

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLAN COMMISSION OF THE  
VILLAGE OF KENILWORTH HELD AT THE KENILWORTH VILLAGE HALL,  
419 RICHMOND ROAD  
AT 8:00 P.M. ON MONDAY, OCTOBER 1, 2007**

A regular meeting of the Plan Commission of the Village of Kenilworth was held at 8:00 p.m. on Monday, October 1, 2007. Chairman Smietana called the meeting to order at 8:05 p.m. The following Commissioners were present:

Present:	Robert Smietana	Chairman
	Tolbert Chisum	Member
	Henry Mawicke	Member
	Elizabeth Bannon	Member
	Gwen Sommers Yant	Member
	Frank Cavalier	Member
	Susan Hoopes	Member
	Tom Feeny	Member

Absent:	Jim Junewicz	Member
	Tim Dugan	Member
	Dirk Degenaars	Member

Other Village Officials Present:	Bradly Burke	Village Manager
	Susan Criezis	Community Development Director
	John Houseal	Houseal Lavigne

Chairman Smietana enumerated what he hoped to accomplish at the meeting. He said he would like to review the minutes, discuss comments received at the Open Houses, and vote on whether or not to recommend the Draft Plan to the Village Board. Chairman Smietana noted the recommendation to the Village Board could be made with or without changes to the current draft document. Chairman Smietana thanked the Commission members, especially Elizabeth Bannon, Gwen Sommers Yant, and Susan Hoopes for all of their efforts in preparing the exhibits, setting up the room, and coordinating refreshments for Saturday and this evening's Open House events. Chairman Smietana noted these three members of the Commission put in a lot of time and effort and did a great job making the events a success.

The minutes of the August 6, 2007 meeting were placed before the Commission. Some corrections were suggested. Member Feeny moved to approve the minutes as corrected. Member Cavalier seconded the motion, and the minutes were unanimously approved as corrected.

Chairman Smietana asked for comments on the Draft Plan. Member Bannon said there are two types of street lights discussed previously by the Commission, one type of lighting is at a scale for parking lots and one at a scale for pedestrian. She asked if the two types of lighting should be represented in the Plan. She asked John Houseal to include photos of the light standard as requested in earlier meetings.

Chairman Smietana clarified the public hearing process and said this is only the beginning and there will be revisions as the plan moves through the hearing process.

Member Cavalier said he was approached by a resident at the Open House regarding affordable housing and senior housing. Member Cavalier felt the reference to these items was as clear as possible at this time. Member Yant said the Plan Commission members should be familiar with the Affordable Housing Plan. Member Yant noted some of the newer members of the Plan Commission may not be aware of Kenilworth's Affordable Housing Plan and asked that the document be distributed to the entire Commission.

Chairman Smietana reviewed some of the public comments submitted at the Open Houses. He said the comments addressed building height, the pros and cons of a Sterling Road cul-de-sac, protecting the Blann building, and buffering adjacent residential properties from the commercial area. Chairman Smietana said staff would write up and distribute the comments to the Plan Commission member as an addendum to the minutes of this meeting. He said the public hearing would be a formal presentation of the draft Comprehensive Plan. Chairman Smietana noted the Commission will then take comments received from the public at the hearing and discuss them and take any necessary action. Chairman Smietana said another option is to hold another meeting and discuss public comments received during the hearing process.

Member Yant made a suggestion on the format of notification of the public hearing. She suggested presenting it as more of a town hall meeting where there will be a formal presentation on the draft plan. Member Mawicke said the meetings have been well publicized, and there has been plenty of time for public commentary.

Member Cavalier asked about implementation of the Plan and an action plan. He asked how we make sure the Plan does not sit on a shelf. John Houseal said the two most important and immediate items are amendments to the Zoning Code and that everyone, including staff and all Village committees and commission, understand the foundation of the Plan in reviewing development proposals.

Member Hoopes asked about traffic studies and talking to the railroad. Chairman Smietana said that would be part of the action plan. John Houseal explained the action plan for implementing the Draft Plan.

Member Cavalier asked how often it would be updated. John Houseal said the staff should go through it every five years, and that will keep it solid for a couple of decades.

Member Cavalier commented that it was interesting how many comments were received about building height and a desire to see a specific building height included in the document. John Houseal said the Plan Commission left a numeric value out of its discussion of the height and noted any changes to the Zoning Code would be where a specific height is spelled out.

Member Bannon said she would like to revisit the height issue to put a number in the Comprehensive Plan. John Houseal said typically a height regulation is included in the Zoning Ordinance and not included in the Comprehensive Plan.

