

GLENVIEW PLAN COMMISSION

Minutes of Meeting
March 8, 1988

The regular meeting of the Glenview Plan Commission was called to order in the Board Room by Chairman McCreery.

Upon roll call there were

Present: Mrs. Mers, Ms. Appert, Messrs. Geitner, Fuller, McCreery, and Silver

Absent: Mr. Carlson

Also Present: Assistant Director of Development Porter and Village Engineer Jacobson

Minutes of February 23 - approved on motion by Mr. Geitner and seconded by Mr. Silver with the following changes: 1) page 2 and 3, change "Ralph Campbell" to "Rolf Campbell", 2) page 3, 7th line should be Southwest corner instead of Southeast, 3) page 3, 2nd line from the bottom should be "topography" instead of "typography", 4) page 6, 3rd paragraph from bottom insert a comma after Milwaukee, 5) page 8, paragraph 4, add "between two parked cars" at the end of the sentence, 6) page 12, 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence, insert "existing between "some-one's" and "house" and add to the end of that sentence "but there will be some people in the market who wouldn't mind," 7) page 12, 5th line from bottom, insert "proposed" between "of" and "office."

Call of Cases (in order heard)

| | |
|----------------|--|
| <u>P-88-07</u> | <u>2660 Pfingsten, R-4 and B-1 Rezoning</u> |
| <u>P-88-08</u> | <u>2895 Willow Road, R-4 Rezoning</u> |
| <u>P-88-09</u> | <u>Northwest Corner of Willow and Pfingsten B-1 Rezoning</u> |
| <u>P-88-10</u> | <u>2760 Willow Road, B-2 Rezoning</u> |
| <u>P-88-11</u> | <u>Annexation of 1610 Elmdale</u> |
| <u>P-88-12</u> | <u>Ollman's Subdivision, 1125 Lincoln Street</u> |
| <u>P-88-13</u> | <u>Annexation of the Lock-Up, 747 Milwaukee Avenue</u> |

Attorney, Jeffrey Randall, stated that he represented the Village of Glenview, in the matter of applications to amend the zoning districts presently in the Village of Glenview. The applications were made pursuant to authority granted by zoning ordinance of the Village found in Chapter 24, Section 14.09e. The applications include P-88-07, P-88-08, P-88-09 and P-88-10. He requested that these be consolidated since they were all in the same area.

Chairman McCreery agreed to the request but stated that a separate motion would have to be made for each application.

Mr. Randall continued saying that expert testimony would be presented by a land planner, a traffic engineer, an engineer and a real estate appraiser, resumes also included. He gave a brief overview of the 4 applications annexed to the Village of Glenview on March 1, 1988, pursuant to voluntary annexation petitions filed with the Village Clerk. He said the properties were currently zoned R-1 in the vicinity of Willow and Pfingsten, previously zoned R-4 in the county. He placed a map depicting the adjacent sites, and the 4 sites in question: 1) Conter site west of the southwest corner of Willow and Pfingsten approximately 4.6 acres, to be rezoned from R-1 to R-4. 2) Hart parcel at southwest corner of Willow and Pfingsten, approximately 8.5 acres, a portion not to exceed 6.2 acres to be rezoned from R-1 to B-1, provided that there would be an R-4 buffer zone along south boundary line of the parcel. He said that rezoning would not be accepted until either the death of Mr. or Mrs. Hart, the present owners, or 5 years after March 1, 1988. 3) Wirkus property, 10 acres at NE corner to be rezoned to B-2, with the owner maintaining its current use as nursery property. 4) North Shore property, 3 acres, on the northwest corner to be rezoned to B-1.

Chairman McCreery stated that cases for consolidation were noted in the Chicago Tribune on February 20, 1988. He also stated that the surrounding property owners were notified. In addition, he had Asst. Director Porter swear in all witnesses who would be presenting before the Commission.

Ms. Porter verified to Mr. Randall that all necessary documentation had been submitted in support of petitioners application.

