

Public Comments received as of 3:45pm 12/15/2014 by

- Colleen Konicek Hannigan
- John Landenberger
- Steve D'Amore
- Charles Ross
- Barbara Welsh Reed
- Cinder Dowling
- Elaine and Andrew Wright
- Jim O'Donnell (Not the former Plan Commission Member)
- Pamela A. Cools
- Andrew Wright
- Hollie Free



Robert Kosin <rkosin@barringtonhills-il.gov>

Please see attached letter which is meant for early distribution as part of the E-Packet for the 12/15/14 Special Meeting.

Robert Kosin <rkosin@barringtonhills-il.gov>

Sun, Dec 14, 2014 at 6:42 PM

To: Colleen Konicek Hannigan <ckonicek@barringtonhills-il.gov>

Cc: Fritz Gohl <fgohl@barringtonhills-il.gov>, "Karen S. Selman" <kselman@barringtonhills-il.gov>, Patty Meroni <pmeroni@barringtonhills-il.gov>, Joseph Messer <jmesser@barringtonhills-il.gov>, "Michael E. Harrington" <mharrington@barringtonhills-il.gov>

Your letter has been received and you have indicated copies for the Board of Trustees which will occur with this acknowledgement.

Also the copy will be posted with the E-Packet upon the resumption of the business day on Monday 12/15.

On Sun, Dec 14, 2014 at 6:23 PM, Colleen Konicek Hannigan <ckonicek@barringtonhills-il.gov> wrote:

To ensure compliance with the Open Meetings Act, elected or appointed members of the public body may reply to this message, but they should not forward it or send a copy of the reply to other members of the public body.

--

Robert Kosin

Village of Barrington Hills

112 Algonquin Rd, Barrington Hills, IL 60010-5199

847.551.3000 | BarringtonHills-il.gov



Konicek_Letter_re12152014.pdf

212K

Colleen Konicek Hannigan
Trustee, Village of Barrington Hills

Robert Kosin, Village Administrator
Dolores Trandel, Village Clerk

This letter is written in response to the December 8th request for a special meeting by Trustees Gohl and Selman for the stated sole purpose to "discuss and approve the (Anderson) Horse Boarding Text Amendment" recommended by the ZBA to the BOT, amending sections 5-2-1, 5-3-4, and 5-5-2 of the Village's ordinance. I would like to formally put forth my objection to this meeting taking place at the requested time on the basis of several factors which I believe show the agenda item is premature, as well as demonstrates a lack of respect and consideration for the residents of this community, the office of the Village President, and the various boards and commissions which are put in place for the public health and safety of this Village.

Firstly, a regularly scheduled meeting of the BOT is already set for December 19, 2014. As this has been on the Village's calendar since January, the public and members of the BOT have been able to accommodate their schedules in reliance on it. I see no reason to hold a special meeting, of which the public has not been apprised with sufficient time to address their respective schedules during the busy holiday season. In fact, the whole process within which a meeting such as this has been called, is disrespectful of the trustees' and the residents' time. In this instance, I hold no illusion that five of the trustees of the BOT were aware, prior to the December 8th request even being made, that there would be a quorum available for this meeting. Namely, that those five trustees would be available.

Despite my response to the request for the special meeting, which was communicated to me by the Clerk for the first time on December 9th, wherein both the Village President and I indicated prior commitments on the date requested, I never received confirmation that a quorum had been achieved until I requested whether one was from the Village Administrator late Thursday (12/11) afternoon. I had sent several communications to Village administration requesting information to prepare for the meeting, in the event it took place, and further indicating that no confirmation had been provided. Despite this, it took me being physically present in Village Hall and posing a direct question to Administrator Kosin before I was given confirmation at around 4:50 p.m. on Thursday, December 11th, that the meeting was confirmed. Why was information like this withheld from me, an elected official of the Village? I immediately requested whether the meeting had been posted on the Village's website, which, of course, it had not, and stated that the residents of the this community deserved better from our Village administration than to receive notice of such an

important meeting for the first time on a Friday afternoon (the anticipated posting date) during the holiday season. At my insistence, the Deputy Clerk posted the meeting on the Village's calendar late Thursday afternoon.

