedures*.

Ms. Wells stated that a single-unit detached house is not eligible for the planned development process. Ms. Wells stated that lots over 25,000 square feet are required to go through planned development. In the B-1 & B-2 districts, development is required to go through the Planned Development Process regardless of lot size.

Ms. Wells stated allowances from the standard are permitted as long as the developer can demonstrate how the allowance would be compatible with the surrounding area and is necessary for the development of the location.

Member Cap asked if the modifications are intended as a way to judge the deviation from the standards or might it be an offset to some standards. Ms. Wells explained the benefit to the applicant and how the deviations can benefit the community.

Member Cap asked if it is intended to be ordered by importance. Ms. Wells stated no. the applicant can choose one and base their request off of it.

## MEETING MINUTES

Member Cap stated he likes the idea of affordable housing. Ms. Wells stated it is becoming a concern, all over the country as well.

Member Johnson asked what deed restricted means. Ms. Wells stated deed restricted guarantee in the deed that the property must be rented at an affordable rate, but it can expire.

Member Cap asked if the motivation comes from the prospective tenants or the property owners. Ms. Wells stated just the proposals, but they can have the discussion that it can be a benefit to the property owners and tenants.

Member Johnson stated that it is a good idea and that it can be preempting a State or Federal mandate and it gives good flexibility.

Chairman Sierzega asked if affordable housing has come up before. Ms. Wells stated that it was on the notes from people in the pre-workshop poster board notes at two meetings.

Member Cap asked if at the next meeting the phrasing would be clarified.

Ms. Wells presented Chapter 7, *Zoning Procedures*. Ms. Wells stated the major changes are to administrative review. The Fire Chief will be responsible for issuing temporary or conditional Certificates of Occupancy. Ms. Wells stated they are proposing the addition of a zoning compliance permit, a limited use permit, a temporary use permit, and an administrative exception.

Ms. Wells stated the proposed temporary use permit would be reviewed by the Economic & Community Development Director and they will be revising the table to show which uses should get temporary use. Also, a table will be added with notice requirements added.

Ms. Wells stated that are proposing that the costs of the notices would be the responsibility of the applicant and not the Village, as it is currently.

Member Cap stated, regarding some of the deletions, that it's a sound idea to simplify them, but he is questions some of the requirements should continue to be included, an example is the storm water management report.

Member Cap stated the new procedure puts the burden on the staff, who is more than capable of handling it, but the failure to provide certain materials might be a reason to ask developers to regroup. Member Cap stated that if we continue to include the requirements, it's another reason in the procedural flow that could be a deficiency against them.

Ms. Wells stated it can be in the list of things submitted in the general application requirements, but outside of the ordinance itself. It would allow the Village to update the list without updating the ordinance.

Member Cap why it was removed, but others because in his opinion, a number of the deletions are important.

Chairman Sierzega stated a concern is if the requirements are not laid out a developer may say that they didn't know it was necessary and it would delay the process.

## MEETING MINUTES

Member Johnson stated the agreed and that it would probably be in there, but is unsure where it should be.

Staff Liaison Mesaros stated something can be written in.

Ms. Wells stated they certainly can add it in.

Member Cap stated they should have reasonable requirements and have them upfront, unless there are modifications to the standards.

Ms. Wells stated it could be added in to the general application requirements.

Member Cap stated he would be in favor of something like that.

Member Bransky stated, in Chapter 6, the intent is to give the Director of Economic & Community Development the power to eliminate some of the requirements when they aren't needed and used "when reasonable", but a developer can argue what is reasonable; so it should be kept in so there are no arguments with the developer.

Ms. Wells stated it can be put on the waivers so the Director of Community Development can pick which is applicable.

Member Bransky stated in the site plan review criteria, it is very specific and technical, and asked where it will be or if it is being pulled and only what is necessary is being used and the rest is being scuttled.

Ms. Wells stated it has been edited pretty substantially. There will be administrative approval on very subjective cases. The more subjective standards elsewhere include documentary review to officials.

Member Cap stated the language for Variance give authenticity to approve a variance as long as it lists what, and asked it to be clarified.

Ms. Wells stated they would be reviewed by the Commission and the exception is in 9-22F and it would be reviewed and approved by the Director of Community Development.

Member Cap stated that F2 permits lot to use less than 95% of the required lot and stated is seem there is a gap of 5%.

Ms. Wells stated there is a more clear distinction of the administrative exception and the Commission exception, but they can clarify it or make the language more distinct.

