



**MINUTES
VILLAGE OF GLENCOE
PLAN COMMISSION**

Regular Meeting
Wednesday, June 27, 2022 – 7:00 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The June 27, 2022 meeting of the Plan Commission of the Village of Glencoe, Cook County was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Chairman Huvad.

The following Commissioners were in attendance:

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

The following Commissioners were absent:

Georgia Mihalopoulos, Public-at-Large Representative

The following Village staff were also in attendance:

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

Also in attendance were:

Trustee Dudley Onderdonk
Francesca Lawrence, Teska Associates

2. CONSIDER THE JUNE 27, 2022 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Commissioner Van Vechten made a motion to approve the April 27, 2022 Plan Commission Meeting Minutes, as submitted. Commissioner Novack seconded the motion.

RESULT:	ACCEPTED
AYES:	Gale, Huvad, Lissner, Spain, Thompson, Turner Novack, Pope, Van Vechten (9)
NAYS:	None (0)
ABSTAIN:	None (0)

ABSENT:	Mihalopoulos (1)
----------------	------------------

3. PUBLIC COMMENT - None

4. CONSIDERATION OF A PROPOSED FINAL PLAT OF SUBDIVISION AND ASSOCIATED VARIATIONS AT 538 GREEN BAY ROAD

Mr. Baxter provided background information on the proposal. He stated that there are no significant changes since the approval of the preliminary plat. He mentioned a request to reduce the required front setback that was received from a neighbor prior to the meeting and that staff is not opposed to this change. Chairman Huvad stated that as long as the final plat conforms substantially with the preliminary plat, the final plat should be approved. Mr. Baxter agreed and said that the review should also include any additional conditions that were included in the preliminary plat approval. Chairman Huvad said that the Plan Commission’s role would be to approve the final plat, with direction regarding the proposed front setback. He added that the Village Board could establish the front setback, regardless of whether the Plan Commission made a recommendation on it.

Commissioner Turner asked if the Park District had any comments regarding the proposed front setback. Commission Spain responded that while there are not any plans for the parcel in front of 538 Green Bay Road, there could be plans for that in the future, and that a reduced setback may not be in the Park District’s interest.

Commissioner Novack said that he would like to discuss the appropriate setback and what the benefits of being closer to the street would be. He said the while he does not have a strong opinion, he leans toward it being appropriate to reduce the setback.

Chairman Huvad asked about any future plans for the sidewalk in front of the property, specifically about any long-range plans to improve the conditions along this sidewalk. Mr. Baxter responded that he did not know of any such plans and added that there is not much room within the public right-of-way without going into park property. Mr. Brown added that the width of the sidewalk and the distance form the roadway are two separate issues, and that the sidewalk was not designed to include cyclists. He said that the distance form the curb also plays into pedestrian comfort and that this should be considered during the Comprehensive Planning process.

Commissioner Pope said that he appreciated the coordination between the property owner and neighbors in light of previous objections and that the proposed front setback seemed to be reasonable.

Commissioner Van Vechten said that he was struggling with the rationale for the setback reduction request. He said that he did not understand the request to bring the new homes into alignment with the house to the north, as this house would be significantly closer to the street. He also questioned the stated impact on homes along Hawthorn and Vernon, as the homes on Vernon have a large back yard and the homes on Hawthorn generally are not impacted except for one or two properties. He agreed that the larger proposed back yard would be a benefit, and that he could potentially support the reduction for this reason. He said he would like to hear more explanation and discussion.

Peter Cummins, the representative for the owners of 538 Green Bay Road said the he had committed to the owners of 550 Green Bay Road that the homes would be pulled forward as much as possible, as the

more the house is pushed back, the more it impacts the sightlines from their home. He said that this would be a benefit to the neighbors, but that he would need enough room to provide access to both lots within the front yard of the new lots. He added that the transaction for the transfer of the buffer property to the owners of 550 Green Bay would be completed before the recording of the subdivision plat.

Barney Gallagher, owner of 550 Green Bay Road, said that he made the request to reduce the front setback because during discussions about what could be done with the property, neighbors agreed that new houses would be best located as close as possible to the front of the property. He added that while his garage is very close to the street, the house itself would be more in alignment with these new homes if they could be pushed forward. He said that this would also allow a builder to have different setbacks between the two new homes.

Commissioner Van Vechten motioned to recommend approval of the plat with the condition that the property transfer to 550 Green Bay Road and that the front setback requirement be reduced to 22.8 feet. The motion was seconded and approved by a vote of 7-2.