While still in Village Hall, I pulled the meeting up on the Village's calendar and saw that the posted agenda listed the section of the meeting for Public Comment to be after the "vote" on the Horse Boarding Text Amendment. When I asked Mr. Kosin and the Deputy Clerk why Public Comment had been moved to the end of the agenda when President McLaughlin had moved it to the beginning of the agenda shortly after taking office, the Deputy Clerk indicated she would change it and that it must have been drafted on a template from the former administration's agenda. The Village Administrator then indicated that Public Comment could not be moved because it was specifically requested to be after the "vote" by Trustees Gohl and Selman. I asked how it was acceptable that two trustees could circumvent the policy put in place by the Village's elected President and the right of the tax paying members of the public to voice their stance in favor or against the proposed amendment in advance of a vote, and was told this was allowed under our code. When I later requested written confirmation regarding the moving of Public Comment, Mr. Kosin advised me in writing that both Trustees Selman and Gohl had advised the Village Clerk orally that they wanted Public Comment moved to the end of the meeting. He further advised that he followed up with them by phone to confirm their request and additionally contacted Trustee Messer who agreed that Public Comment should be held after the BOT vote on the amendment. These Trustees have not requested my input on this change to the current President's policy and I wish to be on the record in advance of the meeting that I find this to be a complete betrayal of the trust of the residents of this Village and a continued show of divisive tactics that defy the current President's attempts at open, honest, and transparent government.

Further, the Agenda indicates that there will be a "vote" on the Anderson Horse Boarding Text Amendment. To the extent this change in the agenda which typically reads "discuss for approval," or some such language, is an attempt to further curtail the voice of the sitting trustees to discuss the amendment, I show my objection to these strong arm tactics, as well.

Lastly, and most importantly, any vote on the Anderson Horse Boarding Text Amendment is decidedly premature. As Trustee Gohl knows from having attended the most recent Plan Commission meeting on December 8th, the Plan Commission has requested that the BOT put off any vote on this item until they have had an opportunity to review the language and analyze it in light of the Village's Comprehensive Plan to assure there is no negative impact on the protections afforded the Village by the Comprehensive Plan. Further, as Trustee Harrington should be aware as he is Trustee Liaison to the Board of Health, the BOH has discussed on both November 12th and December 9th, and voted specifically on December 9th to request that any vote on the Anderson Horse

Boarding Text Amendment be put off until such time as expert analysis and studies can be undertaken to look into the potential effect of horse grazing density on our Village. The BOH specifically requested that Administrator Kosin convey this request to Trustee Harrington.

I'm disappointed, but no longer surprised, by the lack of considered thought and protection for the majority of residents and their property displayed by certain members of the Village's boards and commissions in fervent favor of a distinct minority, arguably a single landowner. There are no properties other than the one that is the subject of current longstanding litigation that are in any manner jeopardized by the Village's Ordinances as they currently exist. To rush this vote prematurely, and under such negative and underhanded conditions, continues the tone of discord and divisiveness that has separated this Village and unnecessarily pitted neighbor against neighbor. We will assuredly end up in more than one costly lawsuit as a result of these tactics. The biggest threat, however, is not to our Village coffers, but to the peaceful and friendly relationships that used to exist within the confines of our Village boundaries.

Please provide the entirety of this letter to the members of the Board of Trustees and make it a part of the E-Packet materials for the Special Meeting scheduled for Monday, December 15th. In that I have already conveyed my displeasure with the Village administration's apparent failure to post material matters that I had requested to be part of this meeting's E-Packet last week, it is my expectation that this letter be posted as early as possible on Monday morning.

Sincerely,

/s Colleen Konicek Hannigan

Trustee, Village of Barrington Hills
[112 Algonquin Road](#)
[Barrington Hills, IL 60010-5199](#)
[847.551.3005](#)

cc: Members of the Board of Trustees
E-Packet for 12.15.14 Special Meeting



Dolores Trandel <clerk@barringtonhills-il.gov>

Barrington Hills Horse Boarding Amendment

John Landenberger <john.landenberger@att.net>

Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 5:44 PM

Reply-To: John Landenberger <john.landenberger@att.net>

To: "jfreeman@barringtonhills-il.gov" <jfreeman@barringtonhills-il.gov>, "kanderson@barringtonhills-il.gov" <kanderson@barringtonhills-il.gov>, "krosene@barringtonhills-il.gov" <krosene@barringtonhills-il.gov>, "cbenkendorf@barringtonhills-il.gov" <cbenkendorf@barringtonhills-il.gov>, "dstieper@barringtonhills-il.gov" <dstieper@barringtonhills-il.gov>, "dwolfgram@barringtonhills-il.gov" <dwolfgram@barringtonhills-il.gov>, "rchambers@barringtonhills-il.gov" <rchambers@barringtonhills-il.gov>

