



**MINUTES  
VILLAGE OF GLENCOE  
PLAN COMMISSION**

Virtual Meeting  
Wednesday, February 23, 2022 – 7:00 p.m.

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The February 23, 2022 meeting of the Plan Commission of the Village of Glencoe, Cook County was called to order virtually at 7:02 p.m. Chairman Huvad provided the legal basis for holding a virtual meeting.

**2. ROLL CALL**

*The following Commissioners were in attendance:*

Gail Lissner, Vice Chair, Village Board Representative  
Lisa Brooks, Park District Representative  
Georgia Mihalopoulos, Public-at-Large Representative  
Michael Pope, Glencoe Public Library Representative  
John Satter, Zoning Board of Appeals Representative  
James Thompson, Public-at-Large Representative  
Greg Turner, Public-at-Large Representative  
Peter Van Vechten, Historic Preservation Commission Representative

*The following Commissioners were not in attendance:*

Bruce Huvad, Chairman, Public-at-Large Representative  
Marc Gale, School District 35 Representative

*The following Village staff were also in attendance:*

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

**3. CONSIDER THE JULY 28, 2021 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**

Commissioner Turner made a correction to the minutes, changing one word on Page 2 from “contract” to “contrast”. Commissioner Turner moved to approve the minutes. Commissioner Brooks seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

**4. CONSIDERATION OF EXTERIOR APPEARANCE REVIEW FOR A PROPOSED WALL SIGN AT 45 GREEN BAY ROAD**

Taylor Baxter provided background information on the proposal. The proposal is a new 37.3-square-foot wall sign for a Coldwell Banker location on the corner of Scott Avenue and Green Bay Road. Vice Chair Lissner stated that the sign meets zoning requirements and opened the floor for questions.

Commissioner Turner asked about how allowable sign area is calculated. He asked what the allowable size would be if limits were based only on the front of the building. He said that the essence of the rule could be considered to be based on the wall on which a sign is to be displayed. Mr. Baxter said that if this were only a 20-foot-wide store frontage, the allowable signage would be 30 square feet. He added that the code implies that the frontage measurement should be based on the property line and that one sign is allowed per street frontage. He said that the 150-square-foot limit would be based on the entire street frontage of the lot. He confirmed that the proposed sign would be approximately 20% larger than what would be allowed if the building was only the 20-foot-wide diagonal section.

Commissioner Brooks asked about the code’s restrictions on dark sky best practices. Mr. Brown said that there had not been any discussion of dark sky requirements in the sign code itself. He said that 75 foot-candles is fairly bright and might not be considered as part of best practices for dark sky requirements, but that what is most important is what light leaves the site. He said that we do not have a standard for dark skies and that this could be part of a code update in the future. Mr. Baxter added that he did not know the exact brightness of the light, but that the applicant had stated that it would not exceed 75 foot-candles. The applicant was not present to answer questions about this topic.

Commissioner Van Vechten added that a standard office illumination is 40 foot-candles. He stated that he had concerns about the size of the sign on the storefront. He said that the fact that the sign was being relocated may afford the opportunity to observe how it looks at night. He asked about what is included in calculating the allowable square footage and reiterated that the sign looks large, but there are some large signs in other locations nearby to the south. Mr. Baxter clarified that the frontage was measured from the east property line to the corner and then along Green Bay Road to the edge of this suite, totaling approximately 100 feet. If the building frontage alone were used, the allowable square footage would be well over 37 square feet. Vice Chair Lissner added that the sign had already been removed from its previous location.

Mr. Brown added that the sign would be a halo-lit, channel-letter sign. He said that the previous location had gooseneck illumination, which would put more lighting onto the background than the current proposal with lighting behind the channel letters. The proposal would not have the large, white field that would be produced by gooseneck lighting.

Commissioner Satter said that he agrees with Commissioner Van Vechten that the sign looks big, but it may just be a function of the space and that the façade may be larger than it appears. He said that the sign is well below what would be allowed under the zoning code, and that even if just the diagonal area is considered, the sign is only around 20% larger than what would be proposed. He expressed his support for the sign.

Vice Chair Lissner asked about public comments. Mr. Baxter said that there were no written comments. No attendees provided any comments on the sign.

Commissioner Mihalopoulos asked if there are plans for an awning. Mr. Baxter said that there were no awning plans at this time and any new awnings would come to the Commission for review.

