



VILLAGE OF GLENCOE

675 Village Court, Glencoe, Illinois 60022
p: (847) 835-4114 | info@villageofglencoe.org | Follow Us: @VGlencoe

www.villageofglencoe.org

Virtual Meeting Information

The June 22, 2022 Plan Commission meeting will be held virtually via telephone and videoconference (individuals may participate either by telephone or by video conference) pursuant to Governor Pritzker's ongoing Executive Order. In addition, at least one representative from the Village will be present at Village Hall in compliance with Section 7(e) of the Open Meetings Act.

Individuals may call the following to participate in the meeting:

By Telephone:

Phone Number: 1 (312) 626-6799
Webinar ID: 836 6399 7153

By Zoom Video Conference:

Zoom video conference link: [Click here](#)

Video conference participants using a computer will be prompted to install the Zoom client; participants using smart phones or tablets must download the Zoom app from their app store.

Public Comment Submittal Options

Option 1: Submit Comments by E-Mail Prior to Meeting

Public comments can be submitted in advance of the meeting by e-mail to glencoemeeting@villageofglencoe.org. Public comments received by 6:00 p.m. or one hour before the start of the meeting on the day of the meeting will be read during the meeting under Public Comment. Any comments received during the meeting may be read at the end of the meeting. All e-mails received will be acknowledged.

Public comment is limited to 400 words or less. E-mailed public comments should contain the following:

- The Subject Line of the e-mail should include the following text: "June 22nd Plan Commission Meeting Public Comment"
- Name of person submitting comment (address can be provided, but is not required)
- Organization or agency person is submitting comments on behalf of, if applicable
- Topic or agenda item number of interest, or indicate if the public comment is on a matter not listed on the Commission meeting agenda

Option 2: Submit Comments by Phone Prior to Meeting

Individuals without access to e-mail may submit their comments through a voice message by calling (847) 461-1100. Verbal public comments will be read aloud during the meeting and will be limited to three minutes.



**AGENDA
VILLAGE OF GLENCOE
PLAN COMMISSION**

Virtual Meeting
Wednesday, June 22, 2022 – 7:00 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

*Bruce Huvad, Chairman, Public-at-Large Representative
Gail Lissner, Vice Chair, Village Board Representative
Marc Gale, School District 35 Representative
Georgia Mihalopoulos, Public-at-Large Representative
Scott Novack, Zoning Board of Appeals Representative
Michael Pope, Glencoe Public Library Representative
Carol Spain, Glencoe Park District Representative
James Thompson, Public-at-Large Representative
Greg Turner, Public-at-Large Representative
Peter Van Vechten, Historic Preservation Commission Representative*

2. CONSIDERATION OF THE APRIL 27, 2022 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Individuals interested in addressing the Plan Commission on non-agenda items may do so during this time.

4. INTRODUCTORY DISCUSSION OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN PROCESS

5. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

6. ADJOURN

The Village of Glencoe is subject to the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Individuals with disabilities who plan to attend this meeting and who require certain accommodations in order to allow them to observe and/or participate in this meeting, or who have questions regarding the accessibility of the meeting or the facilities, are requested to contact the Village of Glencoe at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting at (847) 835-4114, or the Illinois Relay Center at (800) 526-0844, to allow the Village of Glencoe to make reasonable accommodations for those persons.



**MINUTES
VILLAGE OF GLENCOE
PLAN COMMISSION**

Virtual Meeting
Wednesday, April 27, 2022 – 7:00 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The April 27, 2022 meeting of the Plan Commission of the Village of Glencoe, Cook County was called to order virtually at 7:00 p.m. Chairman Huvad provided the legal basis for holding a virtual meeting.

The following Commissioners were in attendance:

Bruce Huvad, Chairman, Public-at-Large Representative
Gail Lissner, Vice Chair, Village Board Representative
Lisa Brooks, Park District Representative
Marc Gale, School District 35 Representative
Georgia Mihalopoulos, Public-at-Large Representative
Michael Pope, Glencoe Public Library Representative
Scott Novack, Zoning Board of Appeals Representative
Peter Van Vechten, Historic Preservation Commission Representative

The following Commissioners were not in attendance:

James Thompson, Public-at-Large Representative
Greg Turner, Public-at-Large Representative

The following Village staff were also in attendance:

Taylor Baxter, Development Services Manager
Lee Brown, Village Planner
Dave Mau, Public Works Director

2. CONSIDER THE FEBRUARY 23, 2022 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Commissioner Lissner made a correction to the minutes, changing one word on Page 6, paragraph 4, line 4, from tress to trees.

