

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING OF
THE VILLAGE OF KENILWORTH HELD AT THE VILLAGE HALL, 419 RICHMOND ROAD AT
7:00 P.M. ON THURSDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2005.

Chairman John McGinnis was present and called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Max Slankard acted as Secretary and called the roll as follows:

Present:	John McGinnis	Chairman
	Cristy Laier	Member
	John Vitt	Member
	William Folland	Member
Absent:	Tim Dugan	Member
	Beth Baxter	Member
Other Village Officials Present:	Max Slankard	Village Manager
	Susan Criezis	Building Consultant
	Jackie Bossu	Village Trustee
Others Present:	Cameel Halim	533 Roslyn Road
	Nefrette Halim	533 Roslyn Road
	Cary Johnson	722 Roger Avenue
	Hester McCarthy	336 Leicester Road

The Committee decided to suspend discussion on real estate riders until Ms. Baxter could be present.

Chairman McGinnis called for discussion on historic districts. Mr. Folland said most of the Committee members at this meeting were here for Andrew Fisher's presentation about national districts. He said local districts were the more time consuming. He had discussed this with Amy Easton of the Illinois Historical Preservation Association, and he distributed to Committee members packets of information he had received from Ms. Easton. He stated that he had felt all along that a national district approach, similar to that being implemented in Wilmette, would not be controversial here. There is not much to do to establish one, and it does provide for financial rewards for residents. Ultimately, creation of a local district is probably the way to go, but he felt that would be much more controversial in the community and he questioned whether he has the stomach for the fight at this time. Chairman McGinnis said we at least need the Illinois Historical Preservation Association to come and make a presentation to explore this path. He suggested selecting a couple of possible dates at the end of the meeting for such a presentation. Mr. Folland said he would contact them the next day.

Then the discussion turned to zoning incentives and bonuses. Ms. Cristy Laier said she had lot of edits on the draft. She also had a question for the Committee on first floor height in District R-1. She said Mr. Tim Dugan was concerned about the height limit of the first floor, expressing concern that it was too low. Chairman McGinnis said height was not the issue, but window placement for an English basement was. If the limit was 4 feet, the Village would need something to address windows in the basements. Susan Criezis agreed. She said the English basements on new homes have full windows with no wells. Ms. Laier said she thought the issue

was the flattening of roofs. Chairman McGinnis said unless the Committee wants to debate the issue, he was happy with the existing language and letting the Building, Planning and Zoning Committee make adjustments. Ms. Laier said there had been a comment that people could get zoning variances for this, and they really cannot. Ms. Criezis agreed because there would be no hardship. Chairman McGinnis said he thought the issue was an English basement on Park Drive that comes out of the ground and does not match the block face. Ms. Laier said the Committee needs to put in a statement of intent so it is clear to BPZ what the issue is. Mr. John Vitt asked if the issue was going to be thrown to the Building, Planning and Zoning Committee. Ms. Criezis said it is administratively complex if based on averaging. Ms. Laier commented that the height could be limited by District.

Chairman McGinnis said his concern was that the more we regulate, the more we have to regulate. Trustee Bossu said the Village just wants language that is enough to not set up a conflict with design review. Chairman McGinnis said, if we are just talking about new homes, design review has 12 principles to meet. Ms. Criezis added that the regulation of first floor height would only relate to new construction. Kenilworth is the only code that does not have such a restriction. Mr. Folland felt Kenilworth should have one. Chairman McGinnis said if the Village proceeds with design review, there may be no need for this restriction. If not, there will be a need for a limit. Ms. Laier said she was concerned about homes such as hers, which has a first floor height that is 44 inches above grade. Chairman McGinnis said his feeling was that the Committee's intent is that there is an absolute value that should be placed on a property either by District or Village-wide. Ms. Laier said originally we had a difference for R-1 and R-2E, and she is concerned whether we have the right number.