Mr. Rolf Campbell, Rolf Campbell & Assoc., 51-L Sherwood Terrace, Lake Bluff, city planning zoning consultant representing the Village of Glenview said he was very familiar with all of the surrounding properties in question. He said that in addition to the proposed properties he had reviewed the properties to the east and the west, and he felt there were five area of responsibilities: 1) Land use, particularly what exists. 2) Zoning classifications and recommendations, 3) Land planning, showing the method by which the properties could be developed, 4) Site amenities including vegetation and architecture and 5) Impact on the school and the Village in terms of tax revenue.

Mr. Campbell stated the petitioner was proposing to rezone the intersection into a commercial classification, B-1 and B-2 including the Wirkus property at the northeast corner from R-1 to B-2; the North Shore property at the northwest corner to B-1; the southwest corner which is a portion of the Hart property to B-1 from R-1; the southern portion of the property to R-4. Mr. Campbell displayed a land use and zoning exhibit outlining the site locations. The exhibit represented 1) the single family, residential use of the property, 2) the commer-

cial or retail use, 3) the public or quasi-public use, and 4) the vacant properties awaiting development. He stated that two of the main quadrants of the intersection were used and zoned for commercial purposes. He pointed out that in the northwest corner, North Shore property, part of the property was vacant and part of the property contained a single family home. He said immediately to the north the property was used as a day care center and was part of the Village of Northbrook. He said the southwest corner was the Hart residence and adjacent to that, the Conter property, both presently used with one single family home. The property to the west of the Conter property was rezoned to R-4 and was being developed for a single family residential subdivision. He said the portion just south of the Hart property was a retention basin and was installed as part of Al Miller's development when the Willows was installed. He said the property around the shopping center and the Wirkus property was currently zoned in Northbrook or Glenview for single family residential homes. The property to the east of the Wirkus property was the site of the Church.

Mr. Campbell produced an overlay of the existing zoning classifications and the bearing upon the recommendations made for the zoning proposal. He stated that the current zoning classification was R-1 for all subject properties. He said the Plaza del Prado shopping center was a planned development for commercial purposes, the land to the south and west was zoned R-4, and the property immediately adjacent to that to the west was zoned R-3. He said the property to the north of the North Shore property was zoned R-1 in Northbrook and further north was a combination of R-4 and R-6 all in the Village of Northbrook, along with the church property, zoned IB. The properties in unincorporated Cook County were zoned R-4.

Mr. Campbell stated that the subject properties draw their character from the intersection at Willow and Pflingsten, and two of the properties at that intersection were already used for commercial purposes, one in being in Glenview. He said that the Wirkus property was used for commercial and was part of one of the special uses in unincorporated Cook County to allow the use to continue and he felt it was appropriate to have it zoned in Glenview for commercial purposes. He said from a land use viewpoint and zoning viewpoint, the four corners should be zoned in a similar classification to consolidate the corner and make each of the uses compatible to each other. He said the properties also draw their character in part from Willow, a major facility with commercial property located along it and from Pflingsten, also a major thoroughfare. He said the transition between the commercial uses falls along a rear property line to maintain the separation from commercial and residential.

Mr. Campbell showed Petitioner's Exhibit 3, Land Use & Zoning Exhibit and Petitioner's Exhibit 4, Site Plan. He stated that the site plan was not intended to show how the property would be developed, but demonstrated how the property could typically be developed. He stated the Wirkus property would continue to operate in its current capacity.

The northwest and southwest corners had been designed into neighborhood type specialty centers with boutique-type uses. The property along the north would contain approximately 22,500 sq. ft. of retail use located on 2.8 acres with one access off Willow and one off Pfingsten, in both cases lining up with access points across the street. The Hart property containing 44,500 sq. ft. of space on 6.2 acres, was also shown as a shopping center-type use with a portion designated as a restaurant with additional parking, and the remaining portion for retail uses. The corner building would be a combination office/financial institution. The access points would be off Willow, lining up with the boutique center to the north and one at Pfingsten, lining up with Plaza del Prado. On the southern portion of the Hart property, shown as R-4, 10,000 sq. ft., having single family residential lots. He said that three of the lots face and contain access from a road to the north, so both lots would back up to existing single family lots in the development to the south. He said the other 3 sites are reversed with the road pointing south so the road lines up with one of the access points of the shopping center and the rear yards would back up to the shopping center. He said this would provide a better transition between commercial to residential if the two uses backed up to each other, rather than face along the same street. He said that adjacent to the western and southern line of the commercial portion of the Hart property, 30' had been set aside for a buffer with screening and landscaping. The Conter property to the west contained 14 single family residential home sites. He said that just west of that was the Semar development which turned and extended north coming off Willow and that the residential area would have 2 access points at Pfingsten and Willow. He stated that there were other options for development. He said the southern portion of the Hart property, 2.37 acres, would have 6 lots for the Harts and 14 lots on 4.63 acres for the Conter property.