Member Yant said she thought floor heights should be compatible with existing buildings. She said we do not want a Northern Trust building similar to that found in Winnetka on Kenilworth's northern boundary.

Member Bannon asked about the impact of big changes to the Plan and how any major changes would be incorporated. Chairman Smietana said that changes would be part of the public hearing process.

Member Yant expressed her opinion she would like more information about the parks included, while Member Bannon stated she would like to change out some of the photos. It was noted these items could be revised after the public hearing.

Manager Burke urged the Plan Commission to be cognizant of staying within the budget and noted any additional projects, added to Houseal Lavigne's task of developing the draft plan, will increase the cost of the overall project. Member Cavalier stated the Commission members needed to be aware of and responsible in to trying to complete this project within the budgeted parameters. John Houseal noted the Commission is well beyond the original budget.

Chairman Smietana said, after much thought, discussion and work, it was his opinion the process should be moved forward and a recommendation should be made to the Village Board to proceed to public hearing. Chairman Smietana asked for a motion to approve the Draft Plan to go to the Village Board at its October 9<sup>th</sup> meeting to request a public hearing be scheduled. Member Cavalier made the motion, which was seconded by Member Chisum and unanimously approved.

The next Plan Commission meeting was tentatively scheduled for November 5, 2007; however, Chairman Smietana noted if the project was moving toward a public hearing date in early November, the regular meeting of November 5, 2007 may not be needed.

Member Feeney moved to adjourn. Member Cavalier seconded the motion which was unanimously approved, and the meeting adjourned at 9:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Criezis

**COMMENTS RECEIVED AT THE SEPTEMBER 29<sup>TH</sup> AND OCTOBER 1<sup>ST</sup> 2007 OPEN HOUSE TO REVIEW THE DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.**

**PAUL O'CONNOR, 550 MELROSE AVENUE, [poconr@yahoo.com](mailto:poconr@yahoo.com):** Cul-de-sacing of Sterling is a bad idea. Traffic will be diverted to Wayland and Melrose. Impossible to handle all baseball traffic with a cul-de-sac.

**MARY REMIEN, 542 KENILWORTH AVENUE, 847-251-2542:** Retain as is buildings: N & W of Swab building & those across alley to W – up to Melrose corner. Allow Ken.Press Bldg to be Tudorized. Limit 35' in height. The excellence of architecture cannot be duplicated today.

**ERIC MILLER, 522 MELROSE AVENUE, 847-899-0696, [ericmiller2002@hotmail.com](mailto:ericmiller2002@hotmail.com):**

Although the Plan is significantly improved from earlier versions, I am concerned that there are no protections or language that calls for saving historic downtown buildings—specifically the Blann's Pharmacy Building. What would protect every commercial structure in Kenilworth's business district from being demolished over the next 20 years?

**BEVERLY KIRK, 522 MELROSE AVENUE, [frankbev Kirk@comcast.net](mailto:frankbev Kirk@comcast.net):** 1. I would like to see a 35' height restriction. I don't want a huge wall between the Kenil & Worth sections of Kenilworth. I don't want huge buildings to block my light and lake breezes. 2. How much have we paid Houseal Lavigne and when do we unhook from them. 3. Is there anything to protect the Blann Pharmacy Building.

**GARY BANNON, 328 RALEIGH ROAD:** 1. Plan should specify height restrictions on buildings on Green Bay. 2. Photos of examples of things allowed vs. not allowed need to be separated on the pages more to avoid confusion.

**CHUCK SWANSON, 531 MELROSE AVENUE, [cswan123@sbcglobal.net](mailto:cswan123@sbcglobal.net):** Regarding height (physical) on Green Bay. I believe specific mention to height limitations should be included. As a resident close to Green Bay Rd. my personal preference is as close to 35' as possible.

**CHUCK SWANSON, 531 MELROSE AVENUE:** p. 33 specific picture of "Block Redevelopment Illustrative Concept" be changed to look as generic as possible – not to look like Melrose-Wayland block.

**FRANK KIRK, 522 MELROSE AVENUE:** Build a 8' high brick wall on the residence side of all commercial areas to separate residence from commercial. Leave openings to access present garages et al.

**ERIC MILLER, 522 MELROSE AVENUE, 847-899-0696, [ericmiller2002@hotmail.com](mailto:ericmiller2002@hotmail.com):** Why does figure 5 on page 22 not list the name of the

park that is adjacent to the Stuart Memorial Building? Why is the park where we celebrate Memorial Day not listed. On page 18 under Active & Passive Parks?

