

**VILLAGE OF LINCOLNWOOD
PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES
MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
VILLAGE HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MEETING HELD VIA GOTO MEETING AND
AVAILABLE LIVE AT WWW.LINCOLNWOODIL.ORG/LIVE-CABLE-CHANNEL/
JUNE 15, 2021**

Call to Order

Village President Patel called the Meeting of the Committee of the Whole of the Lincolnwood Board of Trustees via GoToMeeting to order at 6:01 P.M. Tuesday, June 15, 2021, meeting held via GoToMeeting and available live at WWW.LINCOLNWOODIL.ORG/LIVE-CABLE-CHANNEL/, County of Cook, and State of Illinois.

Upon roll call by Village Clerk Beryl Herman the following were:

Present: President Patel. Trustees Klatzco, Herrera, Saleem, Sargon and Halevi.

Absent: None

After roll call Mayor Patel read into the record the requirements for public comments for later in the meeting.

A quorum was present.

Also present: Village Manager Anne Marie Gaura, The following were present via Go-To-Meeting Chuck Meyer, Assistant Village Manager; Jon Bogue, Acting Assistant to the Village Manager; Jake Litz, Management Analyst; Nadim Badran, Public Works Director; Scott Mangum, Community Development Director; Doug Hammel, Development Manager; Brendon Mendoza, Assistant to the Public Works Director.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of June 1, 2021 Committee of the Whole Meetings were presented for approval.

Trustee Sargon moved to approve the minutes of June 1, 2021, Committee of the Whole Meetings, seconded by Trustee Klatzco.

Upon Roll Call the results were:

Ayes: Trustees Klatzco, Herrera, Saleem, Sargon and Halevi

Nays: None

Regular Business

1. Discussion of Zoning Regulations Related to Front Yard Obstructions

This item was presented by Development Manager Doug Hammel.

Development Manager Hammel noted that there are regulations which establish regular setbacks that might apply on a typical street in Lincolnwood. Some additional allowances are made for things like air conditioning units and other utilities for houses. Staff received a request to expand these regulations to include decorative masonry columns.

Development Manager Hammel asked the board whether these obstructions should be permitted in front yards and corner side yards.

Existing front or corner side yard obstructions were identified:

Stand-alone Lamp Posts:

- *Prevalent throughout the Village
- *Include decorative light
- *Sometimes includes an address plate

Masonry Columns:

- *Exist throughout the Village, but most prevalent in areas with wider lots
- *Sometimes include a decorative light and/or address plate
- *Typically located on either side of a driveway or sidewalk
- *Typically 3-4 feet in height

Sculpture:

- *Not as prevalent as lamp posts or masonry columns
- *Typically on lots with wider widths
- *Vary in terms of size or mass

Mailboxes:

- *Exist on a limited basis throughout the Village
- *Typically mounted on a decorative stand or bracket

Policy Questions were identified:

Should these types of obstructions be permitted in the front and/or corner side yards?

If so, front yards and corner side yards be treated differently for corner lots?

- *Zoning Code identifies the shorter of the two frontages as the front lot line
- *Throughout the Village, there is a variation whether the primary entrance exists on the front yard or corner side yard

Are certain types of obstructions more or less desirable in front and corner side yards?

Should improvements be permitted in the public right-of-way?

- *Zoning Code currently allows certain types of natural screening to encroach into public right-of-way on corner lots with special approval (public hearing process)

He added that, if the Board moved to regulate these obstructions, then pre-existing ones would not have to be removed. He also postulated whether front yards and side yards should be treated differently. Additionally, he stated that there might be some nuance involving the size or mass of an object, or more generally, whether some types of obstructions might be considered more desirable than others. Feedback from the board was then requested by Mr. Hammel.

Trustee Klatzco noted that having lamp posts is a good thing for the Village. He expressed concern regarding large masonry columns that might block the view of drivers reversing out of driveways and in other situations.

Trustee Sargon stated that restrictions should not be overly burdensome on residents and that some flexibility should be allowed. She agreed with Trustee Klatzco that lamp posts are generally helpful for the community.

Trustee Herrera agreed with Trustees Klatzco and Sargon. She stated that some sort of standards should be put in place regarding masonry. She noted that mailboxes should be considered too.

Trustee Saleem expressed concerns regarding light pole standards.

Mayor Patel stated that the Zoning Regulations in question should be discussed specifically. Mr. Hammel provided additional clarification.

Trustee Klatzco asked Development Manager Hammel about a previous instance involving a resident requesting to build a fountain in their front yard. Assistant Village Manager Charles Meyer interjected to agree with Trustee Klatzco, that a resident had seen other houses with fountains in their yards and had asked to build his or her own.

Trustee Klatzco requested that research be done by staff regarding that request and its result.

Trustee Halevi expressed concern regarding line of sight.

Mayor Patel provided clarification.

Mayor Patel declared this item concluded and asked to move on.

2. Discussion Concerning Hen Coop Regulations

This item was presented by Scott Mangum, Community Development Director, using PowerPoint.