Chairman McGinnis cautioned against getting to the point where we starting to dictate style. He said beyond R-1 and R-2, the Committee has no data to support differentiation. Ms. Criezis said 3 feet is high for a new house. Chairman McGinnis said at 3 feet, people probably would not be able to do something the Committee would find objectionable. Ms. Laier asked if it made sense to allow variances. Manager Slankard said no, as hardship could never be demonstrated. Chairman McGinnis said we are not going to suggest economic hardship. Ms. Criezis said even if someone is doing a Queen Anne Victorian house, they will do a different, modernized treatment, and it opens the door for a full useable basement floor. If there is no limit, the space will be used. Mr. Folland said he thought the Committee was trying to please everybody, and we cannot make everybody happy. He suggested setting a limit and letting the chips fall where they may. Chairman McGinnis said he wanted to hold off on making this change till the full Committee can be in attendance and everybody can see this. Mr. Vitt said he agreed with holding off, but also agreed on a 3 foot limit.

Next, with respect to porch definition, Ms. Criezis said there was no limit as written regarding a porch being a front porch, or a wrap-around. Ms. Laier said many screened porches are on the back. Ms. Criezis said she did not think there should be a bonus for screened porches in the back. Both Mr. Folland and Mr. Vitt agreed. Ms. Criezis asked for comments on covered entries. Mr. Folland said some are on the side. Ms. Criezis suggested it could be called the main entrance whether it is at the front or the side. Chairman McGinnis said he has a covered entry on the back and thought he should be able to get a bonus for that too. Ms. Laier said we have an overall cap in place of 110%, so why not allow it. Chairman McGinnis said this definition of covered entries

is not his. He said he would be happy to leave it as is, but the screened porch issue is interesting. He asked if the Committee wanted to consider that.

Mr. Vitt said there is a difference in the homes that have covered entries as part of the structure, and the homes that add such spaces later for additional living space. Ms. Criezis said those spaces can be quite large. Chairman McGinnis said we need more definition, separating the entries that are original to the house, but it is a can of worms. Ms. Criezis asked how the Village would define what is original. Mr. Folland said good question. He went on to say some original porches were removed over time, then added back, and how would that be treated. Chairman McGinnis said Mr. Folland was bringing up a good issue, but he needs to help the Committee solve it. Ms. Laier said her house only has a covered entry that would qualify as a bonus. Chairman McGinnis asked if there was another way to talk about this issue. He wondered if there was a way to differentiate between a porch constructed with the house and a porch that was added. Ms. Criezis said added porches usually do not have solid enclosed foundations. Mr. Vitt said he could not imagine the Committee getting in trouble with eliminating back porches, and he is okay with front and side porches. Chairman McGinnis said he was inclined to leave the regulations as is. Mr. Vitt said we do have a 110% cap so we should leave it as is.

Ms. Laier asked why we count port cocheres. Ms. Criezis said because it is covered space and can be big. Chairman McGinnis asked if there was anything else. Ms. Laier said we should include the first floor height under aesthetic consideration. The Committee felt it was not applicable.

Mr. Cameel Halim questioned the basis of the 110% figure. Chairman McGinnis explained if credit is given, then credits granted should not exceed 110% of the current floor area ratio. He said the Committee is suggesting that there needs to be some limit. Mr. Halim said if you have 20%, you will still lose 10%. Chairman McGinnis agreed, but there has to be a limit someplace. Mr. Cary Johnson said that at beyond 110%, people can go for a variances. Mr. Halim felt it was hard to get a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals. Chairman McGinnis said this Committee has done what it can do.

Ms. Nefrette Halim asked why is the cap is at 110%. Chairman McGinnis replied it is tied to variance amounts that have been approved by the Zoning Board, based on hardships. He said in the spirit of what residents want, it is not everything, but it is a lot more than exists now. Chairman McGinnis said we will make the changes, the send the suggested draft to the Board of Trustees in January 2006.

The Committee asked Mr. Folland to explore setting a presentation from the IHPA on January 17, 24 or 26, 2005.

There being no further business, Mr. Folland made a motion that the meeting adjourn. Mr. Vitt seconded the motion, and it was unanimously carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Max Slankard

Village Manager