

ATTACHMENT 3

Plan Commission Minutes

(August 9, August 23, September 13, September 27, October 25)

EXCERPT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 9, 2016 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING

P2016-034 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update (Public Hearing)

Chairman Bucklin explained the background for the Village of Glenview Comprehensive Plan update. The Board of Trustees appointed a committee made up of residents of the Village. This Committee was charged with updating the Village's Comprehensive Plan, which acts as a roadmap for future development and other aspects of life in Glenview. Chairman Bucklin complimented the work of the Comprehensive Plan Committee, the staff and the public for all of their input, passion and work to produce the document.

Mr. Jeff Brady went on to explain how the document would proceed through the Plan Commission for review. The review would occur over three (3) meetings. At each meeting, several chapters or aspects of the Plan would be reviewed.

Chapter 1:

Mr. Brady summarized the materials submitted to the Plan Commission for review, which included the draft Comprehensive Plan update, a staff report and various background documents.

Chapter 1 focused on the background, history and context for the planning process. Mr. Brady highlighted a section regarding the purpose and definition of a Comprehensive Plan.

The following comments were made regarding Chapter 1:

- There were discrepancies in the population growth tables. Mr. Brady clarified that some graphics were not able to be updated prior to this meeting.
- Commissioner Igleski inquired about the perceived lack of focus on the impacts of the Glenview Naval Air Station and how it was different than other base closings and redevelopments across the country. Mr. Brady added that he would work on language to summarize this.

Chapter 2:

Mr. Brady explained the public process described in Chapter 2. Over the course of 21 meetings, the Comprehensive Plan Committee, the public and staff gathered input to guide the planning process.

Mr. Brady described the public workshops that took place and the various exercises used to identify assets, values and priorities within the Village. This resulted in a clear vision statement crafted by Comprehensive Plan Committee based on drafts from the public.

The following comments were made during review of Chapter 2:

- Commissioner Igleski noted that The Grove seemed to be missing as a valuable and unique asset within the Village.
- Chairman Bucklin asked Mr. Brady if the Park District had been an active partner in the process. Mr. Brady confirmed that the Park District was present at a lot of the meetings and were given multiple drafts of the plan for comment.
- Commissioner Dickson commented on the public process and how the exercises were created to gather input from the public in an appropriate manner that was approachable and not intimidating for citizens who are not experts in land development.

Chapter 5:

Mr. Brady summarized the intentions of Chapter 5. This chapter is related to various properties around the Village that have been subject to development pressures since the creation of the previous Comprehensive Plan in 2004. These areas were identified and then evaluated for potential development changes in the future. Goals and development parameters were created by the Comprehensive Plan Committee to guide any change in land use or site configuration in the future. Mr. Brady made it clear that in most cases no development proposals are imminent. For example, Subarea 4 is the Kraft/Heinz R&D facility. Kraft/Heinz has stated that it has no intention of closing the operation at any point, but such a large parcel suddenly becoming vacant and becoming occupied by another use can have a significant impact on the community, so planning exercises such as this one are important.

Chairman Bucklin asked the Plan Commissioners to offer their thoughts on the development considerations and ideas presented for each subarea. Commissioner Dickson and Mr. Brady clarified that some of the background materials featured development considerations and potential land uses that were not included in the draft plan. This information was part of working drafts for any of these subareas.

Using photos and charts from the redevelopment workshop exercises, Mr. Brady and Commissioner Dickson explained how groups of participants were able to demonstrate how they think the land should be developed or redeveloped and with what use.

Subarea 1: Old Willow Road/Willow Road

Mr. Brady explained the context of the site, its adjacencies, and the considerations the Comprehensive Plan Committee used to arrive at their proposed goals and parameters. In the case of this subarea, the Committee recommended a goal that limited future redevelopments to industrial and retail land uses, or a mix of both.

More specifically, the development parameters for this subarea focused on the adjacency to Willow Road, access to any future development site and traffic.

The following comments were made regarding Subarea 1:

- Commissioner Dickson asked Comprehensive Plan Committee Chair Kerry Cummings to clarify the use of “could”, “should”, “would, and “shall” in these goals. Chair Cummings clarified that the use of these words throughout the document was made with careful considerations as these provide guidance on the intention of a requirement or a suggestion.
- Commissioners Igleski and Burton discussed the possibility of residential uses and how this was discussed at the Committee level. Mr. Brady described the context up and down Old Willow Road and the surrounding uses, all of which are industrial in nature and have recently made improvements. Mr. Brady also stated that the subarea had recently been sold and is under new ownership. These new owners are actively marketing the property to a variety of uses.
- Chairman Bucklin asked the Commissioners if they had any preference for industrial or retail in this area. Commissioner Fallon and Igleski both liked the phrasing the recommendation used to allow flexibility for either use.

Chairman Bucklin opened the public hearing and asked if anyone present at meeting wished to comment on subarea 1. No one spoke regarding this section.

Subarea 2: Lehigh Industrial Corridor

Mr. Brady explained the context of the site, its adjacencies, and the considerations the Comprehensive Plan Committee used to arrive at their proposed goals and parameters. In the case of this subarea, the Committee recommended a set of goals that limited future redevelopments to industrial uses with the ability for mixed use development in the southern areas closest to Chestnut Avenue. The Comprehensive Plan Committee identified that an eclectic mix of industrial, artistic, and service uses had been occupying the area and that this was important and should be preserved. Additionally, the properties along the northern extents of the subarea are quite narrow and would require some difficult assemblage to develop.

More specifically, the development parameters for this subarea focused on the adjacency to Gallery Park and Lake Glenview, access to any future development site and traffic.

Mr. Brady utilized visuals from the draft plan to highlight the following redevelopment goals for Subarea 2.

The following comments were made regarding Subarea 2:

- Commissioner Igleski suggested more clearly delineating the border between northern and southern properties.
- Commissioner Fallon inquired about how limiting the use language seemed. Commissioner Dickson and Burton explained the background. A number of property owners were present at the workshops and stated that they wanted to keep their properties industrial in nature and had no immediate intention to apply for redevelopment or rezoning.
- Committee Member Brian Duff clarified that the intention was to emphasize a mix of uses. The real goal that received the most discussion related to the connectivity to Gallery Park for whatever the use may be.
- Chair Cummings offered a change to the content of the goal to offer more flexibility to address the Plan Commission's feeling that the items were limiting.
- Committee Member Judy Beck also commented on the importance of studying and improving traffic flow in this area, especially with the adjacency to the railroad crossing.

Chairman Bucklin opened the public hearing and asked if anyone present at meeting wished to comment on subarea 2. No one spoke regarding this section.

Subarea 3: Pearson Education Campus

Mr. Brady explained the context of the site, its adjacencies, and the considerations the Comprehensive Plan Committee used to arrive at their proposed goals and parameters. In the case of this subarea, the Committee recommended a set of goals that would allow another office user, institutional uses (such as a school) or a single-family residential development.

Chairman Bucklin stated that he was familiar with this property and felt that the building was of an age where being reused by another corporation may not be feasible. Chairman Bucklin asked if the school districts were consulted on this process and this property with regard to the possible addition of a number of single-family homes and the possibility of any new schoolchildren. Mr. Brady stated that the schools offered no additional comment.

Chairman Bucklin commented on the size and scale of this site related to others included in the plan. He felt that if this site were to be available for redevelopment, the impacts to surrounding properties could be far-reaching.

Mr. Brady explained that one development parameter pertained to the configuration of access for a future development and its relation to the existing Tall Trees neighborhood.

Mr. Brady utilized visuals from the draft plan to highlight the following redevelopment goals for Subarea 3.

