

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING OF
THE VILLAGE OF KENILWORTH HELD AT THE VILLAGE HALL, 419 RICHMOND ROAD AT
7:00 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 2005

Chairman Hester McCarthy was present and called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Max Slankard acted as Secretary and called the roll as follows:

Present:	Hester McCarthy Beth Baxter Randy Nelson Tim Dugan William Folland John McGinnis Bob Smietana	Chairman Member Member Member Member Member (7:25 p.m.) Member
Absent:	none	
Other Village Officials Present:	Max Slankard Susan Criezis L. Hamilton Kerr, III	Village Manager Building Consultant Village President
Others Present:	Lee Brown Jackie Bossu Don Stephani Cristy Laier Kathy Barnett Curtis Barnett Bill Holland John Roberts Tom Prince Patricia Babb Elizabeth Bannon Ray Drexler Jane Drexler Gwen Sommers Yant Gary Bannon Susie Mesrobian	Teska & Associates 614 Earlston Road 538 Melrose Avenue 306 Oxford Road 626 Wayland Avenue 626 Wayland Avenue 342 Sterling Road 521 Kenilworth Avenue 303 Richmond Road 349 Ridge Road 328 Raleigh Road 111 Kenilworth Avenue 111 Kenilworth Avenue 706 Cummings Avenue 328 Raleigh Road 423 Abbotsford

Chairman McCarthy introduced for review and approval the minutes of the April 6, 2005 meeting. Mr. Smietana observed that his name should be listed under the "Present" column. With that change made, the Chairman sought a motion for approval. Mr. Nelson made a motion to approve the minutes as revised. Ms. Baxter seconded the motion which, upon voice vote, was unanimously approved.

Next, the Chairman introduced Mr. Nathan Parch. Mr. Parch is a Community Development Analyst with the Village of Glencoe. Mr. Parch made a presentation to the Committee entitled "Why Residential Appearance Review". The Chairman asked Mr. Parch where the Village of Glencoe is at on design review. Mr. Parch reported that it has been under consideration for a few years. There is currently a design review proposal being considered by their Village Board. Mr. Nelson asked if it was mandatory or voluntary. Mr. Parch replied that it had started as voluntary. Their Committee's recommendation going to the Board was for mandatory, but the Board has previously rejected that. The Chairman asked him to

elaborate on bonuses. Mr. Parch advised that Glencoe does provide some bonuses that do not relate to design review. Mr. Smietana asked, under a voluntary system, why someone would go through it. Mr. Parch replied that there are 9 incentives proposed. Mr. Nelson asked who would do the design review. Mr. Parch replied that it would be the Contextual Design Review Commission, composed of residents with design interests or backgrounds. The Chairman asked about the nature of historic districts in Glencoe. Mr. Parch replied that there are no districts in Glencoe, there are individual designations only. The Village Board has designated only three homes historic over the objection of the property owners. A designated home can be demolished after a six month delay, rather than the standard 60 day delay. Ms. Cristy Laier asked about zoning control changes in Glencoe and their effect. Mr. Parch replied that there was a floor area reduction in 2000; at the same time, incentives were created. Ms. Laier asked if design review would help minimize the perception of bulk. Mr. Parch replied he felt it would, and is an addition set of tools to be used.

Ms. Baxter asked how they were addressing the neighborhood context element. Mr. Parch replied that new home plans would be submitted along with photos of homes on either side. Mr. Smietana asked if it would cover large additions as well. Mr. Parch replied it would. Ms. Criezis asked if there was a size threshold. Mr. Parch replied at one time there was, but not any longer. Mr. Smietana asked if there were 59 teardowns in Glencoe in 2004, how many additions would he guess there were. Mr. Dugan noted that there were 54, and Mr. Parch clarified that number were those over \$100,000 in value. Mr. Smietana observed this would lead to over 100 design reviews if it is passed. He asked how that would be paid for. Mr. Parch indicated that there would certainly be an additional cost to the process for applicants. Mr. McGinnis asked what kind of staff support it would require. Mr. Parch replied that was too detailed a question for where they are right now, but that was a valid question to which a solution will have to be worked out. The Chairman asked what would happen if a Frank Lloyd Wright design was proposed. Mr. Parch replied it would be evaluated on the basis of their design guidelines matrix, acknowledging that such a design would be more challenging. Ms. Criezis asked Mr. Parch if he had any sense as to their Village Board's objections or concerns. Mr. Parch replied that he didn't know, but that there have been concerns with the effect of incentives, and the real end result of applying the incentives. Mr. Smietana commented that a slippery slope is created if many incentives are allowed. He asked if there is some point at which they can say something is just too big. Mr. Parch replied that the incentives allow for up to 20% more floor area. That is not the target, but rather the limit. He noted that their proposed process is voluntary, and if the applicant does not like the process, they can drop out and design their project under the zoning code. He noted that under the zoning code, applicants can get an almost 20% bonus now. Design review is a different set of tools to add to what they have now. Mr. Folland asked if Mr. Parch had a breakdown on teardowns based on developer versus owner. Mr. Parch replied that he did not, but the majority were developers. Mr. Bill Holland noted the strong support in the Village's survey for Village involvement in design. Mr. John Roberts asked if Glencoe had researched other community's design review processes. Mr. Parch replied that they had looked at Park Ridge, Skokie and Lake Forest. He felt design review was becoming more prevalent. Ms. Gwen Yant asked why the context had been limited to only the house on either side of a subject property. Mr. Parch replied because they are the most immediate neighbors.