Commissioner Lissner made a motion to approve the February 23, 2022 Plan Commission Meeting Minutes, as amended. Commissioner Brooks seconded the motion.

RESULT:	ACCEPTED
AYES:	Brooks, Gale, Lissner, Mihalopoulos, Van Vechten (5)
NAYS:	None (0)
ABSTAIN:	Huvad, Novack, Pope (3)
ABSENT:	Thompson, Turner (2)

3. CONSIDERATION OF A PROPOSED PRELIMINARY PLAT OF SUBDIVISION AND ASSOCIATED VARIATIONS FROM THE SUBDIVISION CODE FOR FRONT LOT LINE LENGTH, LOT AREA, AND LOT WIDTH AT 538 GREEN BAY ROAD

Taylor Baxter provided background information. Currently, the property is 26,400 sq. ft, zoned RC which is single-family residential-only, and can be redeveloped with one single-family home. The applicant indicated that it has agreed to convey the northernmost 6,400 sq. ft. of the lot (a 40-ft. wide strip) to the owner immediately to the north, leaving the applicant's parcel with 40,000 sq. ft. This conveyance is an exchange between adjoining owners and is not subject to the subdivision ordinance.

The proposal is to subdivide the remaining property into two new lots, each of 20,000sf, to replace the existing single-family home with two new single-family homes. The property is situated south of Hawthorne Avenue and north of South Avenue and is unusual in that it has access from Green Bay Road but there is no street frontage on Green Bay Road: Instead, it has access to Green Bay Road through a 20- foot-wide easement over Park District property, which also borders the property on the south.

Commissioner Pope asked that assuming that the purpose of the buffer area is to make this proposal more palatable to the Village, why is it necessary that this buffer be owned by the property to the north? Mr. Baxter said it is not something that the Village requested so it is not necessarily more palatable to the Village, and that the applicant would be better able to explain the reason.

Chairman Huvad commented that the Plan Commission is being asked to review the subdivision as if the conveyance has already occurred. Commissioners are looking at the proposal as a two-lot subdivision and the configuration that has been proposed, and this is the working assumption right now.

Referring to the proposed subdivision plat, Mr. Baxter explained that the access easement to Green Bay Road does not meet in the middle of the two proposed lots and, therefore, a secondary access easement over proposed lot 1 to reach proposed lot 2 is needed. The need for this secondary easement, as currently proposed, is what necessitates two out of the three variations that are being requested.

In addition, Mr. Baxter explained that due to lack of frontage on Green Bay Road, there is no front lot line on this property and the Village Board has the ability to set front setbacks in this case as it determines what is appropriate and will consider a recommendation from the Plan Commission.

Continuing on, Mr. Baxter advised that three variations are requested to address (1) lack of frontage on Green Bay Road, (2) insufficient minimum lot area and (3) insufficient average lot width.

The first variation stems from the historical existence of the access easement over Park District land after an earlier owner gifted property to the Park District and retained the easement.

The second and third variations stem from how lot area and average lot width must be calculated given the existence of the secondary access easement over proposed lot 1. This additional access easement causes proposed lot 1 to fail in two respects: the lot size is 9,477.7 sq. ft. (instead of 10,000 sq. ft) and the average lot width is 59.23 feet instead of 60 ft.

Commissioner Van Vechten said that the new access easement is only for vehicle and pedestrian access and he asked if it included or excluded utility easements. Mr. Baxter said that utility easements have no bearing on the lot size and this easement is just for ingress and egress.

Regarding public utilities, Mr. Baxter advised that the sanitary sewer is proposed through the easement of properties to the north, water is currently served by a line through the Park District property and there is no current connection for a storm sewer. Because this is the preliminary plat, he said the applicant would need to secure adequate utility access per the subdivision code, before the final plat is approved. Also, because there is no front lot line, the Village Board has the ability to determine the appropriate setback. The preliminary plat comments show a 30-foot front setback which is the minimum in the RC District, and staff is of the opinion that the proposal meets the standards of the subdivision code. In addition, this is a unique property with physical hardships which may justify granting the variations and a reduction of the front setback less than 30 feet.