The following comments were made regarding Subarea 2:

- Commissioner Fallon inquired about potential industrial uses. Uses would be limited to office, distribution and warehouse.
- Commissioner Igleski commented on the incorporation of office uses into Glenview's residential character. Both Commissioner Igleski and Chairman Bucklin expressed concern regarding the property being converted to Single-Family residential.
- Commissioner Fallon thought the residential use was acceptable if done correctly. Mr. Brady explained how cluster homes and zoning would be possible in this location.
- The Plan Commission discussed the potential for impacts of a residential use on the traffic, infrastructure, schools and character of the adjacent existing neighborhood. The Plan Commission offered no change to the parameter once the zoning basis was established and tied to the adjacent residential use.
- RD3.1.3 should be stricken as RD3.1.4 was meant to replace that parameter.

Chairman Bucklin opened the public hearing and asked if anyone present at meeting wished to comment on subarea 3. No one spoke regarding this section.

Subarea 4: Kraft/Heinz R&D Facility

Mr. Brady explained the context of the site, its adjacencies, and the considerations the Comprehensive Plan Committee used to arrive at their proposed goals and parameters. In the case of this subarea, the Committee recommended a set of goals that would allow development while preserving the adjacency to Downtown and consideration for the natural assets in the area such as the River. Additionally, screening for the Circles neighborhood was a high priority during Committee discussion.

Mr. Brady utilized visuals from the draft plan to highlight the following redevelopment goals for Subarea 4.

The following comments were made regarding Subarea 4:

- Chairman Bucklin inquired about mixed-use development in this area. Mr. Brady clarified that the Committee had focused on something that complemented the downtown. The Plan Commission should discuss the feasibility of altering the Goal.
- Commissioner Igleski felt this site was suited for residential as it drew people downtown.
- Mr. Brady summarized the possible changes to allow for mixed use development in addition to the residential.

Chairman Bucklin opened the public hearing and asked if anyone present at meeting wished to comment on subarea 4.

Ms. Carolyn Heck, of Orchard Glen, spoke regarding the existing traffic patterns in this area. She felt a stoplight should be pursued if any redevelopment occurs. Mr. Brady explained how stoplight requests are made for IDOT roads. Chairman Bucklin explained that these items would be explored during a review of redevelopment.

Committee Member Judy Beck spoke regarding the wildlife in this area and the importance of incorporating a conservation easement to protect this wildlife corridor.

Subarea 5: Signode Office Building

Mr. Brady explained the context of the site, its adjacencies, and the considerations the Comprehensive Plan Committee used to arrive at their proposed goals and parameters. In the case of this subarea, the Committee recommended a set of goals that would allow for consistency with the adjacent development and adequate screening from industrial uses. Mr. Brady also explained that the railway spur is still in use on occasion and may have to be relocated as part of any future development.

Mr. Brady utilized visuals from the draft plan to highlight the following redevelopment goals for Subarea 5.

The following comments were made regarding Subarea 5:

- Commissioner Iglesias felt that residential would be challenging because of the existing conditions including the rail spur and forging connections to the adjacent neighborhoods. He felt this site was likely to maintain its existing industrial character.
- Chairman Bucklin identified scenarios in which industrial redevelopment could be harmful to the neighbors as well.
- Commissioners Iglesias and Fallon identified that this area may be good for park space or greenspace.
- The Plan Commission discussed the ability and effect of including a park space option.
- Committee Member Henrietta Saunders spoke regarding the greenspace option. She felt parks should be where they are needed or used. In this instance, the need or usability would be low. The Plan Commission agreed that it may be a burden to create a development parameter regarding converting the property into a park. Committee Member Judy Beck explained the Park District's process for identifying and creating parks. In many instances, funding for such projects has been dwindling due to state budgetary constraints. Committee Member Beck asked the Plan Commission to consider emphasizing a land donation over park creation.
- Mr. Brady stated that Village staff will contact the Park District and identify this to be an opportunity for their own Master Plan. Chairman Bucklin asked that Mr. Brady contact the Park District prior to the next meeting to see if the area is even feasible for Park District operations.

Chairman Bucklin opened the public hearing and asked if anyone present at meeting wished to comment on subarea 5. No one spoke regarding this section.

Subarea 6: West Lake and Pfingsten Offices

Mr. Brady explained the context of the site, its adjacencies, and the considerations the Comprehensive Plan Committee used to arrive at their proposed goals and parameters. In the case of this subarea, the Committee recommended a set of goals that would allow for development that is mindful of traffic congestion in the area and the peak times of adjacent institutional uses such as the high school or

religious facilities. In addition to emphasizing low-impact traffic uses, the Committee also developed parameters relating to reuse of the existing buildings in this area.

Mr. Brady utilized visuals from the draft plan to highlight the following redevelopment goals for Subarea 6.

The following comments were made regarding Subarea 6:

- Commissioner Igleski supported this goal. He also inquired about what kinds of uses were discussed as complimentary to the adjacent institutional uses. Mr. Brady listed the other uses and some of the impacts they may or may not have including religious institutions.

Chairman Bucklin opened the public hearing and asked if anyone present at meeting wished to comment on subarea 6. No one spoke regarding this section.

Subarea 7: Milwaukee Avenue

Mr. Brady explained the context of the site, its adjacencies, and the considerations the Comprehensive Plan Committee used to arrive at their proposed goals and parameters. In this instance, the challenges to development lie with the difficulty in assemblage of the properties and various timelines of existing leases. This particular subarea was identified for more detailed study. A special area plan has been created. A number of meetings with various stakeholders have been held. Results of the special area planning process will be shared in detail at the August 23rd Plan Commission meeting.

Chairman Bucklin opened the public hearing and asked if anyone present at meeting wished to comment on subarea 7. Mr. Ed Breden, owner of 1223 Milwaukee Avenue, spoke regarding the process. He felt that the process had gone on too long without a decision. He was in favor of a commercial development on his property.

Subarea 8: Aon Parking Lot

Mr. Brady explained the context of the site, its adjacencies, and the considerations the Comprehensive Plan Committee used to arrive at their proposed goals and parameters. In the case of this subarea, the Committee recommended a set of goals for development that dealt with the limited access to the site, adjacent park land and the potential need for parking if large user uses existing building formerly occupied by Aon. Mr. Brady also mentioned that the Park District and Abt Electronics could potentially expand into this area.

Mr. Brady utilized visuals from the draft plan to highlight the following redevelopment goals for Subarea 8.

The following comments were made regarding Subarea 8:

- The Plan Commission discussed if retail would be appropriate and complementary to the uses on the Milwaukee Avenue corridor. The Commission felt there were challenges to allowing retail, but the opportunity should not be eliminated completely.

Chairman Bucklin opened the public hearing and asked if anyone present at meeting wished to comment on subarea 8. No one spoke regarding this section.

Subarea 9: 4700 West Lake Avenue

Mr. Brady explained the context of the site, its adjacencies, and the considerations the Comprehensive Plan Committee used to arrive at their proposed goals and parameters. In the case of this subarea, the Committee recommended a set of goals that allowed for potential senior housing as it was a low-impact use from a traffic perspective and would also have limited aesthetic impact on the adjacent residential neighborhood.

Mr. Brady utilized visuals from the draft plan to highlight the following redevelopment goals for Subarea 9.

The following comments were made regarding Subarea 9:

- Chairman Bucklin opened the public hearing and asked if anyone present at meeting wished to comment on subarea 8. No one spoke regarding this section.
- No Comments Made by Plan Commission

Subarea 10: Northwest Corner of Pfingsten and Willow Roads

Mr. Brady explained the context of the site. This site is governed by the Village of Northbrook. The inclusion of this site within the Village of Glenview’s Comprehensive Plan is related to the reaffirmation that the site be held to the standards laid out in the Willow Road Corridor Agreement, which would allow retail uses but limit access to Willow Road.