Current Policies were presented:

11-3-18. Keeping certain animals prohibited.

*No person shall keep or suffer to be kept any farm animals or other livestock, horses, swine, poultry or naturally wild animals whatsoever in the Village.

*Section 3.08 of Zoning Ordinance does not allow keeping of poultry as an accessory use.

Typical regulations that are followed in neighboring communities include the stipulation that no fewer than two hens may be kept at a time. Additionally, chickens need to be provided with adequate space to roam, and their pens must be kept clean and hygienic. Proof of notice to adjacent neighbors, proof of insurance that covers hen coops and notice of completion of a relevant educational course are also required.

Benefits and concerns were identified:

Benefits:

*Human-animal bond and feelings of autonomy over food selection

*This feeling of autonomy over food selection is especially attractive to some residents due to the ongoing issues with COVID-19 and concerns about the food supply through production of eggs on the resident's property.

Concerns:

*Dr. Connie Austin, State Veterinarian at the Illinois Department of Public Health, offered the following information regarding public health risks associated with backyard chicken-keeping in saying that the public health risks, including salmonella, campylobacter and histoplasmosis, are limited to those in direct contact with the chickens or consuming their meat and eggs.

*Keeping chickens also has the potential to create odors, feces, food spillage, noise, attract rats and attract other predators. Communities that allow chickens emphasize that these risks can be mitigated with the proper education of chicken owners and municipal regulations.

The question was raised as to whether the Board wanted to allow the keeping of hens and if so, would there be any need to alter regulations and requirements.

Trustee Sargon recommended that residents be given a chance, or more specifically a pilot program, in order for the Board to see how the raising of hens would function in the Village of Lincolnwood. She noted that a permit and various other restrictions should be required.

A member of the public, Trustee Halevi's husband Charles, came up to the podium to speak on the issue.

Mr. Halevi warned the Board that there were many dangers and harmful elements surrounding the keeping of hens in a Village like Lincolnwood. He noted that life-threatening outbreaks of salmonella and E-Coli have been proven to be linked with the keeping of domestic hens.

Mr. Halevi also noted that coyotes will try to kill chickens if they smelt them. They can, for example, leap a six-foot fence and easily reach a chicken contained in a backyard. He recommended the board move to prohibit the keeping of hens.

It was noted by Trustee Sargon that currently, residents across the Village of Lincolnwood keep hens.

Pam Lefkowitz, a member of the public, joined the discussion via GoToMeeting. She noted that there were less benefits to keeping chickens than the adverse.

Trustee Halevi noted that on April the 20th she noticed two escaped chickens in her backyard. This happened multiple days in a row and resulted in two more chickens from a different neighbor escaping. She noted that this aggravated her neighbors' dogs and cats. She stated that there are people who do not know how to look after chickens in the Village. She questioned whether, when winter comes, residents would be able to look after these animals.

Trustee Klatzco noted he had investigated chicken coops extensively. He noted that chicken feces are very unpleasant to smell. He added that chickens are very loud, especially when laying eggs. He stated that Lincolnwood is not a farm community. He affirmed that he was not in favor of keeping chickens.

Mayor Patel noted that these things are happening regardless of current rules. He noted that employing licensure with strong regulations was the route he recommended when this issue was last discussed on April 20th. He asked whether the Board wanted to go any further regarding permissibility. He also noted that tagging the hens so that there was some kind of responsibility and potential repercussions for owners whose animals get loose.

Typical requirements from Deerfield, Evanston and Lake Bluff were exhibited.

Unique requirements were also presented.

Proposed directions for the Village Board:

*Does the Village Board want to allow hens?

If so, is there direction to adjust any potential requirements?

If the Board is interested in allowing Hen Coops, staff recommends that the matter be referred to the Plan Commission to amend the Zoning Ordinance to allow the keeping of hens as an accessory use, along with any specific direction of policy matters the Board would like included in an ordinance to modify the Health Regulations in the Village Code.

Community Development Director Mangum noted that a penalty already exists - up to the sum of \$2500 per day, per violation - for the keeping of illegal animals in the Village.

Trustee Saleem argued that there were greater issues to focus on rather than chicken pens.

Trustee Herrera stated that it could be an effective way to manage the issue if neighbors were allowed a say if their neighbor wanted to keep animals like hens.

President Patel asked whether it would be possible for the Board members to see a chicken coop in a community which allows them to assess for themselves whether the smell or other elements would be permissible.

Public Forum

There was none.

Adjournment to Closed Session

At 6:59 P.M. Trustee Sargon made a motion to move the meeting into Closed Session for the purpose of discussion of closed session minutes and regarding the selection of a person to fill public office seconded by Trustee Klatzco.

Upon Roll Call the results were:

AYES: Trustees Halevi, Sargon, Saleem, Herrera and Klatzco.

NAYS: None

Reconvention

At 7:30 P.M. President Patel reconvened the Committee of the Whole.

Meeting Adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,



Beryl Herman
Village Clerk