Mr. Campbell then addressed Exhibit 5, School and Tax Impact Study. He said the Illinois School Consulting Service was also used. The studies showed 12 K-8 elementary school children and 4 high school children for a total population of 64 people. Combining the residential and commercial portions, the total tax was based on 15 3-bedroom homes and 5 4-bedroom homes at a price range of \$275,000 - \$300,000, representing a total market value of \$5.5 million. The 22,000 sq. ft. for the boutique center and 44,500 sq. ft. for the shopping center, represented a total market value of \$2.5 million, for a grand total of \$8 million market value, adjusted to an assessed value of \$3,814,790. He said that the equalize value against the current tax rate would result in annual taxes of \$320,000 per year for all taxing bodies, \$38,000 to the Village of Glenview, \$14,000 to the Park District, \$113,000 to School District 30 and \$80,000 to High School District 225. He said the projected share of retail sales taxes to the Village of Glenview would be about \$78,000 per year not including additional fees such as building permits, zoning fees, etc.

Mr. Campbell proceeded with the landscape concept plan for the development and distributed Exhibit 6, Existing Vegetation Impact. He said

there was nothing of major significance to be saved in terms of potential landscaping. He stated that the maple trees on the North Shore property fell adjacent to the right of way and could be preserved. The bulk of the rest of the materials which was second growth materials had not been maintained in a condition that could be conducive to moving, but the few remaining items of nursery stock could be saved and moved.

To summarize, Mr. Campbell reviewed the items on the fact sheet. He said it had been established that the land use for this area had been commercial and should probably continue that way and therefore the two properties being proposed for commercial use should be approved. He said the request for the southern half of the Hart property and Conter property was in line with the surrounding residential properties. He said that Exhibit 4 dealing with the contemplated use of the property showed only a suggested use of the property. Mr. Campbell said that with regard to the public benefit the proposed project would provide a positive tax impact and a need in the community in the way of shopping, housing and jobs for local people.

Mr. Campbell also explained that the school system was adequate to accommodate the projected population of children. With regard to the impact on the neighborhood property, he stated that buffers would be provided.

Mr. Silver asked Mr. Campbell that based on the zoning, if there would be a negative market value. Mr. Campbell stated that the value question was related to the use of adjoining property and there would be no adverse affect on the market value. He said that if the properties were developed as recommended, there would be a positive affect on the people who own the land. He stated that in his opinion R1 was not the best use of the property and was intended only until the Village or property owners request a zoning classification, and that commercial zoning would be the best use for the corner properties.

In response to Mr. Fuller's question, Mr. Campbell advised that the current use of the northern third of the Wirkus property was for nursery stock with a barn in the north portion.

As a point of order, Chairman McCreery acknowledged acceptance of petitioner's witnesses.

Mr. Darrell Wright, professional engineer, and President of James J. Benes and Assoc., Inc., 1100 Jorie Blvd., Oak Brook, IL. stated that his firm provides engineering services for the Tollway and Department of Transportation and other municipalities in the Chicago area. He said his firm was asked to look at the traffic impact of the purposed rezoning. He stated he first looked at the existing conditions were at Pfingsten & Willow Roads. He said there were traffic counts available from the Chicago Area Transportation Study. He explained that existing conditions characterized in the morning by the Level of Service C and in the evening, Level of Service D, with A being the best and F being

the worst condition. He stated that C and D were considered acceptable operating conditions and improvements would not be provided for either. He said the proposed development was looked at next using the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation rates, the residential use of single family homes and the shopping center. He said they estimated the number of trips that would enter and leave the developments during the peak hours of the morning and evening. He said the trips were evaluated and the volume would increase in the morning by about 1% and during the evening the combination of residential and commercial activity would increase the volume by about 7%, which was still within Level of Service D. He also said that additional improvements in the roadway would not be required due to the development of the subject properties but they would recommend that the development of the property should anticipate a right turn lane on the approaches.