**FRANK KIRK, 522 MELROSE AVENUE, 847-256-0556:** 1. Existing 35' height limit to continue! 2. No new Village Hall-contract police to Winnetka like size dept. 3. Improve existing buildings by tax incentive – it's economically sound. 4. Page 35 shows utter ignorance & unlawful blockage of private parking lots. 5. Pages 1, 42 incorrectly use the Kenilworth logo – to look official – wrong. 97% of the "Document" is already published materials including Joe Sears & his Kenilworth to current US census. Almost all of this material is extraneous. Why did we pay so much?

**TOM DAVIS, 604 GREEN BAY ROAD, [tomd@tadavis.com](mailto:tomd@tadavis.com):** As a property owner in the Green Bay Road corridor, I like the ideas of the Plan as proposed. I also think it is essential that it be put into effect so that property owners know what their options are for the future. Once it is in place, the corridor can start to evolve toward what the Village would like it to become. I strongly support it. In particular, I support the cul de sac on Sterling Road, which will solve a pedestrian problem and offer a development opportunity.

**RUSSELL ELDERKIN, 616 ROGER AVENUE:** I am not in favor of the cul de sac that is planned to be built on Sterling.

**ROBERT DEPTULA, 610 ROGER AVENUE:** I would strongly suggest against any commercial development on any land created by building a cul de sac on Sterling Rd near the Intersection of Green Bay Road and Roger Ave.

**LINDA FORSBERG, 521 SHERIDAN ROAD:** I am concerned about the median on Green Bay – if you attempt to slow down traffic it could be a nightmare – if traffic moves fairly fast, then we run the risk that the median will be hit by a fast moving car. In the winter the snowplows/salt may ruin plantings. Many businesses that would have to leave while redevelopment takes place would not come back due to the high cost of relocating. I am not supportive of any restaurants – the low wage workers they attract may not be desirable – the parking situation has me concerned – many people would not like to park in the alley & walk around to the business they are patronizing. You can't assume that all businesses want a rear patron entrance – it is not possible or practical in many cases. Currently, many employees park behind their storefronts. Where would they park? Would any proposed condominiums have to be set aside as "low income housing"? Currently, many rental apartments above stores serve this need. If high priced condos take their place, where do the low income housing units go? If someone makes a proposal to develop an area, I assume there would be public hearings on it so we could know who the "players" are. It is some times difficult for people to pull out of parking spaces depending on the location – you can't add trees & plantings that would make it even more difficult.

**KATHY BARNETT, 626 WAYLAND, 847-251-3475:** There is no existing yield sign at Wayland & Exmoor. There is an existing 4 way stop at Wayland & Sterling.

**RACHEL NOEL, 141 KENILWORTH AVENUE, 847-251-7181:** Please look into reducing/removing street signage along the sides of the roads as it will make driving and walking safer. This is a new concept being tested in Europe with good results! Also-slow down the traffic – have a traffic study – narrow GBR to one lane on each side, have traffic calming measures built in (see Cambridge, MA). GBR needs to be pedestrian friendly for anyone to want to stroll there. Lots of benches – landscaping\* will help as well.

\*Big trees, flowering shrubs.

**CARY D. JOHNSON, 722 ROGER AVENUE, 312-577-7179,**  
[cary\\_johnson@gensler.com](mailto:cary_johnson@gensler.com): Very thorough. My interests are: Green Bay Road redevelopment – yes! Roger intersection; further beach development; train station condition and lack of maintenance.

**VIVIAN VAHLBERG, 530 MELROSE AVENUE, 847-251-4396:** This document is greatly improved over the original. I appreciate its insistence that all development on Green Bay be in keeping with the scale & character of the Village. That is essential. Two edits: Figure 11 – Protecting Existing Residential Neighborhoods – It states that new development should be designed to minimize light – you probably mean to minimize artificial lighting spilling out from the buildings & parking lots to the residential area – which is good. But you also want to maximize natural light on residential properties – which is one of the reasons you are requiring a setback on upper stories at the back, which is very important. This should be spelled out. Roofs & Roofing page – first bullet – don't you mean "upper gables may include windows but are not required to have windows"?

Comments: I would strongly request that the plan set a specific maximum height for commercial buildings on Green Bay Road, in addition to the 3½ story limit so the door is closed to buildings that are too tall & so that we don't get tall steeply pitched roofs like we've had on new houses where they stretched the rules to the limit in order to get a usable extra story. Setting a height limit is precise. Setting a story limit opens the door to interpretations that might not be desirable. Also, it should be made very clear that the 3½ story height is only acceptable if the plan continues to contain the requirement for a setback at the rear above two stories.