

VILLAGE OF BARTLETT
COMMITTEE MINUTES

December 16, 2014

President Wallace called the Committee of the Whole meeting to order at 7:42 p.m.

Present: Trustee Arends, Camerer, Carbonaro, Martin, Reinke, and Shipman

Also Present: Village Clerk Lorna Giless, Village Administrator Valerie L. Salmons, Assistant Village Administrator Paula Schumacher, Administrative Intern Sam Hughes, Finance Director Jeff Martynowicz, Information Technology Coordinator Chris Hostetler, Community Development Director Jim Plonczynski, Building Director Brian Goralski, Public Works Director Dan Dinges, Public Works Engineer Bob Allen, Chief Kent Williams, Deputy Chief Joe Leonas, Assistant Golf Pro Phil Lenz, and Attorney Bryan Mraz

PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE

310 North Avenue Accessory Building Height Variation

Chairman Camerer asked Community Development Director Jim Plonczynski to review the agenda item.

J. Plonczynski explained that the property in question is 310 W. North Avenue and the petitioner, Chris Carrier, is requesting variances for the accessory structure that was constructed in his rear yard. He is asking for it to be 1 foot-8 inches above the maximum allowable height of 15 feet and also to encroach 2.5 feet into the 5-foot accessory structure setback on the side yard. The petitioner has spelled out, in the staff report, some issues with the building permit and the timing on obtaining the building permit. He explained that originally the petitioner wanted to remodel the garage that stood on that property. He came in for a permit for the remodel and found out that the garage couldn't be remodeled because it had some dry rot. Subsequently, he applied for and poured a concrete patio in front of the garage (referring to exhibit). He wanted to store his recreational vehicle in the remodeled garage. The building permit application was actually submitted after the hired contractor began work on the garage. Once the permit was approved and all the subcontractors were registered, he went ahead with the project. There was an electrician issue with the contractor somewhat after the original application. The contractor took a while to get the electrician registered. By that time, the new garage was built. The petitioner was asked to update the plat of survey and the plans for the garage. The computer drawn permit for it showed the garage with these elevations and at this height (referring to exhibit). The roof pitched changed on it. When it was all said and done, the garage was too big and also although still in the location of the original garage, a setback variance is required because the original garage that was grandfathered in was torn down completely. At this point in time, the petitioner has gotten

the permit and was notified of the variance process. The Zoning Board of Appeals reviewed the variation requests at their December 4, 2014 meeting and recommended approval based on the Findings of Fact. As you can see, (referring to exhibit), it is a nicely constructed garage and does, in fact, hold the RV which was the intent of the garage.

Trustee Reinke clarified that the hardship, in this case, is that the contractor didn't pull a permit.

J. Plonczynski responded yes, that is the short version of this case.

Trustee Reinke stated that the contractor took all the money and didn't do all the work.

J. Plonczynski responded that eventually the contractor did do the work; he just didn't get the permits in a timely manner. The petitioner, Mr. Carrier, is present to answer any questions.

Chairman Camerer asked if there have been any concerns from the neighbors relative to the size of the garage.

C. Carrier responded no. He stated that he ended up having to put doors on the garage at his own cost, over and above what was already paid to the contractors. He explained that the contractors have disappeared and he has not heard from them for a full year. They keep making promises that they will be back to do different things, but they have not. He stated that he has filed police reports and will be going to the State's Attorney's office to file a report. He stated that the company is one that he will never work with again or recommend to anyone. He stated that throughout the entire experience, the Bartlett Police Department, did have some very useful information regarding the company and its owner and the Police Chief should know that the officer did a very good job.

Trustee Reinke asked what, if anything, did the contractor tell Mr. Carrier about building permits.

C. Carrier explained that the contractor said that they had gotten the necessary permits. Everything the Village needed, such as architect drawings and a plat of survey, the contractor said they would get, but did not. He stated that the contractor told him to let him deal with everything and not talk to the Village.

Trustee Shipman commented that this is a cautionary tale.