Chairman McCreery asked Mr. Wright if there was any way to assess the future impact on the intersection after development of the Hart parcel, and Mr. Wright stated that the figures quoted assumed that all four parcels being fully developed as described.

Mr. Wright also answered a question from Mr. Silver, stating that they applauded the way the driveways were moved from the intersections and they were lined up across from each other. He said this would allow the turning movements to occur without conflicting with each other, rather than the driveways being staggered.

Mr. Carl Kupfer, P.E., 6215 Touhy, Chicago, stated he was requested by the Village to determine the reliability, accessibility and availability of infrastructure for the proposed rezoning. He stated that having worked in this area he had a substantial knowledge of existing conditions. He presented Exhibit 8, Utility Map and pointed out that there was a Metropolitan Sanitary District 16" sewer south on Pflingsten and east on Willow. He said there was an existing storm water collection system within the Miller development, draining south and connected to that was Semar and Porter Court. He said the shopping center and Westfield subdivision drained northerly and up into the Metropolitan Sanitary District line. He said a 12" arterial water main extends to the entrance of Plaza del Prado and north and west from there connecting with the Semar subdivision was a 12" main. He explained that west from there the Village had a master plan to design a water main that would connect to the proposed site. He said that within the subdivision to the south of Willow there was a grid iron of 6" and 8" mains carrying up to and connecting with the main on Willow Road. Plaza del Prado also had a loop around the rear through the Westfield subdivision and connecting to the distribution system. He said the system was well interconnected and would be better after the water main was connected.

Mr. Kupfer continued saying that the proposed uses were generally light users. He said the distribution system could handle the increase and the 12" loop was adequate for fire protection. Plaza del Prado's storm water drains southerly through the detention basin of the Westfield

subdivision. The properties to the west of Pfingsten drain through the subject properties south and west and split to the southerly direction through the middle of the site, and the south half of those properties drain toward the existing detention basin and through the Miller development. The property to the north of Willow was in a different watershed. He said he felt the sanitary sewers were adequate and it was his opinion that the utilities were adequate and would be enhanced with the proposed zoning.

In response to Mr. Geitner's question regarding the Miller detention basin, Mr. Kupfer stated that the south half of the Hart property drains into the Miller detention basin and that the future development of that property would have to incorporate the storm water detention. The impact would be unchanged. He said it could be relocated onto the Hart property for homes that would be built there.

Mr. Kenneth T. Polach, MAI, RM, of William A. McCann & Assoc., Inc., 414 North Orleans, Chicago, stated that he had been involved in the acquisition of real estate for the past 18 years and during that time he had appraised residential, commercial, industrial and special properties throughout the Chicago area. He said he was asked to analyze the properties with respect to the highest and best use of the property and to establish the effect of the rezoning on the adjoining properties. He said he inspected the subject property and surrounding areas to determine the present use. He brought forth Exhibit 9, Photo Exhibit of the surrounding properties. He identified photographs of the subject properties as well as all of the surrounding residential and commercial properties.

Mr. Polach stated that the homes in the area were on lots generally from 10,000 sq. ft. to 2 acres in size. The more recent development occurred on smaller lots of 10,000-13,000 sq. ft., occurring primarily along Willow Road. He said home prices ranged from \$250,000-\$400,000+. Based upon the studies he examined including the development plans, the engineering study, the traffic engineer's study and the tax impact studies, as well as market data for similar properties throughout the area, he felt that the proposed rezoning was consistent with the trend in the area consisting of commercial development at the intersection with single family residential development surrounding the intersection, and it was consistent with the highest and best uses of the property.