Chairman Huvad shared a couple of observations. He said there is a letter in the file which referred to the easement between the property and the Park District, and he felt it is not really germane to the discussion tonight. He noted that the current ingress/egress to Green Bay Road has been there for a long time. He felt the main issue is that the variations are needed because of the way that access occurs to the second lot, and without the need to create that path to the second lot, the Commission would not be talking about the three variations. Chairman Huvad said that two of the variations are asking the Commission to ignore zoning standards – minimum area and average width – and these were caused because of the conveyance of the 40-foot buffer. He said he would like to explore ways of dividing the two lots, preserving the 40 foot buffer, but doing so in a way that did not require the Plan Commission to recommend variations.

The applicant Peter Cummins reported that he has spent the last six months working with the neighbors and trying to come up with a plan that meets their needs and the hardship of the property owner, as well as trying to come up with something that was acceptable to the neighborhood. He felt that the lack of public comments tonight indicate that they have done their job. As relates to the sale of the 40 feet to the north, Mr. Cummins said that they tried to maintain a separation and the way to provide stewardship for that property was to attach it to the second property. He emphasized that they cannot relocate the easement that has been there since 1924.

Mr. Baxter displayed a sketch that was prepared by Commissioner Van Vechten. Commissioner Van Vechten explained the three parts of the sketch and said the first diagram was the plan that was submitted, Alternate Option 1 was the second diagram, and Alternate Option 2 was the third diagram. He said the two alternate options would solve the two variation requests for lot size and average lot width. Further, he said that Lot #1 is not at 10,000 sq. ft., and this was created by the applicant. It could have been solved by making the buffer 37.5 ft. wide and that would allow Lot #1 to be 10,000 sq. ft. When the buffer is left at 40 feet wide, he personally has an issue with not designing it to the zoning code because it is a self-inflicted problem. Commissioner Van Vechten commented that these two suggestions are options to fix the problems.

Chairman Huvad explained that they are using a rarely used process in the subdivision code which is to consider allowing lots that do not meet the minimum area and average width requirement, and they are doing this when the problem could be avoided. He asked Mr. Cummins if either of the new options prepared by Commissioner Van Vechten might be worth pursuing.

Mr. Cummins said he can work with Alternate Option 1. He noted that one of the commitments they made to the neighbors was to bring the house on Lot #1 as forward as possible. Commissioner Van Vechten said that the lot width on the east side for Option 1 and Option 2 is identical and they are also identical on the west side. He noted that on the east side of Lot 1, the lot width is 36.39 feet.

Chairman Huvad asked staff to confirm that, as currently presented, the proposal is asking for a front yard setback of 30 feet.

Commissioner Novack asked what the depth of the Park District lot was, and Mr. Baxter said it is 80 feet. Commissioner Novack then assumed that a 30-foot setback for this proposal would be a 110-foot setback from Green Bay Road and Mr. Baxter answered yes, that is correct. Mr. Cummins stated that he had no concerns with the setback being proposed and said the neighbors would rather see the homes further toward Green Bay Road, and he noted that the house would have a side-loading garage facing south.

Commissioner Brooks said that it was interesting that the Park District was brought into the conversation now because they are the primary neighbor and haven't been part of any of these discussions. She said she didn't know how the Park District would feel about bringing the house closer than 30 feet, but she was guessing they would not think this was a good idea. She reminded everyone that they retain this Park District land for public use. She asked Commissioners to consider that the setback should be used to maintain distance from the Park District property rather than Green Bay Road.

Lee Brown, Village Planner, said that the usual practice of referring to an average setback would not be helpful in this case because continuity across a block doesn't exist here, and the majority of the block is open space.

Commissioner Mihalopoulos asked if the setbacks were the same for Lot 1 and Lot 2. Mr. Baxter said the Village Board could possibly require different setbacks on both lots. She asked for an explanation of why the applicant wanted the setbacks as shown. Mr. Cummins answered that this is driven by the unique and architecturally significant home at 550 Green Bay Road that has a wall of windows that faces southwest. With the proposed setback, he said they would preserve the view and light of that house, and then the other house on the south lot could be pulled back.

Commissioner Gale commented that if the applicant reduced the size of the buffer and moved that square footage to lot 1, all the irregularities would go away and all conditions would be met. He asked how they arrived at the 40 square feet for the buffer. Mr. Cummins said they were working with round numbers and trying to preserve lot size and width and did not know they would have this problem when they sold the 40 feet.

