



Village of Bartlett  
Planning and Zoning Commission  
June 2, 2022

---

M. Werden, Chair called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm.

Roll Call

Present: B. Bucaro, S. Callahan, C. Deveaux, M. Hopkins, J. Kapadoukakis, G. Koziol, J. Miaso, M. Sarwas, M. Werden

Absent: None

Also Present: Planning & Development Services Director, Roberta Grill, Kristy Stone, Village Planner and Devin Kamperschroer, Associate Planner

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made to approve the May 5, 2022 meeting minutes.

Motioned by: B. Bucaro

Seconded by: J. Miaso

Roll Call

Ayes: B. Bucaro, S. Callahan, C. Deveaux, M. Hopkins, J. Kapadoukakis, G. Koziol, J. Miaso, M. Werden

Nays: None

Abstain: M. Sarwas

The motion carried.

**M. Werden** opened the public forum. No one from the public came forward. **M. Werden** closed the public forum.



Village of Bartlett  
Planning and Zoning Commission  
June 2, 2022

---

(#22-06) 841 Brookside Drive  
Variation – Side Yard  
PUBLIC HEARING

The following exhibits were presented:

Exhibit A – Picture of Sign

Exhibit B – Mail Affidavit

Exhibit C – Notification of Publication

Exhibit D – Letter from 839 Brookside Drive

The petitioner, **Pete Rakiewicz** of 841 Brookside Drive came forward and was sworn in by **M. Werden**. **P. Rakiewicz** stated, I am here tonight requesting a variance of 2-1/2 feet to the north side of my home. Having a 1-car garage has proven to be difficult at times. In 2018, I extended my driveway up on the north side of my property approximately 8 feet wide. I would like to extend my 1-car garage into a 2-car garage over that existing 8-foot concrete slab. When the house was built 40 years ago, it was placed in the center of the lot and if it was placed slightly to the south approximately 2-1/2 feet I would not need to ask for this variance. Also, in my back yard, there is a 60-foot utility easement. To construct a 2-car garage in the back of the property that would consume a very large portion of the back of my property. Additionally, if I did that, I would have to demolish the existing garage. The proposed garage addition would match identically to the siding of the house and the overall appearance of the house. I have a letter from my next-door neighbor directly to the north at 839 Brookside Drive who would be the most affected neighbor from this addition. In the letter, she does express that she has no issues with the plans for our addition. **M. Werden** asked staff, did you get any calls from any neighbors? **D. Kamperschroer** no. **M. Werden** I think it is admirable that the neighbor who you would be encroaching on the most does not have a problem with this addition because this is pretty close to the property line. Seeing that nobody is opposed to this and you do have the letter, I think it would be a big improvement for you.

**M. Werden** opened the public hearing portion of the meeting. No one from the public came forward.

**B. Bucaro** made a motion to pass along a **positive recommendation** to the Village Board to approve case **(#22-06) 841 Brookside Drive for a side yard variation** subject to the findings of fact outlined in the staff report.

Motioned by: **B. Bucaro**

Seconded by: **M. Sarwas**

**M. Werden** closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

**Roll Call**

Ayes: **B. Bucaro, S. Callahan, C. Deveaux, M. Hopkins, J. Kapadoukakis, G. Koziol, J. Miaso, M. Sarwas, M. Werden**

Nays: **None**

The motion carried.