Cc: "mmclaughlin@barringtonhills-il.gov" <mmclaughlin@barringtonhills-il.gov>, "ckonicek@barringtonhills-il.gov" <ckonicek@barringtonhills-il.gov>, "jmesser@barringtonhills-il.gov" <jmesser@barringtonhills-il.gov>, "fgohl@barringtonhills-il.gov" <fgohl@barringtonhills-il.gov>, "mharrington@barringtonhills-il.gov" <mharrington@barringtonhills-il.gov>, "pmeroni@barringtonhills-il.gov" <pmeroni@barringtonhills-il.gov>, "kselman@barringtonhills-il.gov" <kselman@barringtonhills-il.gov>, "clerk@barringtonhills-il.gov" <clerk@barringtonhills-il.gov>

ZBA Members and Barrington Hills Trustees

After reading the notes from the ZBA meetings on December 2 and December 3 I am again disappointed in the actions of the ZBA. To me it seemed clear from statements at the December 2 ZBA meeting additional research and considerations needed to be pursued before recommendation or passage of the Horse Boarding Amendment.

Statements from Donald Schuman, Building and Zoning Enforcement Officer, clearly identified significant dangers of the slippery slope partially informed actions can take us down. Once again I believe caution must be exercised to insure the best interests of all Barrington Hills residents are protected. I expect our elected officials to fulfill the primary obligations of government. The most basic duty of a government is to protect its people.

This protection includes making choices that best benefit the majority and not special interest groups.

Putting the best construction on the the December 3 vote by the ZBA to forward the amendment to the Trustees, I hope this brings the issue to a clear direction that more consideration needs to be undertaken to insure decisions regarding Commercial operations of any type are controlled to insure the safety, wellbeing and happiness of the majority. Even members of the ZBA expressed concerns about open questions and due diligence. Why would we hurry for a resolution that has identified issues, unidentified issues and without establishing adequate controls?

I expect our Village Leadership to step up to the challenge and lead as we the citizens of Barrington Hills believe we put you in office to do.

Thank you for your consideration of my thoughts and perspective.

John Landenberger
18 Bow Lane
Barrington Hills, Illinois 60010
847-277-0613



Dolores Trandel <clerk@barringtonhills-il.gov>

Public Comments on "Anderson" Amendment

D'Amore, Stephen <SDamore@winston.com>

Fri, Dec 12, 2014 at 8:09 AM

To: "clerk@barringtonhills-il.gov" <clerk@barringtonhills-il.gov>

Please consider these my public comments to be added to the record of the special board meeting this coming Monday:

I will not be able to attend the board meeting on Monday because of previously scheduled travel. I relied, like many others, on the regular meeting schedule, which included a planned meeting on Thursday of next week. This new, special meeting next Monday was called by two trustees specifically to avoid public scrutiny and public participation in this significant change in our laws. I am informed that these trustees actually called for this meeting on Monday of this week, yet notice was delayed until yesterday. Our village deserves more than these shenanigans, especially on an issue that has become so significant and been the subject of great controversy.

If I was able to attend the meeting on Monday, I would urge the board to reject the amendment on three principal grounds:

First, the amendment is retroactive. This is rare in legislation and demonstrates, in the most vivid and acute way, that this amendment was not designed to advance the public interest as a whole, but rather to immunize prior unlawful conduct by one or more lawbreakers. That is reason alone to reject this amendment.

Second, the amendment grants blanket permission to horse boarders first, and then requires disrupted neighbors to bring grievances second, only after they have been harmed. That is exactly the opposite of what responsible legislation should do. Rather, the proper way to regulate horse boarding is to do so by special use permits (even long term special use permits). Special use permits allow neighbors' rights to be considered and protected first, before they suffer harm. That's the right order of things. The current amendment has it exactly backward, putting the proverbial cart before the horse. This is further evidence that the legislation is not designed nor effective to advance the public interest as a whole. Its purpose and effect is to benefit a special class of commercial operators, including those who have deliberately violated our existing laws.