There were no comments from the Plan Commission or the public.

Subarea 11: Hart Property – Southwest Corner of Pfingsten and Willow Roads

Mr. Brady explained the context of the site. In the 1980’s, the Village of Glenview had passed an ordinance granting rights for the property to be rezoned to R-4 Single-family residential and B-2 General Business Districts should the owner ever vacate the site and wish to redevelop it. The commercial zone would be applied to the northern portion of the property while the single-family zoning would apply to the southern portion of the site adjacent to other residential neighborhoods.

The Plan Commission chose to accept the Comprehensive Plan Committee’s recommendation to maintain the zoning outlined in ordinance 2856 to allow for B-2 and R-4 zoning.

There were no comments from the public.

Subarea 12: 3365 Willow Road – Gibson Property

Mr. Brady explained the context of the site. This site is also governed by the Willow Road Corridor Agreement. The inclusion of this site within the Village of Glenview’s Comprehensive Plan is related to the reaffirmation that the site be held to the standards laid out in the Willow Road Corridor Agreement, which would allow development within the Village of Glenview as a residential use consistent with the adjacent cluster homes at Glenridge Meadows.

There were no comments from the Plan Commission or the public.

Downtown Wayfinding Signage:

Mr. Brady explained that as part of the Comprehensive Plan update, the Village was also evaluating the inclusion of downtown wayfinding signage to build community identity and bolster commerce in the downtown area. As part of the Comprehensive Plan update workshops, participants completed a visual preference survey and other activities in order to identify the appropriate type of signage to be used. The Village teamed with Teska Associates to create preliminary designs of these signs. Depending on the direction from the Plan Commission and Board of Trustees, these same design principles could be applied to other entry signage across the Village.

Commissioner Dickson added that this particular goal fit within the vision statement developed by the Committee and was an important piece of downtown development. Commissioner Dickson went on to summarize activities that took place at the workshop relating to the identification of the true “edges” of downtown.

Chairman Bucklin inquired about the process for approval of such signs. Mr. Brady stated that should the signs receive the necessary support and funding from the Board of Trustees, a review process would be implemented to gather input from the various boards and commissions regarding proper locations and designs for these signs. They would likely be installed over time as funding became available.

Chairman Bucklin opened the public hearing and asked if anyone present at meeting wished to comment on downtown wayfinding signage. Committee Member Judy Beck spoke about her belief that this is important building block for Village-wide identity, not just downtown.

There was no further comment from the Plan Commission or the public.

Downtown Glenview:

Mr. Brady described the inclusion of principles from the Downtown Revitalization Plan in the Comprehensive Plan update. These were included to reinforce and formalize the commitment to downtown redevelopment.

There were no comments from Plan Commission or the Public regarding the inclusion of the Downtown Revitalization Plan.

Chairman Bucklin continued the public hearing to the August 23, 2016 Plan Commission meeting, where additional chapters would be reviewed.

EXCERPT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 23, 2016 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING

P2016-034 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update (Public Hearing)

Acting Chairwoman Dickson gave an overview of the Village of Glenview Comprehensive Plan process, which has taken nearly one year. A diverse Committee of residents worked to develop the document that has now been presented to the Plan Commission and will ultimately be reviewed by the Village Board of Trustees.

As reviewed at the last Plan Commission meeting, Mr. Jeff Brady briefly explained the purpose of a Comprehensive Plan and noted that the Committee has made recommendations regarding a wide range of civic interests in the Village, however, it is not a regulatory document. Rather, the Comprehensive Plan covers a wide range of topics, including land use, housing, traffic circulation, utilities, public services, recreation, environmental, and many other topics. Mr. Brady explained that the Village of Glenview Comprehensive Plan would serve several purposes:

- Provide a description of current conditions and trends shaping the Village of Glenview
- Identify planning issues, opportunities, and challenges that should be addressed
- Explore land use and potential policy alternatives
- Ensure that the Comprehensive Plan is current, internally consistent, and easy to use
- Provide guidance in the planning and evaluation of future land and resource decisions
- Provide a vision and framework for the future of the Village of Glenview

There was a great deal of public input and ideation that was incorporated into the recommendations. At the previous Plan Commission meeting, the Overview, Vision and most of the Redevelopment Chapter were reviewed in detail. There was a recommendation from the Committee calling for further study of the area of Milwaukee Avenue adjacent to the Grove and the existing LifeStorage building. This study has been completed and the findings of the study will be reported and reviewed this evening. Also at tonight's meeting, the Plan Commission will review the Transportation section and the Natural Resource section recommendations and goals.

Chapter 5 – Redevelopment

Of particular attention was Subarea 7 (east side of Milwaukee Avenue). Mr. Brady provided background information and noted that following public feedback and Comprehensive Plan Committee review, a special study of the area was commissioned. The study intended to identify appropriate uses and development parameters for the subarea. Considerations included the impact of retail, proximity to Grove/residential and timing/development feasibility. A memo* from Teska Associates was included in the Commissioner's packet and referenced as Mr. Brady described the existing conditions:

- A. 1255 Milwaukee Avenue: Former medical office building – currently for-sale or for-rent
- B. 1245-1247 Milwaukee Avenue: Two connected office buildings, offering office space for rent; open to discussing potential redevelopment ideas
- C. 1223 Milwaukee Avenue: Existing single-family residence – site for sale with interest from a prospective retail purchaser.
- D. 1205 Milwaukee Avenue: Vacant lot owned by Life Storage located south of self storage use – site for sale with interest from non-office users.

**The memo incorrectly lists B & D as C & D*

Mr. Brady stated that a change to potentially introduce retail components primarily along Milwaukee Avenue was discussed. It was seen that the area was bigger than what a typical retail development can handle. Several members of the Plan Commission felt that if there was going to be a change in use in the area, perhaps a coordinated effort among property owners to have retail along the street frontage and keep some of the office components was needed. As stated in the memo from Teska, Village Staff hosted two neighborhood meetings in March, which included one meeting with subarea property owners to hear issues and opportunities that might happen in the subarea. Likewise, all properties owners to the north, south, east and west were invited to neighborhood meeting and gave their input. From that feedback, an additional meeting was held in June to review some conceptual ideas regarding redevelopment in this area. At that meeting, it was very clear from some of the property owners that there was a significant lack of interest in doing any redevelopment on these sites. For example, Guaranteed Trust was not interested in any short or long term development of the area and planned to stay as an office building for a long time. The owners of LifeStorage have recently remodeled and were not interested in any changes. In June, the Village met with the property owners who could possibly be interested in redeveloping their properties (A and B-open to redevelopment ideas, C-definitely open to zoning modifications because significant interest has been expressed, D-outlot of Life Storage building - decided to market this site and are entertaining discussions with non-office developers).

Based on discussions with these four property owners, Long-Term Development Scenarios were developed:

<p><u>North Parcel</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Requires consolidation of multiple properties -Commercial retail (14,000 square feet) -Office building 	<p><u>South Parcel</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Retail not preferred -Small/medium office building
--	---

Mr. Brady explained the differing opinions of property owners of the labeled A-B-C-D parcels. If further developed, the need for a slip road and potentially a stoplight was noted. These were tenets of the Milwaukee Avenue Corridor Plan. On August 10th, Village Staff met with B-C-D property owners (A owner was not in attendance). The parcel owners discussed the existing conditions and potential development to include retail, leased space, demolition, etc. Opinions varied greatly. A-B-C needed to be in agreement because these three parcels would need to be redeveloped into a single parcel. Parcel A is a very thin property, therefore, given the long-term development scenarios, redevelopment would be difficult.