Mr. Polach stated he also analyzed whether the proposed rezoning would have an affect on the adjoining parcels. He said the Conter property was adjoining a developing subdivision which are similar in nature to what would be developed under the proposed zoning. The Hart property would have residential development buffering existing residential development to the south, and development of the Conter property to the west could be planned to minimize any affect by the Hart development of commercial. It could be developed so that rear yards would be abutting the commercial portion which would provide an adequate transi-

tion. The North Shore property, proposed for commercial zoning, and adjoining properties were single family residences on large acreage sites which contain homes a sufficient distance from the property line, and would not be affected by the zoning of that property. He said the Wirkus property is adjoined by single family residences to the north and by the church property to the east. He said this was an existing use and would continue, so it would have no detrimental impact on the property. He concluded that the proposed rezoning represented the highest and best use of the properties and would not have a detrimental impact on the adjoining properties.

Chairman McCreery acknowledged a letter from Mr. & Mrs. Arnold Gaffen outlining their understanding of a situation relevant to the Wirkus property wherein the northernmost boundary was to have a 7" fence buffered with 12' trees. The letter stated that the fence was in significant disrepair and the trees were not there.

Mr. Randall responded that the property was now under the authority of the Glenview Building and Zoning Department. He thought the letter should be addressed to the proper authorities at the Village. He also responded to Mr. Silver that he was not aware of what was in the letter from the Gaffens, and he did not know what conditions were imposed on the Wirkus' in Cook County.

Mr. Fuller stated that if the Wirkus property were rezoned that there was a requirement for screening in B-2, but the exact nature would have to be determined.

Mr. Silver explained that B-2 zoning does not state what the screening requirements are.

Mr. McCreery then acknowledged a letter from Mr. & Mrs. Robert Brandt, 3836 Miller Drive, Glenview, dated March 1, 1988. He said the letter stated an objection to the proposed rezoning because of a severe increase in traffic and additional congestion at the corner of Willow and Pfingsten.

The public hearing was then opened to the floor for public comment.

Mr. Robert Brandt, Willows resident, stated that his property abuts to the subject property considered for rezoning. He presented a petition signed by neighboring residents against the business rezoning at Willow and Pfingsten. The residents wished to keep the area at the current status due to congestion of traffic. He said he was surprised to see the number of witnesses that were brought forth by the petitioner. He said he considered himself as an expert witness because he had lived there for 14 years. He said he wasn't happy with what was happening to the community and he contested some of the testimony from the witnesses with regard to the traffic congestion. He said the traffic on Willow gets so bad that he has to detour on the side streets through Northbrook to get home from work. He said the Tollway causes a lot of rush

hour back up and he questioned the days the traffic studies were done. He said he called the Village Manager of Northbrook, since they had made a motion to annex the properties in question, and he was told that they opposed the rezoning of the property for commercial use and if annexed into Northbrook it would not be rezoned for business use. He said that what was being proposed would be detrimental to the residents and all of the people that travel on Willow and Pfingsten.

Mr. Brandt continued saying that the Plaza del Prado shopping center had never been fully occupied and currently has vacant stores. In view of this, he did not understand the need for additional stores. He said that if the residents had known what was being proposed that there would be thousands of people protesting it.

Mr. Terry Palmer, 3823 Miller Drive, Glenview stated he lives opposite the retention pond. He pointed out that the pond was filled in several years ago because it was not needed after a large sewer project was completed. He said according to the witnesses the pond would be needed again. He stated that during the rain in the fall, the retention pond flooded into his front yard. He said the proposed property would generate approximately \$115,000 tax base to the Village. He suggested that possibly the rezoning was due to the fact that the Village would benefit from these taxes. He didn't feel additional commercial property was needed and the traffic at Willow and Pfingsten was already congested. He said that more homes were wanted in the area, and the Hart and Conter property should be developed as residential. He also thought the properties to the north should stay residential. He didn't understand why Glenview was in favor of developing the area as commercial. He stated that even though the residents received a notice of the hearing, that no maps were included which would have been very helpful. He said he also didn't feel that the retention area had been maintained by the Village. He felt that the shoppers from Plaza del Prado deposited their garbage there and it was the residents who cleaned it up.

Mr. Tom Lang, 3835 Miller, Glenview, stated he had lived in his house since 1975 and moved there because of the open atmosphere. He stated that the speed limit on Miller Drive was 20 MPH but people drove down Miller at 9:00 or 10:00 p.m. after visiting the Plaza del Prado shopping center at 40-45 MPH, and left empty beverage containers on residents' property. He affirmed that there were vacant store in Plaza del Prado since it opened and felt that additional boutiques would only be in business 2-3 years. He also stated that people used Miller Drive as a thoro fare to get around Willow Road. He said he didn't believe the property values would increase with additional commercial development. He finally stated he was adamantly opposed to any rezoning that would create additional commercial property at Pfingsten and Willow.