The Chairman and Committee thanked Mr. Parch for his presentation and assistance.

Next, the Chairman updated the Committee on the status of the Committee's dimensional standards recommendations. The Building, Planning and Zoning Committee has met recently with Teska regarding the field survey of conditions. Mr. Brown advised that they have had some difficulty with the data assembly. The data has been collected, but there is some question as to the validity. His firm is looking back at the Village's building permit records to identify ways to improve the quality of the data.

Next, the Chairman reported that she had presented the Committee's recommendations on construction management to the Village Board. The Village Board asked for greater specificity on those recommendations. She advised that she and Trustee Miller will review the recommendation and provide greater specificity.

Next, the Chairman introduced the Committee recommendation for tree preservation. The Committee made some additions and corrections at the last meeting, which have been incorporated. She distributed the revised draft to the Committee. Mr. Don Stephani commented that the tree lined streets that used to characterize the Village were public trees, not private trees, and those trees were removed for a reason. He felt that the tree issue was a result of loss of trees due to Dutch Elm disease, the Village's response to that, impatience with tree growth rates, and spacing of parkway trees planted. He felt that the Village should have a budget line item for tree replacement, and those are the trees that need to be replaced. Mr. Smietana asked for the highlighted changes. The Village Manager advised that the survey response figures were incorporated into the preamble portion of the recommendation. The other change was an insertion relating to tree removals due to good forestry practices. The Chairman noted that the survey question did not differentiate between loss of public versus private trees. She encouraged Mr. Stephani to contact the Village on funds for tree replacement, noting that the Village does not have budget funds available.

Mr. Stephani added that some smaller lots may not have the space for replanting requirements. Mr. Folland replied that there is a mechanism in the recommendation for such situations. President Kerr asked how the Village would manage this recommendation and where the resources would come from, noting the limited Village staff and resources. Ms. Baxter replied that the last page includes a reference to a firm that might be able to provide such services, as a pass through cost. The Chairman added that, globally, the Committee was asked to respond to many issues. A lot of those things will require resources, or the Village will remain status quo. Mr. Cameel Halim added that the ordinance could provide for revenue generation from fees and penalties. The Village Manager commented that there will need to be an allocation of resources, but the precise resource requirements have not been determined. It is anticipated that the costs of resources will need to be offset by the revenue stream. President Kerr observed that a lot of the canopy loss is through public trees, and the comments on replanting may be on point. Mr. Folland observed that the issue is not just public trees; it is large mature trees lost throughout the Village. Mrs. Jane Drexler commented that the last time she spoke to Sunrise Tree Service regarding a removal, they were surprised that no permit is required for tree removal. Ms. Gwen Yant observed that cost of regulation is a concern. She asked about the implementation timeline, and felt that with all the issues Ad Hoc is considering, there should be consideration given to what the priorities are. The Chairman replied that in her opinion the dimensional standards are the first priority.

The President asked if the Committee was planning on getting a letter out to residents on this issue. He noted that the BPZ Committee is very busy with other issues right now, and perhaps the public discussions on a tree preservation ordinance should occur before the Ad Hoc Committee. Mr. Dugan replied that this Committee has no authority to take this issue anywhere. The President replied that dimensional standards changes and construction management are fairly normal items for the Village to process. However, design review and tree preservation are new areas, and we need to get that information out to the community. Ms. Susie Mesrobian stated that, as far as vetting a tree preservation ordinance, she felt that the overwhelming survey response was the vetting. Ms. Kathy Barnett stated that she has heard concerns regarding available Village dollars and mailings and staff burdens, but now it was being suggested that more meetings and burdens be imposed. She felt it was time to stop and make some progress. Ms. Drexler added that she felt there was a lot of interest in the community on tree preservation.

The Chairman asked for the consensus of the Committee. Mr. Smietana commented that he felt the Committee had done what it was asked to do. He felt the recommendation should move forward. Ms.

Baxter agreed, adding that she thought the recommendation was very specific and it was time to move forward. Mr. Nelson made a motion to approve the recommendation as presented. Mr. McGinnis seconded the motion which, upon voice vote, was unanimously approved.