Short-Term Development scenarios were also developed and included:

<p><u>C&D Parcels:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Allow for I-2 rezoning, which would permit certain retail uses as Conditional Uses -Create New Zoning District to capture nature of flex space -Coordinated approach by Owners of <u>C</u> & <u>B</u> -Requires consolidation of multiple properties -Commercial retail (14,000 square feet) -Office building
--

The Teska memo* (page 5) in the Commissioners' packets explains several scenarios that were reviewed and recommended. The owners of parcels C and D are actively marketing their parcels and it would be difficult to develop a long-term and cohesive plan for this area unless all parcel owners were in agreement.

**The memo incorrectly lists B & D as C & D*

Referencing the different dynamics of the four parcel Owners, Acting Chairwoman Dickson questioned if the Village could force change. The Comprehensive Plan Committee's recommendations stated that small sections of retail were undesirable. Zoning I-1 is very restrictive and is generally professional space. I-2 would be more flexible, allowing the owners more options, and the Plan Commission would hear Conditional Uses proposals. Some uses discussed were straight retail, day care uses, and boutique hotels (which would be part of a Planned Development).

The Comprehensive Plan Committee proposed the idea of a new industrial district that would allow for more 'flex-type' businesses (examples include fitness centers and automobile services). If a car wash business was proposed for this area, the Committee noted that it should be right-in/right-out only. The Comprehensive Plan Committee's recommendations look to limit property owner restrictions and allow for development matching the architecture of the Abt property across the street. Slip roads would be included for connecting properties, which would be limited by curb cuts. The Committee also made note of wanting to mitigate any impact on The Grove. While the long term scenarios are unlikely feasible and Owners of C & D have absolutely no interest in any new office uses, and the fact that most of the interest has come from businesses not allowed in a I-1 district, that perhaps the Village could change the area to B-2 or allow more flexibility in I-2.

Acting Chairwoman Dickson asked the Commissioners for their individual feedback. Commissioner Witt noted that if retail is wanted in this area, the Plan Commission should not recommend I-2 zoning because it would allow for a greater variety of uses. Perhaps the area should be left 'as-is' and the Village wait-and-see what kind of businesses express an interest in this area; B-2 is too restrictive, although it does allow for offices.

Commissioner Fallon asked what was allowable within I-2 zoning; Mr. Brady gave examples such as automotive detail washing, a distribution facility, lumber store with outdoor storage, etc. Within the Village, I-1 is primarily office buildings and the majority of the Village's corporate parks are I-2.

Commissioner Igleski felt the Plan Commission was unintentionally veering into a rezoning hearing. When looking at the big picture, an ideal scenario will not be realized in relation to current zoning uses, parcel layout, slip road and the Milwaukee Corridor Plan; he prefers B-2. It was agreed that the Commissioners wanted the architecture and site designs to be consistent with the Milwaukee Corridor Plan recommendations. Commissioner Witt agreed with Commissioner Igleski's comments.

Acting Chairwoman Dickson noted that none of tonight's discussion goes against any of the Committee's goals and that B-2 makes sense. One item to strike out might be single-family, residential, townhomes. Mr. Brady stated that if the Plan Commission so desires, it can edit page 5.17, add a few items that were noted in the Teska memo about a development plan and return to the next Plan Commission meeting. Acting Chairwoman Dickson noted that the changes discussed tonight are minor to the Comprehensive Plan Committee's report. The Comprehensive Plan is not rezoning the parcels, however, it is recommending that the Village consider the aforementioned options in relation to retail and perhaps a small boutique hotel.

Acting Chairwoman opened the public portion of the meeting.

Chairwoman of the Comprehensive Plan Committee, Kerry Cummings, asked for clarification about “striking out” single-family/residential recommendations from the report. Allowing for single-family/residential homes was part of the Committee’s discussions and recommendations and should be allowed to abut The Grove. The Committee was also concerned about new retail uses on small lots (specifically C & D). Ms. Cummings stated that if property that is *not* marked A-B-C-D would become available would it automatically revert to retail? Acting Chairwoman Dickson posited single-family/residential, by adding language such as “*if at all possible*”, a multi-property development adheres to the recommended guidelines discussed tonight.

Mr. Ed Breden of 1223 Milwaukee Avenue, stated that a developer has wanted to buy his property for the past twenty months. Mr. Braden stated that parcels C & D were built to be developed as retail and a decision is needed. Milwaukee Avenue is a retail street.

Mr. Jean Jodoin, developer of the Life Storage site at 1205 Milwaukee, stated that any Village is lucky to have this sort of development opportunity and he complimented the Village for the B-2 zoning decision. He has been quietly marketing his property as a medical office facility and he has had no interest whatsoever. While marrying C & D was discussed, it is not possible. Architectural review would be an important aspect of this development, especially when looking across the street at the fine architecture of the Abt site. Lastly, he thanked the Committee on all of their hard work on the plan.

Acting Chairwoman Dickson received a consensus to keep the single-family/residential recommendation along The Grove.

Acting Chairwoman Dickson closed the public hearing portion of the meeting in relation to Chapter 5.

Chapter 6: Transportation & Mobility

Village Staff provided background information with a two-page report to help the Plan Commission understand the designation of the roadway facilities, how public input was incorporated, and conditions of existing transit, bike and sidewalk infrastructure. The Plan Commission noted that the first three pages of the report (6.1-6.3) were very well written.

The designation of the Village’s roadways were noted (6.4-6.9) which actually mirror the designations of the roadway facilities that were included in the 2004 plan. Mr. Brady referenced Page 6.5 regarding collector streets Dewes and Harrison, that were going east and west and exhibiting different conditions than a typical local street, but are not the same as a major street such as Glenview Road. Washington and Overlook (which travels through the Village of Golf) were also noted as collector streets. Mr. Brady discussed roadway maintenance and ownership and noted that the most reported maintenance are potholes and snow plowing.

Commissioner Witt was troubled about Dewes and Harrison that by definition are collector roads, but no longer ‘feel’ like collector roads as noted in the 2004 report. It is a residential roadway with homes on both sides of the street. Perhaps verbiage needs to be included referencing *major collectors and minor collectors*. Mr. Brady referenced the map on page 6.5 and suggested the word ‘*collector*’ be removed in response to concerns about local streets (such as Dewes and Harrison). Perhaps the Plan Commission could add a sentence that explains that some of the local streets function as minor collectors for some neighborhoods. Commissioner Witt was concerned about the idea of possibly

widening all of the sidewalks on major collectors from eight feet to ten feet. She felt that widening the sidewalks could be a burden to some residents, but not on Lehigh or Chestnut.

Roadway uses have changed significantly since the 2004 report. Commissioner Iglecki agreed, stating that degrees of collector roads have changed. He asked about Greenwood (on the map on 6.5), which shows Greenwood as both a collector street as well as an arterial street. Mr. Brady noted the highly unusual situation in which Greenwood gets significant traffic south of East Lake Avenue and south of Glenview Road, so it changes in terms of ownership and receives a lot of traffic from vehicles getting off the toll way. Commissioner Iglecki felt Greenwood is a significant roadway and it was missing from the map and needs to be added. Perhaps a traffic circulation map and an ownership map be included that explained 'who owns what'. Some of the streets are controlled by IDOT, as referenced in the report, and perhaps this is the appropriate section to add the aforementioned clarifications and additions.