C. Carrier stated that the word contractor is now a four-letter word in his vocabulary.

Trustee Martin asked the name of the contractor.

C. Carrier responded that it is Cardinal Construction and the names of the contractors are listed on their website.

Trustee Shipman asked what the options are at this point.

J. Plonczynski explained that the Board can grant the requested variances or deny those variances. In the denial of the variances, staff would be compelled to direct Mr. Carrier to remove the garage and make it comply with the current ordinances.

Trustee Shipman stated that would clearly be very difficult to do. He stated that it is unfortunate that the situation got so out-of-hand. He recognized that Community Development is working with the staff that the Village can afford right now, but it is unfortunate that it got so far away from us.

There being no further comments or questions, Chairman Camerer forwarded the item to the Village Board for consideration.

FINANCE & GOLF COMMITTEE

Auditor Renewal

Chairman Reinke stated that the item on the Finance Agenda is the Auditor Renewal. He asked Finance Director Jeff Martynowicz to review the item.

J. Martynowicz explained that the Village's current contract with Sikich LLP has expired with the completion of this year's audit. The Village has contracted with Sikich since 2007. He stated that Sikich has submitted a three-year renewal of the audit contract for fiscal year end of 2015, 2016, and 2017. The proposal includes a 3% increase in their fees; however, given the length of time the auditor firm has been with the Village, staff wanted to give the Village Board the option of renewing the contract for a three year term or direct staff to solicit an RFP to qualified auditing firms that would be able to handle an audit with the complexity and size of the Village. Staff is looking for direction as to whether the Board has been happy with Sikich or if they would like to go out for an RFP for a new auditor.

Chairman Reinke stated that it is not necessarily an issue of being happy or not with Sikich. They have done a fine job, but have been the Village's auditors for a while and it makes a great deal of sense for the Village to mix it up and bring in a new set of eyes.

Administrator Salmons stated that one of the rules of thumb in municipal finance is that bringing in someone new will look at things differently. Certainly, in terms of transparency, it is an important thing to do. Sikich has been a great auditor, but we have periodically changed auditors every five or seven years. That speaks to that issue about being able to bring in a new auditor to look around. As much as staff would like to stay with Sikich, it is probably wise to go out for RFP.

Trustee Camerer asked if there is a downside to going out for an RFP.

Administrator Salmons responded that one downside is possibly paying a little more. There will also be a whole lot more staff work, but that's okay; that's what we're supposed to do. When you get a new auditor, they want to go through everything from the very beginning – the kinds of things that you have been through with the old auditor for several years. It is, with that in-depth relook at everything, where the value comes in. So, that is probably not really much of a downside – that's doing what it supposed to do.

Trustee Camerer asked if there would be a good chance that other firms would come in under the Sikich price.

J. Martynowicz explained that it all depends on timing. With an April 30 fiscal year-end, a qualified auditing firm would need to find two weeks in the summer to fill their needs to have another client such as the Village. If there is such a need to have a Village such as Bartlett, their prices could be lower, but it's really just a matter of timing.

Trustee Martin asked who the auditor was prior to Sikich.

J. Martynowicz responded it was Miller Cooper out of Northbrook and they will probably be interested again.

President Wallace asked if Sikich would submit a proposal through the RFP.

J. Martynowicz responded that staff is planning on sending Sikich an RFP.

Trustee Arends commented that having been on both sides of the auditor's workload, she would strongly recommend going out for an RFP for a new auditor. Sikich has been with the Village for seven years and after a few years, the auditors and the staff become very comfortable with each other. Because it is the Board's responsibility to make sure there is a reliable certified audit, we should change auditors at this time.

Chairman Reinke stated that it sounds like there is consensus from the Board to go out for an RFP.

President Wallace agreed.

There being no further business, President Wallace entertained a motion to adjourn the Committee of the Whole meeting.

Moved by Trustee Shipman
Seconded by Trustee Camerer

President Wallace adjourned the Committee of the Whole meeting at 7:58 p.m.