Village Planner Berstene stated to clarify, when the lot is within 95% then it is an administrative exception. When it is 90-94% it goes to the Commission anything lower than that is not allowed.

Ms. Wells stated they can certainly clarify it.

Member Johnson asked if the can only clarify through the definitions.

Ms. Wells stated it can be clarified in the code.

Ms. Wells presented Chapter 8, and stated it was mostly just cleaning up of language and consistency in the terminology.

Member Cap stated early in the process it was discussed as to what existing non-conforming uses might be and asked if there is an idea to rectify them going forward.

Ms. Wells stated they discussed 2 & 3-flats in single family neighborhoods and retroactive permitting, but moved away from it. Ms. Wells stated that without records there is no way to know what the building was previously or what was on the lot previously.

Member Cap asked, in the context of non-conformities, what will be done about them.

Ms. Wells stated in Article 3, if they were existing prior to the adoption of this ordinance they will be allowed and their uses won't be considered non-conforming.

Member Cap asked if that creates a blank slate for them.

Ms. Wells stated yes.

Member O'Brien asked about shared driveways and how this will impact them and additional structures.

Ms. Wells stated in Article 5 shared driveways were discussed and the Village did not want to get into neighbor disputes so they will not be allowed going forward.

Member O'Brien asked what is a "planned development".

Ms. Wells stated a planned development is where an applicant has the ability to request a deviation from the zoning standards and it wouldn't otherwise be possible, such as setbacks, heights, parking requirements, etc., but the developer has to show benefits to Homewood and/or to the neighborhood. Ms. Wells stated it cannot be a single-family home.

Member O'Brien asked if it's different than a planned unit development.

Ms. Wells stated it is the same thing and they can use that terminology if that is what the Village prefers.

Staff Liaison Mesaros asked if there is a standard.

Ms. Wells stated no, it varies by community and some call it conditional districts.

Chairman Sierzega stated to go with Planned Development.

Member Cap asked if it would apply to B-1 & B-2 and parcels that are 25,000 square feet in size in residential districts.

## MEETING MINUTES

Ms. Wells stated if it is in a district where other than single-family homes are allowed it would have to go through the process. Ms. Wells stated that any development, regardless of size, can go through the process as long as it's not a single-family home, but it's required if it's in B-1 & B-2.

Member Cap stated it may be better suited in the R-2 District if someone acquired properties to make the 25,000 square foot threshold. That could be strategy by a developer.

Member Castaneda asked if 2 & 3 story office buildings that are existing would be required to go through the process.

Ms. Wells stated it only applies to new development of substantial redevelopment.

Member O'Brien asked if it would have an impact on density.

Ms. Wells stated there is potential for to.

Member O'Brien asked if there is a difference between deviation and variance.

Ms. Wells stated that variance requires proof of hardship while the deviation does not. The deviation required an exchange to give benefit to the community.

Chairman Sierzega asked if there were questions from the audience.

Patrick Hogensen of 18121 Rockwell Avenue, asked if there will be public hearings and notices sent out for administrative exceptions.

Ms. Wells stated no.

Mr. Hogenson asked, regarding the 95% lot size, if it can be approved and the neighbors wouldn't know.

Ms. Wells stated that it's correct.

Ms. Wells stated the next steps are to incorporate the feedback and then present a full draft for review and a redline version. There will be a final workshop and open house with a tentative date of September 22.

Member O'Brien asked if the last opportunity to revise would be September 22.

Ms. Wells stated no, there will be a window after that before voting to adopt.

Member O'Brien asked if there is a date of the last meeting to edit and/or approve.

Ms. Wells stated there is no hard deadline.

Staff Liaison Mesaros asked if Article 9 definitions would be part of that meeting.

Ms. Wells stated yes.

## MEETING MINUTES

Member O'Brien asked if it would be approved as a bundle.

Ms. Wells stated yes, and they can do a conditional approval for any revisions.

Chairman Sierzega asked once the Commission approves it it would then go to the Village Board for approval and they can make changes.

Ms. Wells stated yes.

Chairman Sierzega asked Staff Liaison Mesaros if there was anything coming up.

Staff Liaison Mesaros stated there will be a meeting on July 14 at 7pm.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Chairman Sierzega asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Member O'Brien moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:41 p.m., seconded by Member Cap.

AYES: Members Alfonso, Bransky, Cap, Johnson, O'Brien, Castaneda, and Chairman Sierzega.

NAYS: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: None

Respectfully submitted,

Angela M. Mesaros  
Staff Liaison