Transit (pages 6.10-6.11)

The rail network was explained and highlighted the Metra line and improvements made to the Amtrak line and some freight lines as well as the Village's bus networks. Commissioner Fallon inquired about Amtrak's Glenview plans. Mr. Brady explained the debated relocation of the two train stations in the downtown Glenview location and the North Glen station. There are issues regarding Americans with Disabilities Act (A.D.A) compliance and the physical location of the train stations being on the inbound and outbound side. Discussions are ongoing with Amtrak and one possibility is a tunnel, which seems impractical. Acting Chairwoman Dickson added that the Comprehensive Plan Committee did not indicate that this change was recommended. Mr. Brady agreed and added that the goal is reinforcing the support to move it to the Amtrak station at The Glen and working with the necessary outside agencies in discussions with Amtrak. Examples of such a tunnel were Ravinia and Lombard. Acting Chairwoman received confirmation from Mr. Brady that this potential solution was aimed at traffic and congestion issues at Glenview Road. The improvements being discussed are being required by Amtrak and the Village is working to mitigate the congestion issues that occur when the Amtrak train goes through the Village and all of the gates are down for 4+ minutes

Bike & Pedestrian Paths

Mr. Brady reviewed the identification of the bike and pedestrian paths, infrastructure improvements and mobility for all types of users. The goal is to encourage accessibility for all users and work was done in 2007 to include a walkability study as well as identification of potential opportunities and priorities as part of the Village's *Bike and Sidewalk Master Plan*. Commissioner Fallon noted that although the Village has a lot of very good trails, he felt walking/biking around town is difficult in relation to traffic. Mr. Brady replied that there are a few streets throughout the Village that have dedicated bike lanes and are shared with cars. *The Bike and Sidewalk Master Plan* identified this issue and the Village is working on several grants, one of which is to get better way finding and bike routes (i.e., chevrons painted on the street as a reminder to share the road with bicyclists), especially on Glenview Road. Some Village streets are too narrow to allow for a dedicated bicycle lane. Mr. Brady stated that Village Staff would review the Bike and Sidewalk Master Plan to look for any obvious recommendations that perhaps were not included in the Plan. Commissioner Iglecki asked if the information included in the Comprehensive Plan Committee recommendations were to be considered the primary or overriding document; Mr. Brady replied 'primary document'. Acting Chairwoman Dickson noted that the Comprehensive Plan Committee was not a regulating body, rather a Committee formed to make recommendations to the

Village. Village staff utilizes the *Bike and Sidewalk Master Plan* as a guidance tool on how to implement capital improvements through the village. When Village staff considers a recommendation to make an improvement, they utilize the Plan to analyze where the connection should be and also do an Engineering Report.

Traffic Committee/Access Management

Village staff is regularly asked questions about traffic calming and they utilize the three “E’s” (education, enforcement and engineering) in this order. The general public also inquires about stop signs, perceived speeding and speed bumps. The Village has investigated traffic calming options. Stop signs do not control speeding.

A speed bump pilot program was done in the Village (as requested by residents) and the outcome was that the residents wanted the speed bump removed. More enforcement might be necessary to change habits. Potential engineering changes might help mitigate traffic issues (i.e., medians that were installed on Colfax Avenue)

Also, cut through traffic is an issue in some areas. Access management is a major concern on the Village’s arterial roadways. Reduced curb cuts reduce conflicts, which reduces the number of accidents and improves safety.

* * * * *

Goals

Goal TM-1 (TM-1.1, TM-1.2, TM-1.3)

This goal relates to the Capital Improvement Program and focuses on areas that need major improvements. The Waukegan/West Lake intersection was used as an example as it is routinely congested. A street lighting plan was recommended, although it is very expensive, especially when matching the street aesthetics. IDOT, an outside agency was mentioned in relation to roadway improvements. Also, there are roadways in need of improvement that are controlled by IDOT, not the Village. Commissioner Iglecki asked if the Shermer and Willow intersection was shared with Northbrook. Mr. Brady replied that staff is working with the Village of Northbrook and the state to have improvements made to address the intersection’s traffic congestion.

Goal TM-2 & TM-3 (TM-2.1, TM-2.2, TM-2.3, TM-2.4, TM-2.5) & TM-3 (TM-3.1, TM-3.2 TM-3.3)

This goal relates to public transportation and trains’ impact on the Village. The Village is working with various transit authorities to improve the operations and the ability for transit throughout the Village. Village Staff is also working with other neighboring towns to investigate opportunities to help with the last mile (a reference term that indicates the easy access for commuters to access public transportation, but where the stops are at – via Amtrak or any of the Pace routes – commuters are still not to their final destination - what about the last mile to get home). Feasible long-term solutions are included (i.e., moving Amtrak stop to the North Glen).

A hot topic within the Village (which is on hold with IDOT and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation, in conjunction with the Federal Railway Administration) is the investigation of a plan to increase ridership by adding additional trips along the Amtrak line. To achieve this goal, there would need to be an expansion on the Union Pacific Line that is adjacent to some of the Village’s residential areas. The Village is not in support of this idea.

Goal TM-4 (TM-4.1, TM-4.2, TM-4.3, TM-4.4, TM-4.5, TM-4.6, TM-4.7)

These goals focus on the continuing efforts to ensure that the Village is a friendly environment for bicyclists. Some neighborhoods in the Village do not have sidewalks and there are very diverse opinions on this topic. From the Village's perspective, sidewalks are very expensive to install and/or enlarge. Some residents in the Avoca School area are requesting sidewalks and the existing Village Board policy of a 66% neighborhood vote on the topic will be followed.

Goal TM-5 (TM-5.1, TM-5.2, TM-5.3) & Goal TM-6 (TM-6.1, TM-6.2, TM-6.3)

This goal relates to the network of shared urban trails and paths, which are accessible, convenient, and connected to major destinations. Investigate potential bike share programs, such a Divy as well as a Glenview bike loop map. Goal six relates to better mobility (automobiles, public transit, bicycles, and pedestrians) and context sensitive infrastructure design.

Goal TM-7 (TM-7.1, TM-7.2, TM-7.3) & Goal TM-8 (TM-8.1, TM-8-2)

Goal seven revolves around effect of high traffic volume and speed. Goal eight speaks to the impact of several driveway access points and looks to increase the efficiency of arterial roadways.

Acting Chairwoman Dickson thanked Mr. Brady for the detailed explanation and opened the public portion of the meeting.

Representing his neighbors, Mr. Jeff Salmon, noted that over the years, four different votes had been taken about sidewalks in his neighborhood in East Glenview. Uniformly, neighbors have voted that they do not want sidewalks. Sidewalks would have a major effect in relation to lawns and easements and he asked that the Plan Commission respect the neighborhood's opinions. He felt that money would much better spent addressing the Village's flooding issues rather than sidewalks.

Ms. Lauren Gabizin stated that she is an avid bicyclist who frequently bikes in the Lake/Waukegan Road area and has been nearly hit four times near Plaza de Prado. She has biked in many cities and has never felt as unsafe as she does in Glenview. Ms. Gabizin believes that there is a mentality in Glenview that drivers do not anticipate bicyclists on the roadway. She felt that signage, better lanes and roadway symbols would help the situation.

While referencing 6.14, which show the minority of Glenview Road, Mr. Sam Gabizin asked if the Commissioners would consider stretching the bike path recommendations further east. Last week, a bicyclist was hit at Hubbard and Glenview Road resulting in a seriously fractured broken leg in several places, skull fracture and neck fracture. Glenview Road has a lot of cyclists that ride on Glenview Road up to Sheridan and Northwestern. Obviously, this aforementioned bike route takes cyclists out of Glenview, but anything that the Plan Commission could do to help along Glenview Road would be sincerely appreciated. Acting Chairwoman Dickson stated that the Village would be working with other municipalities on this topic.