RESULT:	ACCEPTED
AYES:	Gale, Huvad, Lissner, Mihalopoulos, Novack, Pope, Thompson, Turner, Van Vechten (7)
NAYS:	Spain, Turner (2)
ABSTAIN:	None (0)
ABSENT:	Mihalopoulos (1)

5. CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Commissioner Van Vechten provided background on the history of comprehensive planning in Glencoe. He said that the founders of Glencoe were very concerned with how the Village would develop, including the image of the community when people got off the train. He said that the building at the northwest corner of Park and Vernon was built in 1908 as a gateway and bookend of the retail district along Park Avenue. He said that the Plan Commission was founded in 1920, meaning that the consideration of planning in the Village went back at least 100 years. The first Comprehensive Plan was meant to substitute “order for chaos”, to conserve taxpayer money, “wise prevention, not wasteful cure”, and the promotion of community life. The plan considered transportation, land use, and public property.

The 1974 plan included a three-year process. The document included aspirational recommendations and defined goals. In 1985, a 15-month process was used to review and update the 1974 plan. This document included new goals and implementation strategies. The latest plan is from 1996 and includes existing conditions analysis, a vision of and for Glencoe, and a land use plan and associated recommendations. Commissioner Van Vechten said that in his opinion, this plan includes more aspirational than specific recommendations, making it difficult to measure progress. It also lacked implementation strategies.

Commissioner Van Vechten said that there were common themes in the plans. First, they mention the need for housing, including for senior citizens. Infrastructure needs are also mentioned throughout the plans, with more successful implementation, likely because these recommendations were more specific.

The built environment was also addressed by all plans. He said that some plans included unique recommendations that were not accomplished, such as one for a waste transfer station and the annexation of the Botanic Garden.

Commissioner Pope asked if there was a reason for why some recommendations were more successfully implemented than others. Commissioner Van Vechten said that cost may have been an issue. He said that in his opinion cost should not hold back good plans and that the Village should embrace recommendations from plans. He said that the reasons for not meeting housing recommendations are more difficult to establish.

Trustee Onderdonk addressed the Commission, expressing the Village Board's support of this process. He said that it is time to put Village resources into the plan. He thanked Commissioners for taking part in the process and provided encouragement.

Mr. Brown said that in the 1996 plan, there were recommendations that were part of a draft document that were eliminated from the final plan. He said that this was part of the Commission's responsibility, as the final plan represented the Community's vision at the time. He said that there were some conflicts about these recommendations at the time, particularly about housing, and that there would be more discussion about these issues during this process.

Mr. Brown provided information on how the topics of environmental protection and sustainability have changed since previous plans were adopted. He said that in 1974, the concern was about point-source pollution, while the conversation is now about a more holistic approach to sustainability, including economic health and equity.

Mr. Baxter provided information on how housing issues have evolved since the 1996 plan. He provided an overview of housing topics that will be discussed as part of this planning process and said that he expects some of these conversations to be controversial and that opinions are unlikely to be unanimous, but that they will be important topics to address.

Chairman Huvad asked Commissioners for their thoughts on the visioning questionnaire they completed before the meeting. Commissioner Novack said he thought the questionnaire put him in a good state of mind to begin this process and that he is looking forward to everyone's responses. Commissioner Van Vechten said that the survey made him think more deeply about Glencoe and that it made him appreciate the Village. Commissioner Thompson said that the worst thing we could do is produce a plan that only sits on a shelf, and that there should be a focus on implementation and action. Vice Chair Lissner said that she thought the questionnaire was too weighty for the general public, and staff responded that the public would be receiving a different survey. Commissioner Gale said that he agrees that this is a privilege to be part of this process and that the Commission should try to think out of the box and be aspirational while also thinking about implementation. Commissioner Turner said that he wants to think about practical implementation and avoid creating a document that isn't used. He said that it's important that we consider the best way to survey residents so that the results are valuable. Commissioner Pope said that he thought this was a valuable exercise and that it is important to think about how the community will view proposed changes. Commissioner Spain said that Glencoe is a transit-oriented, walkable community, and that one of the challenges will be to preserve what everyone loves about Glencoe while recognizing that there is also a need for change. Commissioner Van Vechten added that he sees change in the extensive turnover of Glencoe's housing stock.

In response to Commissioner Van Vechten, Mr. Brown said that in the 1970s, the discussion of housing focused on the perceived problem of monotony. In 1996, the discussion had shifted to teardowns.

Chairman Huvad provided some background on the planning that goes into Commission meetings. He said that this is a collaborative process and that Commissioners can always reach out to him or to staff to provide input.

Mr. Brown and Ms. Lawrence provided information on the plan for public outreach. He said that there is a list of entities that need to be contacted and pulled into the process. Chairman Huvad said that Commissioners could go to other Board or Commission meetings and report back to the Commission, as many other bodies have been working on similar issues for years and can provide valuable information. Mr. Brown said that it is also important for Glencoe to understand how neighboring communities' plans affect Glencoe, and vice versa. He said that there may be an opportunity to explore shared resources between communities. Commissioner Novack asked if nearby communities were also updating plans, and Mr. Brown said that some are and some are not.