Mr. Richard Stein, 3908 Miller Drive, Glenview, stated he lived there for 7 years and initially moved there because of the landscaping. He said he was surprised that the Village was representing the other side

without making an effort to consult the people who live in the area to obtain their views. He said he was present during the ITW hearings and the development adjacent to Porter Court and the attorneys were representing the developer. He said he was surprised that the attorneys were now representing the Village. He questioned the expert witnesses regarding the age of the traffic study and whether the Commission considered the traffic studies made when the proposed changes were made for the ITW property.

Mr. Stein continued to question the statement about the best use of the property drawing from the character of the adjacent properties since the property west of Pfingsten was residential. He also made reference to the right turn lane into the commercial property from a westbound auto on Willow, possibly turning around in a driveway past Pfingsten. He echoed the statement about the shopping center being for the public benefit, since the current shopping center was not filled. He stated he also would have liked to receive a copy of the proposed plan before the meeting.

Mr. Wright was questioned by Mr. Randall, responding to the traffic questions asked. He said the counts were taken by the Chicago Area of Transportation Study in 1985, after the tollway interchange was built and there were only small changes since that time period.

Mr. Campbell responded to Mr. Randall's questions regarding the commercial character of the surrounding areas and said that there were 2 main factors 1) the land uses adjacent to the property and 2) the thoroughfares that it draws access from, the subject property having 2 main thoroughfares carrying large volumes of traffic. In addition, the two commercial properties in question were across the street from commercial property, making the transition between like uses. He said he felt that the 2 properties on the northwest and southwest corner should be commercial, drawing their character from the other commercial properties and that they do have potential for commercial development.

Mr. Randall responded to a statement made by Mr. Brandt who spoke with Mr. Weidaw, the Village Manager of Northbrook about the area never being developed for commercial if annexed to Northbrook. Mr. Alan Schinderman, property owner at northwest corner of Willow and Pfingsten, stated he had spoken to Mr. Weidaw in late January or early February, 1988, and was told that he favored commercial development at that corner.

Ann Stimmer, 3831 Miller, resident for 14 years, stated that she didn't consider Pfingsten as a major thoroughfare. She stated she moved to the area because of the privacy in their back yards that she felt was in jeopardy with the proposed rezoning. She also said that getting across Pfingsten would worsen with additional commercial property.

Mr. Richard Weiss, 2735 Prince, Northbrook said he felt the major consideration was traffic and he didn't believe the C or D ratings, based

on the traffic between the Tollway and Pfingsten around 5:00 or 5:30 p.m. He also questioned the impact on home values. He agreed that commercial properties would create significant financial gains for a tax base. He also questioned the rezoning of Wirkus if it were to stay as is. He continued saying that he thought the omission of reading the Gaffen letter into the record was a disregard of the municipalities for the people living in the area. He also said he didn't understand the letters received by the residents regarding the meeting. He said the residents were not aware of the proposed rezoning. He also questioned the transition from his property abutting Wirkus, if Wirkus were zoned commercial, and questioned whether there would be a buffer zone.

Mr. Weiss continued that he felt the main consideration was traffic and that the traffic would increase considerably with additional commercial properties. He asked Mr. Polach's opinion as to the effect the proposed rezoning would have on the residents directly behind the properties. He said thought the properties would be adversely affected.

Mr. Polach said the affect of the proposed rezoning on the surrounding property was examined, and in each case in which the properties were situated, the rezoning would be buffered or placed so as not to have a negative impact on the existing values.

Chairman McCreery commented on the letter from the Gaffen's not being read into the record, saying that he mentioned it to enter it into the record, but didn't read the entire letter because of the time factor and everyone on the Commission had received a copy of it.

Mr. Weiss asked why Wirkus was requesting a change in the zoning if they wanted to maintain a status quo.