Mr. Kent Fuller, who lives on Dewes and volunteered for many years on the Plan Commission and other bodies, complimented the Comprehensive Plan. He expressed concern about collector streets and noted that Dewes and Harrison were built as neighborhood streets and not for through traffic. Harrison is a local street, especially since there is a school; this area needs traffic calming and protection because it was designed for neighborhood traffic only. He asked that these streets be removed from the plan as

collector streets. Mr. Brady explained that Dewes and Harrison would be taken off the map (6.5). They were included as a carryover from 2004. Dewes, Harrison, and a portion of Pfingsten are in a different area. Portions of Greenwood Avenue are through residential areas. A few other streets function as minor collectors within the local section. There was a suggestion to elaborate on how some local streets function in a pseudo collector manner (local streets feed onto larger local streets and then feed into collector streets such as Landwehr, Lehigh, Sunset Ridge and Wagner). Mr. Brady stated that there are two types of different local streets. Acting Chairwoman Dickson noted that the Village Traffic Committee is always looking to help residents and she encouraged Dewes residents to speak directly to the Village. Mr. Brady noted that the police were doing selective enforcement at Dewes & Spruce this morning.

Mr. Brian Duff, a member of the Comprehensive Plan Committee, wanted to emphasize that a lot of resident feedback was about traffic problems throughout the Village. A clear way to address this issue is to look at other transportation means (i.e., bike, bus, public transportation, etc.). Mr. Duff agreed with Commissioner Iglesiaski's excellent recommendation to explore the Bicycle Master Plan further. He noted the bicycle loop suggestion in Section 5.3 and talked about a bicycle loop that takes riders through Stevens Point, WI and encourages riders to stop by the local retail area and clearly supports a healthy lifestyle.

* * * * *

Glenview's Green Infrastructure bike tour will occur on Sunday, August 28, 2016 at 1p.m. Glenview's Natural Resource Manager will be highlighting some of the circle tour of the infrastructure elements that encourage quality of life via biking. Twenty people have signed up and there is room available for more.

* * * * *

Acting Chairwoman Dickson closed public portion of the meeting.

MOTION: Motion to continue the case and public hearing to September 13th was made by Commissioner Fallon and seconded by Commissioner Witt.

YEAS: Commissioners Burton, Iglesiaski, Witt and Fallon

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

EXCERPT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 13, 2016 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING

P2016-034 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update (Public Hearing)

Chairman Bucklin noted that this was the third meeting to review the Comprehensive Plan. He complimented the Comprehensive Plan Committee on the comprehensive and well-written report.

Mr. Brady stated that the Plan Commission has reviewed Chapters 1,2, 5, and 6. Tonight's focus will be on Chapter 7 and the next Plan Commission will focus on Chapters 3 & 4 and wrapping up a final document that includes all of the proposed modifications to the plan. The Plan Commission will review all of the changes and finally submit to the Village Board of Trustees and adoption in approximately the October timeframe.

The updates include a summary of the August 23, 2016 Plan Commission comments and an overview of the items from Chapter 7 to be reviewed by the Commission on September 13.

Chapter 7

Mr. Brady stated that 7.1-7.3 are background of the Natural Resources section which includes information about the Committee and Commission that are responsible for reviewing not only the Natural Resources throughout the Village, but also reviewing any development areas that have a very high quality environmental status.

Commissioner Igleski asked about the first column on page 7.3, which discussed the eventual elimination of invasive species. Commissioner Igleski inquired about how realistic this goal is and what methods the Village proposes use to eliminate invasive species. Mr. Brady replied that it is a very long-term goal. A successful example is the progress made at The Grove. The Grove has staff and volunteers that maintain the site and specifically target the buckthorn growth because it shuts out light on low growing vegetation. Mr. Brady relayed that invasive species are an unfortunate and common issue throughout Glenview. Commissioner Igleski noted that sentence at the end of the last paragraph is missing. The comment was noted and will amended.

7.4-7.6 - Watersheds

Mr. Brady stated that there are three watersheds to which various portions of the Village drain. Staff has received several comments related to the naming conventions that have been used for the watersheds within the Comprehensive Plan ("The Plan"). The official names of the watersheds are listed in the Plan, however common names have been listed in the report 1) North Branch Chicago watershed, 2) Chicago Calumet sub-watershed 3) Chicago Calumet watershed. The watersheds naming is confusing and the Comprehensive Plan Committee called for the correct nomenclature that is used today. Mr. Brady confirmed this will be clarified in the final document.

Lake Glenview functions as a stormwater retention basin, but should be referred to as an environmental feature. The Plan Commission noted that in several locations, environmentally significant area was inadvertently changed to environmental service area. Village Staff will correct this error.

Referencing 7.1, Commissioner Fallon stated that he found it hard to understand and asked for clarification on several watersheds vs. sub-watersheds. Ms. Judy Beck, a member of the Comprehensive Plan Committee in the audience, agreed that it was very confusing. Running in the Village, are the Des Plaines watersheds and two sub-watersheds; Ms. Beck added that she has received many calls about this confusion. The Committee recommended both a depiction in a graphic format and language so that people can have a clearer understanding. Mr. Brady noted that Village Staff will work with people who understand the watershed system and the nomenclature and utilize best practices. An exhibit that features a larger map with arrows pointing in the correct flow direction will be added to the report, which will include common and simple language. Ms. Beck offered to work with Village Staff on this recommendation.

Referencing 7.5, Commissioner Iglesias spoke to years old discussion regarding Lake Glenview and the possibility of having non-motorized boating. Mr. Brady stated that there is an ongoing discussion between the Village and the Park District regarding this matter. Chairman Bucklin felt verbiage should be included that states that non-motorized boating may be permitted at a future time.

Commissioner Fallon pointed out a typo on page 7.5, 4th line. Village Staff will make the change.

7.7-7.9 – Glenview Natural Resources

The Comprehensive Plan Committee noted the numerous natural areas, both active and passive, within Glenview, however, a question was raised on how to list all of these areas. A suggestion was to lump them all together in two significantly different areas.

A minor modification that was discussed before this meeting was to properly identify that all of Flick Park was originally part of the Synnestvedt Arboretum nursery.

Commissioner Iglesias made note that it would be helpful if a map were included in the report that indicates where certain areas are located; Commissioner Fallon agreed. This map could possibly be shown on page 7.7. Commissioner Iglesias felt it may be appropriate to add a map which shows all of the natural areas.

Goals

Mr. Brady stated that each goal is and followed by action items.

Goal NR-1

Glenview is well landscaped and shall continue to use native species where appropriate.

Commissioner Iglesias used the City of Evanston as an example of natural landscaping, noting that he has seen a home that has very dense natural landscaping, however, all of the surrounding homes are landscaped in a more traditional manner. Commissioner Iglesias went on to inquire about the Village's long-term plan for use of native landscaping. Commissioner Iglesias asked specifically if the materials are proposed for use in parkway planting plans. Mr. Brady clarified that the goal intends to only permit or require native landscaping materials where it is appropriate and fits with the character of a particular development or neighborhood. Through the years, areas have been developed and these natural native landscaping has gone away. Based on our climate, however, many of these native species are coming into vogue again vs. formal landscaping. Mr. Brady stated that IDOT is moving toward more natural settings (i.e., 'no-mow' grass that is more native to our area, needs less attention and less water).

Chairman Bucklin added that for many years, the Village has maintained a ‘country style feel’ as evidenced by no sidewalks in some area and streetlights. Some landscaping looks good only in the summer but looks poorly in the winter. Salt on the roads can also negatively affect native plantings. Chairman Bucklin added that the goal should aim to be ‘practical’, because this could easily become an issue with residents.

In relation to 1.3, Ms. Kerry Cummings, chair of the Comprehensive Plan Committee, noted that this goal and action items are being misinterpreted. The Committee wanted it to reflect the Village maintained parkways versus residentially owned and maintained parkways. Chairman Bucklin added that his home abuts a golf course and natural native species were planted on the golf course; several neighbors didn’t like the appearance because they thought it looked unkempt; the Park District responded by cutting a swath along the fence line.