Commissioner Spain said that she wasn't sure if the entities listed include all the people we want to talk to. She said that she wanted to get a diverse sample of input. Chairman Huvad said that there may be additional people to talk to, and Ms. Lawrence agreed that we want to "broaden" the list. Mr. Brown said that we want to "broaden the pool" through these conversations with boards and commissions. Commissioner Thompson asked if we are talking about people within the community, and Mr. Brown answered that this is correct, although we can also look for outside guidance.

Chairman Huvad asked how the information that comes out of community engagement comes back to the Commission. Mr. Brown said that they will look for commonalities and themes to compile and bring back for discussion.

Mr. Brown said that we will have a public launch at the September 29th farmers market. He mentioned other public outreach opportunities, including open houses, newsletters, and mailing lists.

Chairman Huvad asked Commissioners about their thoughts on the plan to have Commissioners go to meet with other boards and commissions. Commissioner Gale asked about sending postcards to everyone in the Village with a QR code or website. Mr. Brown said that they can generate the card, but they typically leave them in places like libraries or farmers markets, rather than sending them to everyone. The QR code can also be in newsletters. Vice Chair Lissner asked about the Friday email list, and Mr. Brown said that they will use this list. Some Commissioners said they were unaware of this list. Chairman Huvad said that he would like to see as many channels as possible used to get people to participate in the process. Commissioner Pope asked about reaching people in Winnetka or Highland Park and Mr. Brown said that this would be under consideration.

Commissioner Turner asked about how to measure community engagement. Mr. Brown responded that digital surveys allow for easy compilation of data about who is responding. Vice Chair Lissner asked what would be considered a good response to public surveys. Mr. Brown said that there was much more responsiveness to shorter, phone-based questionnaires, and that they would use whatever means they can to reach out to people. Commissioner Thompson asked about benchmarks or goals for responses. Mr. Brown said that we will see when responses start to tail off, and Ms. Lawrence added that people seem to love Glencoe and that people are busy and that you tend to see highest engagement when something is controversial, rather than where people are happier. Chairman Huvad said that the plan

will be useful if it reflects our community, and that the community needs to be part of the plan. He says that he doesn't know the answer to the question yet, and as we start to go through the process we may start to understand if they are reaching sufficient numbers of people.

Commissioner Novack said that he would like to know how many people are signed up for the email newsletter and that it could be helpful to try to increase that number. He said that it could be great to use an "e-post-it note" method of quick responses for getting feedback. He said that the Tudor Court planning process involved surveys and said it could be helpful to look back at that for lessons learned. He said that sign kiosks could also be used.

Commissioner Van Vechton suggested leveraging organizations to reach individuals. For example, Writers Theater could include presentations before performances, or the Park District could reach out to people who use their facilities. He suggested thinking about organizations that have many people involved, such as houses of worship. He also said that the survey the Commission did would need to be adapted for the public and that we need to think about what questions to ask.

Mr. Brown said that we want to ask issue-based questions of the public prior to Commission discussion. This would involve breaking these questions up into small pieces on specific topics. For example, there may be questions going out regarding housing, and a few weeks later there may be more questions about the environment.

Commissioner Spain said that she agreed that open-ended questions can be difficult. We should start with broad input and then a second feedback stage to narrow the focus. Ms. Lawrence said that this is the plan going forward.

Chairman Huvad mentioned that sub-area plans are likely to be an opportunity to provoke a lot of comments about specific issues, although this may happen later in the process.

Ms. Lawrence presented the results of the survey that Commissioners completed prior to the meeting. She showed a word cloud, with "beautiful, friendly, wonderful, philanthropic, safe, lake, community" being featured as responses to what words describe Glencoe today. She mentioned that "not necessarily inclusive" was mentioned. For words describing Glencoe in 10-15 years, there were mentions of maintaining assets, along with sustainability and inclusiveness. She said that people value walkability, nature, parks and beaches, architecture, quiet, approachable government, safe, transit, community, and others. Commissioners thought that we should embrace leveraging wealth to help others, housing density in certain nodes, attention to infrastructure, support of cultural institutions, prepare for climate change, increase walkability, and an active downtown and outdoor cafes. Biggest challenges included an overreliance on property taxes, being "out of touch with the rest of society", preparedness for climate change, aging infrastructure, and the status quo. Responses included Commissioners' thoughts on sustainability, including diverse housing and a focus on the environment.

Chairman Huvad asked Commissioners to email Mr. Baxter regarding their interest in visiting boards and commissions to get feedback on planning issues.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Following a motion by Commissioner Turner and a second, the meeting was adjourned at 8:59 p.m.

RESULT:	ACCEPTED
----------------	-----------------

AYES:	Gale, Huvar, Lissner, Novack, Pope, Spain, Thompson, Turner, Van Vechten (9)
NAYS:	None (0)
ABSTAIN:	None (0)
ABSENT:	Mihalopoulos (1)