Village of Bartlett  
Planning and Zoning Commission  
June 2, 2022

---

Old Business/ New Business

**K. Stone** if you recall, at the last couple of meetings, we discussed the Rules of Procedure. We drafted some rules and they were reviewed by the Village Attorney who added some footnotes to the rules and also made sure that our suggestions were in accordance with the Open Meetings Act. Some of the changes were not exactly what we wanted. We were hoping to be able to have a quorum to include members that are remote. We cannot do that at this time due to the Open Meetings Act requiring a quorum to be physically present. That was only allowed during the emergency order because of COVID. **G. Koziol** what is the issue with remote attendance? **K. Stone** we can still have remote attendance, but need to have at least 5 members physically present. **M. Werden** as long as we have 5 members present the member attending remotely would still be able to vote. **K. Stone** the members that are present would vote on whether to allow that member to join remotely and if it is agreed that they are allowed to attend remotely, they can vote. **G. Koziol** in that case, it would be business as usual as if they were physically in attendance. **K. Stone** yes. **R. Grill** this does state that you should contact the staff and/or the chairman and let them know that is what you would like to do. **B. Bucaro** we had a discussion last month specifically about COVID since it is still around that it is possible that any one of us would attend remotely because of that. On page 5 of the Rules and Procedures, there is a list of reasons. Would that be considered an emergency? **K. Stone** it would be considered a personal illness. **B. Bucaro** I think this is a lot of information and adds a lot of structure to the commission and to the commissioners. It really emphasizes that we have to make the commitment if we want to sit here. As far as laying out the procedures, we have been doing most of this, but this really makes it very formal. I think it is good. I have a couple of suggestions. **M. Werden** is this the time to suggest changes? **R. Grill** you do not have to vote on this tonight if you would like to review it more. **M. Hopkins** I would like to have another month. **R. Grill** okay, that is fine. **B. Bucaro** on page 4, Article 3 – Rules of Order, Section 2, paragraph D., Conduct of Public, the last sentence “The Chairman shall take such actions as needed to maintain an orderly and civil meeting” I would suggest moving that into a separate paragraph to apply it to both commission members and to the public. I think that would be clearer if it was separate. **R. Grill** how does everyone else feel about that? **M. Hopkins** maybe that sentence could appear in both the Conduct of Members and Conduct of Public paragraphs. **M. Werden** does “actions as needed” include asking the police to eject somebody who is overly contentious? **R. Grill** yes, when we are asking someone to leave. We could add paragraph E. and state “The Chairman shall take such actions as needed to maintain an orderly and civil meeting between both the public and the P&Z Commission members”. **M. Werden** that would be good. **B. Bucaro** page 5, Section 3, paragraph A states “shall notify the Secretary as soon as possible if you are not going to be there”. I think that the chairman should also be contacted at the same time. **R. Grill** the Secretary is defined as the Director of the PDS Department, but we can add chairman. Sometimes if you notify the Director we contact the chairman for you. We could put and/or. Would that suffice? **B. Bucaro** I just think that the chairman should know. **G. Koziol** if you contact the secretary does that individual have to prepare the environment for a remote attendance? The chairman cannot do that. He would have to contact the secretary for the remote attendance. **R. Grill** this is not necessarily for remote attendance. It would be to establish a quorum. If we have several members call in to say that they are not going to make a meeting due to an illness that is concerning for us and we will then call each of you to ask if you will be in attendance. By us doing that we are notifying the chairman as well. **B. Bucaro** it is not just for electronic attendance, it is in case you cannot make the meeting. **R. Grill** we are just concerned whether we will have a physical quorum at Village Hall. **B. Bucaro** that can be



Village of Bartlett  
Planning and Zoning Commission  
June 2, 2022

---

under electronic attendance for one of those reasons, but you also could not have a quorum at a meeting. **R. Grill** if you are calling to say that you are going to Zoom in, the P&Z members have to vote on that and if the P&Z says no, that member is not voting and is not on Zoom for that meeting. We can review this with the Village Attorney, but I do not see a problem with what you are asking for. **M. Werden** it is not fair to everybody else, especially the petitioner who has complied if we do not have a meeting because we do not have a quorum. **B. Bucaro** Page 7, Article 3, section 6, Rules of Order, paragraph C, item iv. regarding motions, does that refer to closing a public hearing and can you explain that? **R. Grill** this is when a debate amongst yourselves is taking place and there is a disagreement or the discussion is going on longer than you feel is necessary. You have the right to make a motion or close the debate, or call the question, which means all conversations stop and a motion is made without further debate. It basically stops all discussion. **B. Bucaro** can any commissioner make that motion? **R. Grill** yes. **G. Koziol** could we use this motion to end a discussion? **R. Grill** yes, you would be making a motion to close that debate. **M. Werden** could there be a continuance? **R. Grill** yes, it could be to continued. If you call to close the debate there is no more discussion. It is very standard. **G. Koziol** what is the policy if enough people called and said they cannot make a meeting and we had to cancel a meeting, how would the members be notified of the cancellation? **K. Stone** if a meeting is cancelled because we do not have a quorum, depending on how much time we have, we would post a notice that the meeting is cancelled and when the next regularly scheduled meeting date is. However, if we have a public hearing scheduled for that date the members that can attend would formally continue the public hearing to the next regularly scheduled date without having to republish and renotify. That is not considered part of regular business. **M. Werden** page 8, item C "Speakers shall limit their remarks to no more than 3 minutes unless additional time is granted by the Chairman or a majority vote by the Planning & Zoning Commission." That is not always the case unless there is a large crowd or somebody is going on and on. Do we have to limit the time or is this an option? **R. Grill** our Village Clerk has a timer. They are not very strict on the timing. If someone is in the middle of a sentence they will not be cut off. I think it all depends on how you and the commission want to treat that 3-minute mark. That is just a standard number that fulfills the requirement. **M. Werden** we can enforce that when we need to. **R. Grill** yes. **G. Koziol** it would depend on how many people want to speak. We would let them finish speaking within reason. **R. Grill** I think you hit the legal jargon which is "within reason". **M. Sarwas** I think it depends on what they are saying. I have been on both sides and if they are really trying to explain something we do want to hear what they are saying, but not if they are rambling. **M. Werden** when there have been meetings that look like there might be a lot of people that want to speak I will say there is a 3-minute limit, but that does not happen too often. **K. Stone** there will be more cases like that. It will happen more than you are used to. **R. Grill** it does help the public too when you have a large crowd with a number of people that want to speak. By making an announcement that we are going to try to keep the comments to 3 minutes it is totally understandable and within reason. That would allow everyone that wanted to speak that night to be able to speak. **K. Stone** this section that we are discussing is part of the public forum. The public forum is for things that are not on the agenda, but for someone that comes in from the public and wants to discuss an issue that you do not have a staff report for. It is not the public hearing. That is why there is a 30-minute time limit so that items that are scheduled on the agenda can be discussed at that meeting. **R. Grill** on Page 15, Section 3 under Attendance, it states that "A P & Z Commission member shall not miss two (2) consecutive meetings without first discussing the absence with the Chairman or the PDS Director. Any P & Z Commission member absent from 3 or more meetings