Mr. Randall responded that the Wirkus property was being annexed into the Village as R-1, residential, one acre lots. Petitioner was making application to conform what Wirkus has to existing zoning. He stated that Wirkus did not have to stay as a nursery if rezoning occurred, although it was his understanding that no modifications would be made.

Mr. Silver stated that a nursery was zoned in the Village as B-3, which is a very broad category of business and B-2 was being applied for, which is more restrictive. He said this would limit Wirkus more than with the current limitations.

Mr. Wright responded that the evaluation assumed Wirkus would remain as is. He said other alternatives were not looked into. He reiterated that there was very little business activity during the morning rush hour. He said he couldn't say how much higher the evening traffic would be.

Chairman McCreery responded to questions from Mr. Weiss regarding the validity of the traffic studies if the subject properties were not to

remain as proposed. He said that there were always uncertainties, but the Commission had to look at what was currently being proposed.

Barbara Gaffen, 2725 Prince, Northbrook questioned the restriction on the Harts. Mr. Randall reconfirmed that the rezoning would not take affect until 5 years or the death of Mr. or Mrs. Hart. Ms. Gaffen asked why a similar restriction couldn't be placed on Wirkus. She asked what eventually could be built there. She stated her concerns were regarding the 15 children who lived behind Wirkus should they stumble on the machinery or rubble. She said that there was only 1/3 of a fence as a buffer.

Mr. Randall responded by saying that the B-2 regulations provide that if a lot adjoins a residential district, screening would be provided at the lot line, and Mr. Wirkus would have to comply with the Village regulations now that his property was annexed into Glenview. He said he wasn't familiar with Cook County regulations, but the Village would look into the matter of the fence to comply with zoning regulations. He suggested that Ms. Gaffen bring her questions to the Building and Development Department.

Chairman McCreery explained that the situation with the County zoning was not an issue, but his concern was that any recommendation made by the Commission to the Board carried with it the requirements of the ordinances, and that there would be a buffer. He said the Commission could specify what the buffer would be. He mentioned that the petitioner was not aware of the issue of the buffer, and he didn't think it was fair for petitioner to have to answer before he could read the letter.

Sheila Firestein, 4118 Chester Drive, Willow resident for 10 years, said that since Plaza del Prado had been built she knew of 27 stores that had gone out of business. She said she couldn't understand the need for more stores when so many had gone out of business.

Mr. Stein asked why the Village was the petitioner for the proposed rezoning and not the property owners.

Mr. Randall responded that in Chapter 24, Section 14.9d, the Village of Glenview was exercising its rights to seek amendments of the zoning ordinance. He said the Board of Trustees thought it was in the best interest of the Village to rezone the proposed properties.

Chairman McCreery also stated that this was not exceptional.

Mr. Louis Triebold, Glenview resident, asked if it would be proper to buffer the northern third of the Wirkus property adjoining the Church.

Chairman McCreery said that it would come about if that part of the parcel were to be developed for something other than its continued use

as a nursery. He said plans would come before the Commission for such a change and a buffer would be looked into at that time.

Mr. Weiss clarified to Mr. Fuller that there were no residences on the Wirkus property but there were residences abutting to it.

Mr. Randall pointed out that there was a house to the west of the barn facing Pfingsten on the Wirkus property and that the structure on Willow Road is an office and not used as a residence.

Mr. Brandt stated that the residents of Northbrook and Glenview were opposing the rezoning of the entire area and not singling out any particular property. He said that if the residents had known what they were up against that thousands of people would support the opposition. He said that the residents did not want any more business or congestion.

Mr. Weiss echoed what Mr. Brandt said about the residents not being informed about what was going on. He said he felt they were not given an opportunity to prepare for the meeting.

Ms. Stimmer stated that only the Miller Road residents were notified by the Village of the meeting.

Chairman McCreery responded that these points were well taken. He said that the Village notified the adjacent property owners as specified by the Village ordinance. He said he recognized the need for the property owners to be notified more extensively, and that the issue of distributing maps would be helpful. He said that perhaps a better job could be done with regard to better informing the residents.

Mr. Silver commented that some suburbs posted signs with regard to hearings for rezoning. He further explained that when the annexation occurred, Northbrook's only publication was the legal notices of properties without an address or name for referral. He said he felt that the Village of Glenview always tried to do a good job in publishing and sending out such notices.