Commissioner Satter moved to approve the proposal. Commissioner Mihalopoulos seconded. The motion passed with seven in favor and one in opposition.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>ACCEPTED</b>
----------------	-----------------

<b>AYES:</b>	Lissner, Mihalopoulos, Pope, Satter, Thompson, Turner, Van Vechten (7)
<b>NAYS:</b>	Brooks (1)
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	None (0)
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Huward, Gale (2)

**5. CONSIDERATION OF A PROPOSED COMBINATION PLAT FOR 484 AND 486 MADISON AVENUE**

Mr. Baxter provided background information on the proposal, explaining that the property is three underlying parcels that have been considered a single zoning lot for approximately 20 years. There are two addresses on the property because there were two homes on the property as recently as the 1990s. One home was demolished, and Village records indicate that they have been considered a single lot since then. The applicant could build one single-family home on the property, but Village Board approval is needed to formally combine the property. The Plan Commission’s role is to provide a recommendation to the Village Board. He explained that the applicant has requested combined preliminary and final plat review, rather than two separate rounds of review. The Plan Commission has the discretion to approve or deny this request. He added that staff does not oppose this combined review, as this is a relatively straightforward request. He stated that the underlying parcels do not meet minimum zoning standards, but the proposed combined parcel does meet zoning requirements and that staff is of the opinion that the proposal meets the Subdivision Code’s standards for review. He told the Commission that some neighbors had expressed stormwater concerns, and that the applicant has proposed new stormwater management infrastructure. The Village Engineer’s preliminary review did not present any stormwater concerns, as the project would likely result in improved conditions both on site and on neighboring properties.

Applicant Steve Aisen said that the property probably should have formally been combined years ago, and that this seems like the logical next step.

Commissioner Satter asked if someone could build two houses on the property. Mr. Baxter said that this has been treated as a single zoning lot for many years, and that to go from a single zoning lot back to two zoning lots, with some exceptions, typically requires Village Board approval to go back to two zoning lots from one zoning lot. Mr. Brown agreed, saying that if non-conforming lots are held in common, they automatically become a single zoning lot. If they were held separately they could still be considered separate zoning lots. To build two houses, there would need to be a variation granted to allow two non-conforming zoning lots. Commissioner Satter asked if this had ever been challenged in the court system, and Mr. Brown said that this requirement had held up to legal challenge elsewhere. Commissioner Thompson added that in his experience, the sale of one non-conforming lot could make the lots unbuildable.

Commissioner Van Vechten provided some historic background on the property. These were laid out as smaller lots, allowing for more affordable housing. He said that one of the houses on the property was demolished in 2001 and that the garage is a remnant of this lot. He asked if there is any precedent of granting single-step review and Mr. Baxter responded that he knew of one instance on Sheridan Road in 2019 that was granted combined review. Mr. Brown said that there were other examples before and after the Subdivision Code was updated.

Commissioner Brooks expressed concerns about the single round of review, with regard to sufficient opportunity for public comments. She said that this has been an issue at times with the Park District and that the perception of not providing enough opportunity is something to be avoided. Vice Chair Lissner

mentioned that there is a sign on the property. Mr. Baxter said that the sign was up for a month and letters were sent out a couple weeks before the meeting.

Commissioner Pope said that the sign on the property is large and that neighbors do not seem to have objections, other than about stormwater concerns. He said that neighbors had seen the sign and not objected, and that the proposed house would be an improvement. Commissioner Brooks asked about written comments. Mr. Baxter said that two comments expressed stormwater concerns and that one stated no objection to the project. He read the three comments that had been received and stated that the proposed project would likely lead to improved conditions on the property with regard to stormwater.

Commissioner Satter asked how long the wait would be if the Commission did not approve the consolidation of plat review into one round. Mr. Baxter said that it would be a delay of up to two months. Commissioner Satter said there weren't likely to be any requirements that needed to be satisfied in the plat review process, or whether those would be handled at the time of permitting. Mr. Baxter agreed with this assessment and said that he would be surprised if there were any significant changes that the Plan Commission would review in a second round.

Commissioner Mihalopoulos asked about tree review. Mr. Baxter said that plan review would include deposits for tree removal and that a full review would take place as part of that process.

Commissioner Turner asked if consolidating the review process would preclude the Village Board from returning the matter to the Commission for further consideration or take additional public comment and Mr. Baxter responded that this is correct. Commissioner Turner asked the applicant to talk through how the proposed easement would work. Mr. Aisen said that they would be trying to save all the trees they could, although some trees would need to come down. He said that significant drainage improvements are proposed, specifically detention storage, storm inlets, and improvements to the southwest corner for the improvement of conditions on nearby properties.