Third, the artifice of an "agriculture" designation, which now will be sprinkled anywhere and everywhere throughout the village, rather than in special agriculture zones, is destructive of our overall residential zoning and in violation of the village's comprehensive plan.

I leave to others who are expert in equestrian matters to comment on the provisions relating to hours, horse density, etc. Those are also problematic, for many and varied reasons that have been explored elsewhere.

I will not be able to attend the Monday meeting. No doubt it was the intention of those who called this special meeting, when a regular meeting was on the horizon, and then deliberately delayed its public notice to minimize community attendance and scrutiny of their conduct. Responsible governance requires much more than this irresponsible behavior. I hope you will join me in April to vote the liable trustees out of office and send them back to their lives as civilians, if this process proceeds on Monday as they have planned.

I have spoken with the president pro tem and asked him to reconsider this conduct. I hope he will reconsider, but I am not optimistic. If this meeting goes forward, I urge you, my neighbors, to attend and let your voices be heard, despite the efforts of some of your trustees to silence you.

Once again you must find your voices, attend this dubious meeting and argue against this destructive amendment.

Respectfully,

Steve D'Amore

The contents of this message may be privileged and confidential. Therefore, if this message has been received in error, please delete it without reading it. Your receipt of this message is not intended to waive any applicable privilege. Please do not disseminate this message without the permission of the author.



Dolores Trandel <clerk@barringtonhills-il.gov>

Comment regarding vote on Anderson Horse Boarding Amendment - Vote NO

Ross, Charles <CRoss@tc-mgmt.com>

Thu, Dec 11, 2014 at 8:20 PM

To: "clerk@barringtonhills-il.gov" <clerk@barringtonhills-il.gov>

As a resident of Barrington Hills, I have serious concerns about the Anderson Amendment. I strongly urge a NO vote on the amendment. I also urge that this issue be tabled until after next year's elections. The way that it has been rushed through the ZBA with disregard to the potential consequences and the expressed concerns and unanswered questions of many residents, is a serious matter. And I am concerned that this opens up the Village to potential costly litigation.

Charles Ross

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION

E-mails from this firm normally contain confidential and privileged material, and are for the sole use of the intended recipient. Use or distribution by an unintended recipient is prohibited, and may be a violation of law. If you believe that you received this e-mail in error, please do not read this e-mail or any attached items. Please delete the e-mail and all attachments, including any copies thereof, and inform the sender that you have deleted the e-mail, all attachments and any copies thereof.



Dolores Trandel <clerk@barringtonhills-il.gov>

ZBA proposed text amendment to be voted on this evening

Barbara Reed <breed368@gmail.com>

Mon, Dec 15, 2014 at 10:11 AM

To: mmclaughlin@barringtonhills-il.gov

Cc: fgohl@barringtonhills-il.gov, ckonicek@barringtonhills-il.gov, pmeroni@barringtonhills-il.gov, mharrington@barringtonhills-il.gov, kselman@barringtonhills-il.gov, jmesser@barringtonhills-il.gov, clerk@barringtonhills-il.gov

Dear President McLaughlin and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Board of Trustees:

As a resident of Barrington Hills for most of 58 years, I am truly sickened by the ongoing insistence of the majorities of both the ZBA and the Board of Trustees of Barrington Hills to adopt a text amendment to the current ZBA horse boarding ordinance. I have two primary reasons that I believe the reasoning to do so is wholly flawed. First, any consideration to do anything beyond Special Use in this matter should be based on, not how many acres a BH horse-boarding resident might have, but rather, how many **pastured** acres a BH resident might have. Secondly, the thought of amending an ordinance with an 8-year retroactive clause is absolutely ridiculous and only underscores the obvious obsession to protect one highly visible, politically charged property in Barrington Hills, The LeCompte property.

The more I sit and listen to the arguments presented in meetings being held on this matter, the more disgraced I am by the hostile nature, not only of many of our fellow BH neighbors and friends, but also of the seated board members. Naming names would be folly--so many of you should be thoroughly ashamed of the way that you have behaved on behalf of this community and for the damage that you have done to an historically small, peaceful, friendly, land-loving community. This community has always appreciated and welcomed horses and their responsible owners.