Goal NR-2

Natural resources and open space are considered at all levels of government.

As part of the Environmental Significant Area Ordinance, the Village would continue to evaluate environmentally sensitive areas in regards to conservation, preservation, open spaces and green infrastructure. The Plan Commission had not comments on this Goal.

Goal NR-3

Natural resources and open space is considered in all public and private projects.

Mr. Brady stated that the focus of this goal was identifying opportunities to introduce open space preservation when and where it makes sense in future developments. Examples include Habitat Restoration, floodway buy-out properties, eliminating invasive spaces, etc. The goal also aimed to foster partnerships with public and private properties owners to encourage natural resource projects. The Plan Commission had not comments on this Goal.

Goal NR-4

Lake Glenview and Gallery Park are well managed and maintained.

Mr. Brady stated that both active and passive verbiage was included to avoid any confusion about the intention of the goal and which parts of the park it should apply towards. Commissioner Igleski asked about the second sentence in 4.1. which deals with the ownership of Lake Glenview. Commissioner Igleski inquired about reasons why the Village would want to surrender control of Lake Glenview. Mr. Brady noted that the Village is not typically involved with the maintenance of the various parks, however the Park District is. Mr. Brady noted that this is a complicated issue due to ownership, existing agreements, etc. The Village and the Park District have a strong agreement on how the Park District maintains Gallery Park and how the Village ownership of Lake Glenview relates to the larger park maintenance issues. The Village has maintained ownership due to its role in storm water detention.

Goal NR-5

West Fork, Techny Basin area and Lot 16 have been improved and are attractive sites for the Village

Mr. Brady clarified that the intention of this goal is to ensure that a natural area maintain their natural characteristics. Examples included reducing the riverbank slopes that are eroding by stabilizing the surrounding area. Another example of such an area is to ensure that the Techny Basin area retains its native species and invasive species are controlled.

Goal NR-6

The Village works in partnership with public and private property owners to improve natural resources and open space.

Mr. Brady shared the following examples of such partnerships:

- Working with Loyola Academy on joint use of a pedestrian path that runs near the North Navy Ditch, which is adjacent to the ball field.
- Extending the path along the river, which is adjacent to a church and Valley Lo Condominiums near Tanglewood Road.

Chairman Bucklin inquired about the proposed partnerships; Chairman Bucklin suggested that the goal include partnerships with other communities as well. The example used by Chairman Bucklin was Glenview’s waterways, which come in and out from various communities. Mr. Brady agreed that surrounding communities should be mentioned.

Chairman Bucklin opened the public portion of the hearing. No one spoke, but he left the public portion of the hearing open and continued to September 27th. Chairman Bucklin complimented the Comprehensive Plan Committee for doing such a fine job on their report.

MOTION: Commissioner Burton stated that the Plan Commission has completed review of Chapter 7, provided comments on the contents to staff and heard any public testimony relating to the chapter. The case and public hearing shall be continued to the Plan Commission meeting scheduled for Tuesday, September 27, 2016 to allow for additional review of the draft Comprehensive Plan.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Iglesias.

YEAS:	Commissioners Iglesias, Burton, and Fallon
NAYS:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

EXCERPT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 27, 2016 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING

P2016-034 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update (Public Hearing)

Mr. Brady summarized the materials submitted to the Plan Commission for review, which included the draft Comprehensive Plan update, a staff report and various background documents.

Chapter 3:

Mr. Brady summarized that Chapter 3 focused on the major components of neighborhoods within the Village, the background of subdivisions within the Village, and the characteristics of healthy residential neighborhoods including an affordable housing plan.

Pages 3.1-3.3

Mr. Brady explained that these pages focused on the introductory and background material relating to neighborhoods. There were no comments made regarding pages 3.1-3.3 of Chapter 3.

Pages 3.4-3.5

Mr. Brady explained that these pages focused on the history of the Village's various subdivisions and their unique character. There were no comments made regarding pages 3.4 - 3.5 of Chapter 3.

Pages 3.6-3.7

Mr. Brady explained that these pages provided information and background on the various school districts and schools that serve the Village. Mr. Brady noted that staff often receives comments on how confusing the boundaries are for the various secondary and elementary districts. This section provides descriptions of each along with a map.

The following comments were made regarding pages 3.6-3.7 of Chapter 3:

- Acting Chair Dickson inquired about the possibility of including school names on the map. Staff would add these names.
- Commissioner Iglleski identified some readability issues on the map and asked that staff look into ways to make the street names more easily identifiable.

Pages 3.8-3.11

Mr. Brady explained that these pages focused on community resources within the Village and includes the affordable housing plan, which was passed by the Village Board in response to a county-wide ordinance. This section also identified active recreation areas operated by the Glenview Park District such as the Ice Center and aquatic centers. This section also highlights the Village's historic landmarks.

The following comments were made regarding pages 3.8-3.11 of Chapter 3:

- Acting Chair Dickson felt the photo of the Junge Residence should be swapped for a picture of the front of the home.
- Commissioner Fallon noted that the section on Glenbrook Hospital could be re-worded to better reflect the role of the hospital as an employer.

Mr. Brady noted that the goals in this chapter were wide-ranging, but essentially related to the desire to preserve the high-quality housing and neighborhoods within the Village.

Goal NH-1

Glenview shall continue to maintain, preserve and enhance the quality of Glenview’s neighborhoods.

Mr. Brady noted that the goals in this chapter were wide-ranging, but essentially related to the desire to preserve the high-quality housing and neighborhoods within the Village. The Plan Commission offered no comments on Goal NH-1.

Goal NH-2

Glenview should encourage the public and private preservation of historic and / or significant buildings and sites.

Mr. Brady explained that this goal dealt with the ongoing preservation efforts of the Historic Preservation Commission.

The following comments were made regarding Goal NH-2:

- Acting Chair Dickson suggested that changes be made to identify more clearly that the Park District has their own historic sites and governing body for such sites.
- Commissioner Ileski felt the wording of the goals did not clearly identify that these preservation efforts extended beyond public buildings and were also available for private residences. An improved goal was created which included mention of educational opportunities by staff and the Commissioners through discussion.

Goal NH-3

The Village of Glenview shall continue to provide a balanced mix of housing types that promotes a healthy sense of community.

Mr. Brady explained that this goal discussed the progress and intentions of the affordable housing plan. This goal also aims to preserve the variety of building and product types within the Village. This goal also highlights standards for senior living developments within the Village.

The following comments were made regarding Goal NH-3:

- Commissioner Fallon inquired about what steps are being taken currently to monitor progress as it relates to the affordable housing plan. Mr. Brady explained the calculations used to determine the required amount of affordable housing in a community and how these factors relate to Glenview. These calculations are monitored as new housing units are added through the development review process.
- Mr. Brady also specified how developers can include affordable units in residential developments.

Acting Chair Dickson opened the meeting to public comment for Chapter 3.

Ms. Judy Beck, a member of the Comprehensive Plan Committee, made several comments regarding additions to the resource sections of this chapter.

Margaret Sents, of 2000 Valley Lo Lane, inquired about the requirements for affordable housing. Mr. Brady explained that there is no designated area for affordable housing or requirement on number of units. Ms. Sents felt this put the Village in danger of falling below the threshold required by the state and was dangerous for the Village financially, since it may reduce eligibility for matching funds. Mr. Brady explained that having the affordable housing plan fulfilled the State of Illinois’ requirements.

No other members of the public spoke regarding chapter 3.

Chapter 4:

Mr. Brady summarized that Chapter 4 focused on land uses within the Village.

Pages 4.1-4.2

Mr. Brady explained that these pages focused on the introductory and background material relating to land uses. There were no comments made regarding pages 4.1-4.2 of Chapter 4.