Commissioner Van Vechten compared this process to that from the Hoover Estate, which share a concern from neighbors about stormwater issues. He said that his concern is with consolidating the plat review process due to unresolved issues. He said that until a determination that the proposed solution will work, and that is communicated to neighbors, that this issue remains open and that this makes him uncomfortable with consolidating the review process.

Mr. Mau provided background on stormwater improvements that have been made near this property. He said that significant improvements had been made. The subject property has virtually uncontrolled runoff, which means it is not surprising that there are wet back yards in the area. Any improvements would need to meet stormwater regulations, and a new system all but eliminating runoff would be required.

Commissioner Thompson asked if there is knowledge of why the process was designed to require formal consideration of this combination if the lot is already considered a single zoning lot. Mr. Brown responded that the two-step process is a standard process across the nation, but the fact that the Village included two steps for simple consolidations was because multi-lot consolidations could create enormous lots that should go through the review process. Commissioner Thompson asked if there are standards in the code to consolidate the process into one round. Mr. Brown said that the intent is to ensure that the default is a two-step process, but the Commission is allowed the opportunity to reduce

it to a one-step process if there are not concerns. There is not a standard built into the code, but rather it is at the discretion of the Commission with the agreement of the Village Board. Mr. Aisen added that because the properties have long been considered one zoning lot, in his opinion it would be a waste of Village resources to go through this process again, as it would not change the course of the development. The request is in effect a pin consolidation, as the applicant does not need a plat of consolidation for the proposed redevelopment.

Mr. Donald Spitzer-Cohn, a resident of property near the proposed development, provided public comments, asking who is responsible for potential flooding. He also expressed concerns about the potential size of the house. He reiterated that his main concern is about stormwater. Mr. Aisen responded that the development could take place regardless of the plat of consolidation and that the stormwater management system would improve conditions for nearby properties. Commissioner Satter said that stormwater concerns are in fact part of Plan Commission review. Mr. Baxter responded that stormwater management is one of the criteria that the Commission should consider, but the question is whether there would potentially be any changes to the stormwater management plan based on the actions of the Plan Commission. The applicant could apply for a building permit for a single-family house without going through this process. Commissioner Satter said that some Commissioners might want to see more information about stormwater design elements, but that he did not personally feel this need.

Commissioner Mihalopoulos asked about what could be built on the property as it stands today. Mr. Baxter responded that as it stands today, only one house could be built, as this is currently considered one lot and that dividing the lot would require a variation because the underlying lots are non-conforming.

Susan Spitzer-Cohn, a nearby resident, asked about the use of the proposed stormwater easement. Mr. Aisen responded that the plan is to intercept and collect the water at the back of the property and run it through pipes into the Village system. He said that he did not know the size of the pipes that would be used. Mr. Spitzer-Cohn asked who would be responsible for communicating these things with the neighbors and what would happen during construction. Mr. Aisen responded that they follow all Village rules for site management and that he would be happy to communicate with neighbors through the process.

Commissioner Brooks asked the Spitzer-Cohns whether they are confident that nearby neighbors are aware of this process and have had an opportunity to comment on the process so that they would not feel the need to have a second round of review. Ms. Spitzer-Cohn said that she had not been walking regularly because the weather was bad and she did not know what neighbors' opinions on the subject were. Mr. Mau added that the other adjacent neighbors to the south were in attendance at this meeting. Mr. Baxter added that a second round of review would likely lead to two months of delay for the applicant, but that would not likely delay the issuance of a building permit because this property is a single zoning lot.

Mr. Spitzer-Cohn asked again who would be responsible if the stormwater plans don't work. Mr. Mau responded that there are licensed engineers reviewing the plans, but the developer is responsible for the system and passes this responsibility on to future owners.

Commissioner Pope made a motion to approve the application and to combine the review process into one step. Commissioner Turner seconded the motion.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>ACCEPTED</b>
<b>AYES:</b>	Brooks, Lissner, Mihalopoulos, Pope, Satter, Thompson, Turner (7)
<b>NAYS:</b>	Van Vechten (1)
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	None (0)
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Huvar, Gale (2)

**6. COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

There were no comments on non-agenda items.

**7. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Vice Chair Lissner provided an update on the recent discussion by the Village Board of outdoor dining in Downtown Glencoe and the use of the public right-of-way. The Village Board discussed structures, parking, and carry-out policies, which had been working well during the COVID pandemic. There was discussion of whether to continue these policies, with the Board’s opinion being split. The Board is continuing to discuss this topic, including fees and appearance review standards.

The applicant for the Coldwell Banker sign, who missed the appearance review for the sign, asked if it had been approved and Mr. Baxter confirmed that it was.

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

Following a motion by Commissioner Satter and a second by Commissioner Turner the meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.