By insisting that we are an "Equestrian Community" you seem to have ruined the inherent charm of what has always been a community of equestrians and non-equestrians who have worked hard to enjoy the privilege of living just as they had hoped to live. This is not the Barrington Hills that my parents embraced in 1957 nor is it the Barrington Hills that Glenn and I and our family have called home for 31 years. We are on the BH bridle path and horses and their riders have always, and will continue to be welcome to ride through our property. To us, that is part of living in Barrington Hills. Having a few residents foist their personal demands on the rest of us, on any issue, is **not** part of living in Barrington Hills, or America for that matter.

Until this matter is thoroughly resolved, do NOT vote to adopt. Should you choose to ignore the strong sentiments of so many of your BH constituents, and vote to do so, you will also vote to insure that your current term of office will most likely be your last.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Welsh Reed



Dolores Trandel <clerk@barringtonhills-il.gov>

Anderson text amendment

Cinder Dowling <Cindowling@comcast.net>

Mon, Dec 15, 2014 at 10:03 AM

To: "clerk@barringtonhills-il.gov" <clerk@barringtonhills-il.gov>

I am voicing my opposition to the Anderson Text Amendment. Leave our zoning codes alone, regarding horses and barns and commercial boarding. We've gotten along just fine all these years until Bob Abboud, Judy Freeman and her associates have gotten into office.

Cinder Dowling

Sent from my iPad

W. ANDREW WRIGHT
281 Steeplechase Road
Barrington Hills, Illinois 60010
Ph 847-382-8610 • fax 847-382-8613

TO: Barrington Hills Village Board of Trustees

RE: Anderson Horse Boarding Amendment **Opposition**

Date: December 12, 2014

Elaine and I object to the Anderson Horse Boarding Amendment that has been approved by the ZBA, and forwarded to the Board of Trustees. Several aspects of this Amendment are objectionable:

- There has never been a “horse farm” in Barrington Hills that was populated with 2 horses per acre. We don’t need one or more now.
- Codifying a limitation at two horses per acre for properties involved in “agriculture,” as defined in the Amendment (which are larger than 10 acres) is an arbitrary size that is not based upon any objective criteria presented to the ZBA, but certainly a 10 acre parcel with a primary residence is not a commercially feasible “farm.”
- Barrington Hills is a rural, *residential* community that is equestrian friendly. Barrington Hills is no longer a farming community, with incidental residential properties (and has not been primarily a farming community for at least the past 80 years).
- Commercial activities have been strictly limited by the Village, as they should be, for as long as we have lived here (1978). Allowing commercialization without requiring special use permits is a mistake that will change the nature of this community.
- Special Use Permits provide the Village with a mechanism to review and approve non-conforming uses, from time to time, which would help prevent the potential for unintended, negative consequences of this poorly conceived, overly lenient revision that will promote commercialization, more traffic, various types of pollution and degradation of property values.
- The potential for shifting of the Village tax burden from the newly defined “agricultural” properties to those that are strictly residential is a “beggar-thy-neighbor” aspect of this Amendment that is both unfair and distasteful.
- Changes in regulations are almost never made retroactive by more than the current calendar year, even by the IRS. The retroactive aspect of this Amendment is distasteful at the very least, and may be interpreted as illegally designed to discharge the Village’s own prosecution of the Le Compte commercial operation,

W. Andrew Wright
December 12, 2014
Page 2

which was in violation of Village Code, and is in violation of Village Code at this point in time.

The Village Board of Trustees should take one of the following actions with this Amendment:

1. Reject it, or
2. Revise it such that in order to board more than one horse per *pasture acre* a Special Use Permit is required, or
3. Revise it such that:
 - In order to be considered an agricultural use, the property must be more than 25 acres devoted to an agricultural use (excluding land devoted to residential use, which should be defined to include the residence, patios, porches, swimming pools and attached or detached garages.
 - Restrict such larger parcels to one horse per agricultural acre.
 - For properties of less than 25 agricultural acres, restrict the number of horses per parcel to one horse per acre, but deducting the land area utilized for residential purposes.

Thank you for your consideration.

Elaine and Andrew Wright



Dolores Trandel <clerk@barringtonhills-il.gov>

Special Meeting Commercial Horse Boarding: Public Comment Please Add to Public Comments 651pm cst 12/13/14

James T O'Donnell PharmD MS FCP <jim@pharmaconsultantinc.com>

Sat, Dec 13, 2014 at 6:52 PM

To: clerk@barringtonhills-il.gov

This is a continued insult to the majority of the residents of the Village despite overwhelming opposition in written comments and public comments to the ZBA_ to this amendment.