Pages 4.3-4.5

Mr. Brady explained that these pages focused the existing land uses within the Village. Mr. Brady explained that there was an existing land use map and summary, which is based off a survey completed by the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning. The categories used in the map do not reflect the Village's zoning districts exactly. These figures are used to provide context for the discrepancies between zoning district and actual use.

The following comments were made regarding pages 4.3-4.5:

- Commissioner Fallon identified several areas where categories or land uses may have been double-counted, such as parks/open space. Staff will correct any double-counted categories.

Pages 4.6-4.9

Mr. Brady explained that these pages dealt with future land uses. The Comprehensive Plan Committee evaluated the zoning code and existing uses. Following this evaluation, new land use categories were assigned. Most of the categories dealt with the density of the particular use. Mr. Brady explained that this followed the Village's zoning map more closely. Mr. Brady asked that the Plan Commission provide feedback on the need for a future land use map since it so closely reflects the current zoning. Also, Mr. Brady also asked the Plan Commission to clarify if the redevelopment areas highlighted in Chapter 5 should be added to the map.

The following comments were made regarding pages 4.6-4.9:

- Acting Chair Dickson pointed out some of the discrepancies in the titles of the various maps. Staff explained that they were trying to describe the characteristics shown in the graphic, but could be reworded.
- A discussion ensued regarding the best way to relate the future land uses map to the existing conditions. The maps and titles of the maps were confusing and the use for them was unclear. Staff proposed to work on the titles and figures to make the intentions of each more clear.
- Commissioner Iglleski inquired about the lack of unincorporated areas on any land use map. Mr. Brady provided background as to why unincorporated areas were not included in this Comprehensive Plan Update. Mr. Brady cited the examples of the other neighborhoods in unincorporated areas which have infrastructure issues that make annexation into the Village burdensome. Direction from the Village Board made it clear to staff that annexations should only be considered if infrastructure was brought up to the Village's standards.

Goal LU-1

Significant natural, historic, cultural sites and resources are protected from encroachment of non-compatible land uses.

Mr. Brady explained that this goal dealt with the preservation of Glenview’s important cultural and historic sites from impacts of adjacent high-intensity uses. This goal also dealt with ways to mitigate impacts of other redevelopments adjacent to sensitive uses.

The following comments were made regarding Goal LU-1:

- Acting Chair Dickson suggested several changes to the verbiage within the subgoals to be consistent with discussions at the Comprehensive Plan Committee, including altering language relating to how adjacent redevelopments may relate to sensitive uses. Discussion ensued among the commissioners regarding how to word the goal to require adjacent redevelopments to relate respectfully to the sensitive sites.

Goal LU-2

Development is guided by sound growth management strategies and development review practices.

Mr. Brady explained that this goal highlights best practices for development review and what the Village should consider during those reviews. The goal also dealt with specific land uses such as senior housing.

The following comments were made regarding Goal LU-2:

- Commissioner Witt suggested requirements for an environmental impact study be included for applicable developments.
- Acting Chair Dickson suggested the phrase “development pressure” be simplified for easier understanding by members of the public outside of the development industry.
- Commissioner Iglesias asked if any of these goals had language that conflicts with Village ordinances. Mr. Brady amended the language in goals with requirements from “shall” to “should”.

Goal LU-3

Glenview’s light industrial land uses match the character of Glenview while providing workspace for businesses servicing the local community.

Mr. Brady explained that this goal’s intention is to reinforce the idea that heavy industrial uses are not preferred, but many service based uses in industrial districts are encouraged. This goal also had a recommendation to investigate opportunities to create a new zoning category for light industrial uses that allow for flexible uses. The Plan Commission agreed that the investigation of such a zoning category was well-founded. There were no further comments from the Plan Commission on this goal.

Goal LU-4

New development shall conform to any applicable overlay plan, including, but not limited to: the Milwaukee Avenue Corridor Plan, the Waukegan Road Corridor Plan, the Downtown Revitalization Plan, The Glen Master Plan and Design Guidelines, the Bike and Sidewalk Master Plan, and the Plan for Nature.

Mr. Brady explained that this goal incorporates all the existing studies and plans that are used to regulate various aspects of development in the Village. There were not comments from the Plan Commission.

Acting Chair Dickson opened the public hearing regarding chapter 4.

Ms. Judy Beck, a Comprehensive Plan Committee member, recommended that the Illinois Nature Preserve System also be added to the resources in the chapter.

Ms. Kerry Cummings, chair of the Comprehensive Plan Committee, asked the Plan Commission to clarify their intentions for the land use plans. Mr. Brady clarified that the maps would be titled in a more effective manner. Ms. Cummings also mentioned several areas where the Comprehensive Plan Committee also felt the land use categories generated by CMAP were confusing and should be evaluated further.

Mr. John Hedrick, a former Comprehensive Plan Committee member, voiced his support for the Comprehensive Plan update. Mr. Hedrick was also pleased to see the Appearance Code included in the goals. Mr. Hedrick also questioned the current location of the language relating to the high quality architecture. Mr. Brady summarized the changes to certain goals and the location of mentions of the Appearance Commission. Further discussion ensued about proper locations for discussion of architectural quality and the Appearance Commission within the goals. Staff would work on some rewording to include these topics.

Acting Chair Dickson then closed the public hearing for chapter 4.

The Plan Commission had no further comments. Mr. Brady summarized the next steps for the Plan Commission review. The revised chapters will be brought back to the Plan Commission at the October 25, 2016 meeting.

Commissioner Witt moved that case P2016-034, the Comprehensive Plan Update, and the public hearing be continued to the October 25, 2016 Plan Commission meeting. Commissioner Iglesias seconded the motion.

YEAS:	Commissioners Witt, Iglesias, and Fallon
NAYS:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

EXCERPT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 25, 2016 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING

P2016-034 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update (Public Hearing)

Chairman Bucklin explained that the Comprehensive Plan update has been brought forward for Plan Commission review by the Comprehensive Plan Committee which spent the last year creating and drafting the plan. The update to the Comprehensive Plan is meant to act as a roadmap for development in the coming decades for the Village. Chairman Bucklin also asked that following a summary from staff, the Plan Commission consider recommending adoption of the Plan to the Village Board.

Mr. Brady summarized the materials submitted to the Plan Commission for review, which included the draft Comprehensive Plan update, a staff report and various background documents. Mr. Brady went on to explain the process by which the Plan Commission comments were included in the revised document. Staff prepared marked changes to the Plan within the document and also submitted an updated copy of the edited document.

Commissioner Igleski asked if the Comprehensive Plan Committee reconvened or re-reviewed the changes made to the Plan by the Plan Commission. Mr. Brady explained that the draft was not sent back to the Comprehensive Plan Committee. The Comprehensive Plan Committee had forwarded a recommendation to the Plan Commission who is then charged with reviewing and recommending the document to the Board of Trustees who ultimately adopt the Comprehensive Plan.

Chairman Bucklin commended the Plan Commissioners, the Comprehensive Plan Committee, and staff on the depth of the review of the proposed Plan.

Chairman Bucklin opened the public hearing. No members of the public spoke. Chairman Bucklin closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Witt stated that following the Plan Commission's review of the chapters within the draft Village of Glenview Comprehensive Plan over the course of commission meetings and public hearings on August 9, 2016, August 23, 2016, September 13, 2016, September 27, 2016, and October 25, 2016, the Plan Commission recommends the Village Board of Trustees adopt the Comprehensive Plan as presented on October 25, 2016 and including the noted revisions from the of the October 25, 2016 meeting.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Burton.

YEAS:	Commissioners Burton, Fallon, Igleski and Witt
NAYS:	None
ABSTAIN:	None