Village of Bartlett  
Planning and Zoning Commission  
June 2, 2022

---

in any twelve (12) month period may be recommended for dismissal. This shall be at the discretion of the Village President.” **M. Werden** that is probably a good thing. **J. Kapadoukakis** I am assuming that sickness is exempt from that. **R. Grill** yes, as long as you notify the Secretary and the Chairman. **M. Hopkins** page 10, Section 2. states “relief” requested, but the cases will not always be about relief. **R. Grill** correct, it is not always going to be a relief. We can review that with the Village Attorney. **B. Bucaro** with a planning item, is there a lot of cross examination? **R. Grill** typically at a Plan Commission meeting the chairman would keep notes of the public’s concerns and then ask for the questions to be answered. That keeps the questions directed to either the attorney or the commission. **M. Hopkins** Section 6 Cross-Examination says there needs to be 7 days written notice ahead of the meeting for the General Public Qualified Right. That is a real question mark for me. **R. Grill** the Village Attorney is going to keep that. **K. Stone** the other Rules of Procedure that I researched did not have that section. I found 3 that were very similar to what I had originally proposed and our Village Attorney added more. **B. Bucaro** we will discuss this again next month? **K. Stone** yes, we can discuss this again next month and we will bring these items that were discussed to our attorney and then send you the updates. **R. Grill** each of you received the Planning & Zoning Commission Expectations to sign and date after you have read it. **B. Bucaro** does the Village Board have Rules of Procedures? **R. Grill** yes, they do and it is in an ordinance. **M. Werden** when can we schedule the terrorist/emergency preparedness training? **K. Stone** I spoke with Commander Rybaski about that and he will schedule that with us for the fall. We will have a public hearing for a text amendment on cannabis dispensaries on commercial districts. We will also have a Plat of Subdivision for Dunkin Donuts at Schick Road and Route 59. **R. Grill** as you know, I am retiring and this is my last Thursday night meeting after 32 years. It has been a pleasure working with all of you and getting to know each of you. I have really enjoyed it. **M. Werden** you were very dedicated and we are all going to miss you. **G. Koziol** we both started serving Bartlett at about the same time and looking back, I am proud to say that Roberta’s work and actions for the Village of Bartlett have been above and beyond the norm and that is why we are here tonight. Bartlett is a better place because of the work performed by Roberta. I feel that I am more capable in what I do and have done over the many years that I have had the opportunity to work with you Roberta. You will be missed by all of us, but we are happy knowing that you are moving into a new chapter of your life. Now you will have more time to be with the special people in your life and to do more of what you want to do. **M. Hopkins** I have a unique perspective because I have been practicing architecture for the last 40 years. I work with planners and directors of community development in many suburbs and each municipality has their own codes and rules, etc. Roberta probably does not realize how extraordinary she is in just plain sensibility, practicality, talent and communication, the ability to wrangle so many people and make things happen in a friendly way is unique. She shines above her contemporaries and Bartlett has been the beneficiary of that.

**M. Werden** asked if there was a motion to adjourn.

**Motioned by: C. Deveaux**

**Seconded by: J. Miaso**

**Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 pm.**