And to call a Special Meeting? What's the hurry? In fact, why has this issue, which was discussed ad nauseum at ZBA and BOT in 2011, rushed through ZBA this summer? 'TO MAKE LECOMPTE LEGAL'(Yetarian)

The ZBA has ignored testimony of the experts they called, and did not call some of the experts that the BOT recommended.

The TA will have devastating negative effect on the character of the Village, will increase taxes for non barn owners disproportionately, and is a continued flagrant violation of the laws controlling municipalities.

The text amendment favors one party in litigation, and is not in the best interests of the village. It is doomed to failure. Even the RCBH lawyers, Abboud's personal attorney Kelly, and the special counsel Bond have given legal opinions to the BOT against such a selective favorite party status.

It will be challenged and declared void.

Given the obvious eventual outcome, why would the rogue zba and the hold over and election law violating trustees pass such a self serving amendment.? BECAUSE THEY HAVE THE VOTES! and because their PUPPETMASTER IS PULLING THEIR STRINGS and they are marching to his drum, not acting as responsible public officials.

Responsible citizens have only one recourse, that is to educate the electorate of their illegal acts and dump the rogues in the April election, defeat all their appointed and selected candidates, take majority of the BOT, and then dump the rogues (Freeman, Anderson, Beckendorf, Rosene) off the commissions and committees so that this village can start acting responsibly again.

It will be cause for celebration in April when we can celebrate the defeat of these rogues and send a strong message to the puppetmaster and to the riding club leadership who take dangerous positions without consulting their membership. Remember, even if the entire membership was in favor of this amendment (and they are not), this represents less than 10% of the Village population. THE 90% will take the Village back from this biased minority who are forcing their illegal positions on the majority.

The aftermath will be in the Courts, where these rogues will have to answer for their irresponsible and illegal actions. Interference with the current litigation doom failure to the TA There have been multiple obvious and flagrant violations of the Open Meetings Act. Are there also criminal violations? Is that the RUSH?. It won't stop the push to connect the dots of the hidden donations by lecompte to messer, selman and meroni and the and the Shuman letter making "lecompte legal" ("if it looks like a duck.....")

I encourage state and federal prosecutors to investigate and prosecutors to investigate the rogue actions of these public officials, since hey won't obey the laws and statutes.. They are violating the residents' rights, taking protections away provided by the Home Occupation Ordinance. and they have never uttered an explanation on why their TA is beneficial to the village. They only must think is beneficial to the riding club (parking, polo matches, and obviously, so emphatically publicly proclaimed by the past president of the RCBH to "make lecompte legal". THIS IS NOT IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE VILLAGE.

if you don't like my recitation of facts and my opinions on these destructive actions, don't assume I don't like horses. I do like horses. I wouldn't have moved here if I didn't. I wouldn't have been a Jump Judge at FVPC

events (Judy Freeman shuttled me to my stations), I've advertised in the Polo Match programs, and attended RCBH events - and I am a RCBH member (at least I haven't been informed that I have been kicked out of the Club yet). However, the preservation of my rights and the rights of residents is more important than social status in any club!

Jim O'Donnell (Not the former Plan Commission Member)

Ridgcroft Lane

Barrington Hilla

847 769 2843

jim@pharmaconsultantinc.com



Dolores Trandel <clerk@barringtonhills-il.gov>

Comments for Board of Trustees Meeting December 15, 2014

Pamela Cools <docpammy@ameritech.net>

Sat, Dec 13, 2014 at 7:00 PM

Reply-To: Pamela Cools <docpammy@ameritech.net>

To: Dolores Trandel <clerk@barringtonhills-il.gov>, Mart <mmclaughlin@barringtonhills-il.gov>

Dear Dolores,

Please forward these comments, along with the attachment, to the Board of Trustees for Monday's Special Meeting.

Thank you,

Pamela A. Cools

Dear President McLaughlin and Trustees,

I am writing again to express my opposition to the Anderson Amendment regarding Commercial Horse Boarding. My comments which I delivered at the September 22, 2014 meeting (attached) still hold true for the latest incarnation of the proposed amendment. I continue to steadfastly believe that consideration of any amendment should not take place until the pending litigation regarding Oakwood Farms is resolved.