Next, the Chairman called for discussion on design review. At the April 6 meeting, the Committee concluded that zoning itself was insufficient to control new development, and design review should be considered. The Committee has reviewed information from other communities, and she feels that the Committee has a pretty good knowledge of how design review works. The Committee also discussed mandatory versus voluntary design review, and concluded that voluntary design review, without incentives, was useless. She advised that the Committee needs to consider specific criteria, and needs to make a decision on mandatory versus voluntary review, and also on whether design review should apply to new construction or additions as well. She asked if there were any members who felt we should discuss voluntary review without incentives. There were none. She asked the Committee which of the items they wished to discuss first.

Mr. Folland stated we should discuss mandatory versus voluntary. He prefers mandatory review for new construction as a starting point. For additions, he is happy to consider voluntary review with incentives. He noted the biggest issue in the community was speculative new homes, and does not feel badly about mandatory review to address that issue. Mr. Nelson stated his philosophical disagreement. He endorsed voluntary review for all new construction and additions. He felt incentives would work in such a scheme. Mr. Smietana advised that, in an ideal world and with enough incentives, people might submit to voluntary review. However, he questioned, as a developer, how incented he would be to go through it. He felt the Village should start with mandatory review for new construction, and perhaps significant additions, and see what happens. To undertake voluntary review with incentives, he felt we would struggle with the incentives. Ms. Baxter stated that many builders are repeat customers, and they would either quickly adapt or leave. She reviewed the number of recent teardowns that were done by developers versus owners.

The Chairman commented on floor area incentives. Mr. Brown stated that Lake Forest's most powerful incentive is time. Mr. Dugan commented that Lake Forest's review process is very similar for properties either within or outside of historic districts. However, staff indicated more willingness to compromise outside of the historic districts. He stated his only issue was the 2 year waiting period there, which he felt was transparent. Mr. Folland felt the biggest criticism was on style police, but that is not what design review is about. He also noted the Lake Forest comment on seeing the emergence of higher quality builders. Mr. Smietana felt if it was the same for everybody, and the end of the day, everyone will know the rules and comply. Mr. Nelson stated that people he has spoken to understand the style point, but they object to the other details. He does not feel the community is ready to accept this. Ms. Baxter stated that it is not just one person who is affected by design review. Many people in the community are affected by a project, and that is a much larger number of people. Mr. Nelson asked why not have design review for additions as well. Ms. Baxter felt that the community was not ready for that. Mr. Dugan felt that new construction was more important, as additions generally already have a style to match and they do. Mr. Holland commented we are fortunate to know what the community wants via the survey. Mr. Nelson agreed, but no where does it say they want mandatory design review.

Mr. Stephani felt if new homes were too big, then we do not need incentives. He suggested anti-monotony measures. Ms. Jackie Bossu stated that residents were asked four times about design issues, and every time, more than 50% said yes. She felt that to say that four separate times answers the question. Mr. Halim stated that, for additions, perhaps voluntary review with incentives should be considered.

Mr. McGinnis stated that it seemed to him we were having a theoretical discussion, not a factual one. He felt he did not know enough of the details. He noted that Glencoe has not made up its mind, and they have

had discussion on it for years. He felt that an impression was being created that many communities are doing this, and he is not sure that is true. He has a hard time understanding why government rushes into something that it doesn't understand. He was fully supportive of voluntary review to see how it iterates. We need some certainty as to how it will work, and he does not feel we are there yet. If we are going mandatory, he needs to understand the details before he can weigh in.

The Chairman noted that the Village has had an Architectural Review Commission for some time, but that is not what we would expect on the residential side. She felt this was a bit of a chicken and egg discussion, but her vote would be for mandatory review for new construction. The Committee should then move along to specific criteria. If the criteria proves to be too overwhelming, then the Committee can adjust. Mr. Smietana felt that the Committee should vote on the mandatory question first. Mr. Dugan agreed.

Mr. Folland made a motion that the Committee proceed with the idea of mandatory design review on new construction, voluntary review for additions, and then consider what pieces fit in the puzzle after that. Ms. Baxter seconded the motion, and the following roll call vote was taken:

AYE:	Folland, Baxter, Smietana, Dugan and McCarthy
NAY:	Nelson and McGinnis
ABSTAIN:	none
ABSENT:	none

The Chairman declared the motion carried 5 to 2.

Mr. Dugan noted that in the packet of information was Glencoe's design matrix. Each community that does design review has a different list, but for the most part all have the same flavor. He suggested that Committee members study that material and be prepared to discuss at the next meeting. The Chairman concurred.

The next meeting of the Committee was set for Wednesday, May 4, 2005 at 7:00 p.m. at Village Hall.

There being no further business, Mr. Nelson made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Mr. Folland and unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Max Slankard
Village Manager