Commissioner Lissner said each Alternate Option could be problematic. She was concerned with what it is going to look like as far as options for landscaping and fencing and did not think irregular lots was the way to go because it was adding to the challenges of having a good subdivision.

Commissioner Novack echoed Commissioner Lissner's sentiments and added another perspective. He felt there are times when it makes sense to grant variations, and this may be one of those times. He explained that his comfort level with the variations far exceeds his comfort level of approving the irregular lots which will present problems right from the beginning, especially with fencing.

Commissioner Van Vechten reported that there are many lots in the Village that do not meet the current zoning, but these lots were laid out before the zoning code was created in 1921 and it was amended every decade. He pointed out that the most recent subdivisions tend to meet the current zoning code and he did not agree that it is okay to grant a variation through a subdivision. He said this proposed project started with a blank piece of paper and all the decisions made along the way were for different reasons, but they could have designed around this particular issue. He recommended reducing the 40-foot buffer by 3.5 feet to add to Lot 1 so there could be a cleaner boundary, but if that is not possible, he showed options to use to still meet the zoning criteria. Commissioner Van Vechten pointed out that the bottom line is that this is a preliminary plat application and the Plan Commission is being asked for opinions.

Mr. Brown advised that a variation to the Subdivision Ordinance under our village code is not constrained in the same manner as a Zoning Board variation.

Mr. Baxter asked Mr. Brown his opinion about voting on a plat conditional to certain changes as opposed to asking the applicant to bring back a revised plat to meet changes. Mr. Lee said technically the Plan Commission can approve a subdivision that meets all the standards and has no variations, and the changes based on these conditions could be done before it goes to the Village Board.

Mr. Cummins said he would be most appreciative of that because they have spent months in this process, and the issue arose three weeks ago about the access over the north lot creating the need for these variations.

Mr. Baxter reported that he received one written comment from Patrick Kaniff, 340 Hawthorne, who stated he was in favor of the proposal.

Commissioner Novack stated that he believed the best solution would be to move the easement and asked if there is any zoning district where a 36-foot width on the front lot line is within code. Mr. Baxter said that the minimum front lot line in any zoning district is 20 feet, and in an RC District the minimum average lot width is 60 feet.

Commissioner Mihalopoulos asked if there was any configuration of the 400 feet that could be adjusted to get rid of one of the variations. Mr. Baxter said that even if the easement is one square foot, it would still cause the lot area variation. The lot width variation could be avoided if it was reduced in size, and they would want to see at least an 8-foot-wide driveway going to the second lot.

Commissioner Van Vechten referred to the diagrams and said the lot line between Option 1 and Option 2 is in the exact same location as submitted, and the applicant can do something different as long as the lots are 10,000 sq. ft. He said the diagram shows the concept of equalizing the area by taking one and giving to the other. He added that he felt the best move would be to reduce the 40-foot buffer by 3 feet.

Chairman Huvad asked Mr. Cummins if the proposal to convey the 40 feet is under a binding contract. Mr. Cummins said it is a binding contract that is not contingent to the subdivision.

After more discussion of various motions, Commissioner Pope made a motion to recommend approval of the application as presented and recommend approval of the three variations for frontage, lot area requirement and lot width requirement, as part of the application. Commissioner Novack seconded the motion.

RESULT:	ACCEPTED
AYES:	Brooks, Gale, Lissner, Mihalopoulos, Novack, Pope (6)
NAYS:	Huvar, Van Vechten (2)
ABSTAIN:	None (0)
ABSENT:	Thompson, Turner (2)

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no comments.

5. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Commissioner Novack reported that the Zoning Commission recently considered a code amendment dealing with corner and through lots and would see a related variation in the near future. Chairman Huvar reported that review of the Comprehensive Plan will be starting soon and the Commission will be having some lively discussions.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Following a motion by Commissioner Gale and a second by Commissioner Lissner, the meeting was adjourned at 8:44 p.m.

RESULT:	ACCEPTED
AYES:	Brooks, Gale, Huvar, Lissner, Mihalopoulos, Novack, Pope, Van Vechten (8)
NAYS:	None (0)
ABSTAIN:	None (0)
ABSENT:	Thompson, Turner (2)