If this Board still insists on proceeding down this path which will put our village in legal jeopardy again, I ask you consider carefully the volumes of data and articles from respected scientific journals which I have submitted to the Board of Trustees, the ZBA and the Board of Health which indicate that the proposed density limits are excessive, and the known risks of surface and groundwater contamination if proper manure management practices are not observed.

In addition, I wish to point out that the Plan Commission, of which I am a member, voted on December 8, 2014 to ask the Board of Trustees to allow us to discuss and render our judgment if commercial horse boarding is consistent with our Comprehensive Plan. The Plan Commission had not met since July, so the December meeting was our first opportunity to have any formal conversation concerning boarding. It should also be noted that when discussion of amending the village code to redefine commercial boarding started this summer, ZBA Chairman Judy Freeman specifically asked for comments regarding the conformity of boarding with the Comprehensive Plan. She requested comments from residents, but never the input of the Plan Commission. A vote on the amendment should be delayed until the Plan Commission, which is the "keeper" of the Comprehensive Plan makes its evaluation.

Lastly, the Board of Health also met last week and asked that the Board of Trustees delay any vote on the Anderson Amendment until an impartial university expert in equine science could be consulted to evaluate the proposal and to give his/her opinion on the topics of

horse density, manure management and dangers of water contamination.

This entire process needs to be slowed down until thoughtful and educated study of all the issues take place by the appropriate commissions and until all experts can be consulted so that the interests of ALL homeowners in the village are protected. Failure to do so will have dire implications for us all.

Sincerely,

Pamela A. Cools
32 Little Bend Road
Barrington Hills, IL

 **CommentsBOT092214.pdf**
44K

I have several comments to make tonight.

- 1) I feel that it would be irresponsible and a betrayal of the public trust for this board to even consider any changes to our zoning code at this time. Approving an amendment now has the strong potential to expose this village to new lawsuits by residents. And, if there is anything that this village does not need is more spending on legal fees that we could easily avoid by taking a slow and deliberate approach.
- 2) The Anderson Amendment that is on the agenda tonight has not been exposed to proper scrutiny by our residents. Although the ZBA chair felt that it was not necessary to hold a separate public hearing, it is obvious to anyone who compares the Anderson Amendment to the LeCompte Amendment, that the changes that it contains are considerable and they merit thorough review by the residents. Failure to do so could yet again expose our community to further litigation.
- 3) If any measures are taken by this Board to regulate large-scale commercial horse boarding, it should be done under Special Use Permit, and not under agriculture. Special Use allows the unique characteristics of each boarding operation to be addressed, while giving neighbors more security and protection against potential nuisances.
- 4) While it may seem convenient to categorize horse boarding as agricultural, such a categorization fails to recognize a very important distinction.

The definition of Agriculture in our code* specifically lists relatively passive activities which do not attract visitors or members of the public. This is an extremely important point, which is also apparent throughout our Comprehensive Plan.

Now, I live in very close proximity to the Duda property, and I pass the fields of corn, soybeans, and pastures of cows, goats and free chickens every day. Never have I seen families coming to visit the soybeans, ride the goats or take the chickens out for the day in their trailer. Our code permits bee-keeping and the growing of grapes and flowers, but does not allow farmstands for the sale of their products. And, if our code goes so far to limit each property owner to two two-day garage sales per year, why would we ever consider an amendment which would allow unlimited visitors to those properties 365 days of the year?

- 5) There is a way to find a compromise to satisfy nearly everyone's concerns which would allow commercial horse boarding to continue in the village, which is what we all want. But it seems that the current ZBA is not willing to listen to all sides. If this amendment is approved tonight, I would like to remind everyone here that the next village election is 197 days away. So vote wisely tonight. If you don't, rest assured, we will vote wisely in April.

*AGRICULTURE: The use of land for agricultural purposes, including farming, dairying, pasturage, apiculture, horticulture, floriculture, viticulture and animal and poultry husbandry (including the breeding and raising of horses as an occupation) and the necessary accessory uses for handling or storing the produce; provided, however, that the operation of any such accessory uses shall be secondary to that of the normal agricultural activities.



Dolores Trandel <clerk@barringtonhills-il.gov>

FW: Tonight's Farcical Meeting - Machiavellian Poor Form

Andrew Wright <awright@wrightdev.com>
To: "clerk@barringtonhills-il.gov" <clerk@barringtonhills-il.gov>

Mon, Dec 15, 2014 at 1:57 PM

From: Andrew Wright
Sent: Monday, December 15, 2014 1:43 PM
To: 'clerk@barringtonhills-il.gov'
Subject: FW: Tonight's Farcical Meeting - Machiavellian Poor Form

Please include my email, below, in the package that will be handed out tonight to public attendees at the special meeting.

Thank you,

Andrew Wright

From: Andrew Wright
Sent: Monday, December 15, 2014 11:04 AM
To: fgohl@barringtonhills-il.gov
Cc: mmclaughlin@barringtonhills-il.gov; kselman@barringtonhills-il.gov; pmeroni@barringtonhills-il.gov; jmesser@barringtonhills-il.gov; ckonicek@barringtonhills-il.gov; mharrington@barringtonhills-il.gov; BHObserver@gmail.com; James Wright; cindowling@comcast.net; 'wright281@comcast.net'
Subject: Tonight's Farcical Meeting - Machiavellian Poor Form

Fritz,

Since we spoke the other day about our differing views of the Anderson Amendment, I have had the opportunity to read your (and Ms. Selman's) letters calling for tonight's **Farcical Meeting - For Show Only**. One would have thought that one of the two of you would have reminded the other that calling a meeting with the expressed reason being "to approve" a controversial, poorly thought-out regulation, is poor political gamesmanship. Machiavelli would be appalled at the lack of political elegance and finesse displayed by the blatant announcement in your letters (calling for a Special Meeting of the Village Board of Trustees) that the outcome has already been decided by the Abboud/Le Compte Contingent on our Village Board. It's most disappointing that we residents of VOBH have to continue to suffer indignities from the "Abboud After-Effect." I suppose we have one more election before we are rid of Abboud's sycophants.

To wit, I quote you:

"The topic to be discussed and approved on is to be the Horse

Boarding Text Amendment brought forward to the Barrington Hills Village Board by the Zoning Board of Appeals; section (s) 5-2-1, 5-3-4, 5-5-2. Please prepare and post an agenda with the only item being, action on the Horse Boarding text amendment."

I wish to remind you that when we discussed the potential financial effects on the Village's tax base, and on individual residents, from the inevitable reclassification of many properties from residential to agricultural, you told me that you didn't know. Further, you stated that asking the various assessors from the various counties and townships that intersect in Barrington Hills, results in as many different answers as assessors questioned. Passing such a significant code change without knowing the financial impact is irresponsible. Any Trustee that votes for this, without knowing the financial impact on the Village and its residents, should be voted out of office as soon as possible.

Regretfully,

Andrew Wright

281 Steeplechase Rd.

P. S. This email is for public distribution by anyone receiving it. Please feel free to forward to anyone you care to.



Dolores Trandel <clerk@barringtonhills-il.gov>

Special Board Meeting

Hollie Free <hfreeltd@yahoo.com>
To: "clerk@vbhil.gov" <clerk@vbhil.gov>

Mon, Dec 15, 2014 at 3:39 PM

Dear Mr. President and Members of the Village Board:

I urge you to not pass the Anderson amendment this evening. This would be a huge mistake for our village for the benefit of one particular property, Oakwood Farm. Any one with common sense should be able to discern that it is ridiculous to favor a small special interest group in the village putting aside what is best for the majority of the village residents and keeping the Village in check with it's comprehensive plan. If approved there will be devastating consequences for the village to deal with on many levels. From a zoning perspective the Village runs the risk of agricultural properties being interspersed amongst residential properties and this will bring forth more litigation pitting neighbor against neighbor including legal action against the village which is the last thing I want more of my tax dollars used on. Other very concerning issues in the Anderson amendment are floor area ratios making mega barns acceptable and the proposed hours of operation are beyond ridiculous.

Do the right thing....vote with your heads and not year hearts and vote NO. This isolated case of one property should have no bearing on the future of a thriving equestrian community with plenty of barns available to still board horses at. The scare tactics used by some are appealing to the heart and emotions of individuals residents and on some members of the zoning board and the village board. Use your head to think this through when you cast your vote.

Thank you for your consideration.

Hollie Free

Sent from my iPad