Mr. Alan Matchit, 3840 Miller Drive reiterated what his neighbors said. He questioned if a recommendation would be made to the Village Board or if the Commission would be willing to continue the hearing so the property owners could come with more support. He said he felt the issue was that the rezoning would allow 3 corners to commercialize and that there was no commercial property west of Pfingsten on Willow to the Tollway. He also felt the character of the neighborhood would change.

Chairman McCreery responded that it could be continued, and it was the Commission's responsibility to debate the circumstances, evidence and discussion and put together a decision to continue it or make a recommendation to the Board. He said that it was the Board's decision to accept the recommendation or reject it.

Mr. Randall stated that the Village ordinances were adhered to for the rezoning proposals. He suggested that if the residents felt that changes in the notification requirements should be made, that they present them to the Village Manager and the Board. Mr. Randall continued saying that he did not feel a continuance of the hearing would be purposeful, and that additional residents would only echo the sentiments presented. He summed up saying that based on the expert testimony given, the petitioner felt the recommendation should be to grant the application as submitted.

Mr. Fuller explained that it was the Commission's responsibility to hear the arguments both pro and con. He said the Commission would make recommendations to the Board, and it would be the Board's final decision to approve or not to approve the proposed rezoning.

Chairman McCreery agreed with Mr. Fuller. He said he didn't feel that additional residents echoing what had been stated would uncover any new issues. He felt all the facts had been presented before the Commission. Mr. McCreery then opened the discussion for the Commissioners.

Mr. Fuller stated his concerns were regarding the traffic and the numbers for the Wirkus property if it was further developed. He said he thought an additional turning lane could be a requirement.

Chairman McCreery agreed with the traffic issue and said that the Commission had always been concerned with the traffic in that area.

Lois Matchin, 3840 Miller Drive, commented that there was a park on Miller and that more traffic would be a hindrance for the children playing in the park.

Mr. Silver stated that even though there was discussion about new shopping centers for the proposed property, there actually had been no proposal as to what exactly would be built, and the proposal was only for rezoning. He said that anything that would happen in the future would have to be brought before the Commission. He explained that another choice would be for residential rezoning, and could possibly include townhomes. He said he didn't think that single family homes would be desirable there. He mentioned that east of the site, Northbrook had zoned it R-5, being the highest single family homes. He said it was townhome development that brought in the large volume of traffic and further east was another townhome complex. He said there was additional vacant property that Northbrook would be zoning for commercial or multi-family homes. He summed up by saying that Northbrook established high density property, and even though the Northbrook Village said they would not develop any property along Willow commercial, residential could also mean multi-family homes. Mr. Silver said he felt that this type of zoning would mean more traffic than boutique-type shops. He said he would definitely oppose another Plaza del Prado at the subject site.

Mr. Geitner stated that he had family living on Miller Drive, and he was familiar with the traffic problems, but due to the fact that further development of the subject property would have to be approved by the Commission, he felt that the proposed zoning would be the best use for this property.

Mr. Appert said she could only echo the thoughts of the other Commissioners and it was part of the Commission's responsibility to examine the facts as unemotionally as possible and make a decision. She agreed with Mr. Silver that the subject site be zoned for commercial use.

Mr. Fuller stated that he thought the biggest problem was concerning the northern end of the Wirkus property and the commitment for a buffer, and he would be in favor of a buffer to protect the residents.

Mr. Geitner said he wondered if the retention basin could eventually be turned into land for homes, and possibly a buffer for the street would be necessary.

Mr. Fuller said his understanding was that the retention basin was currently being used as a retention basin and could not be used for building additional homes.

Mrs. Mers stated that she didn't think anyone would buy a home at Willow and Pfingsten if it were zoned for residential. She said she felt there was no other alternative for zoning besides commercial. She also said that the Village never zoned for commercial for the sole purpose of tax benefits. She said that ITW had been turned down, which would have brought in thousands of dollars.

Chairman McCreery added that the most important issue was the one of traffic and its impact on everyone using the corner of Pfingsten and Willow. He explained that there were no solutions to the traffic problem and it could get worse before it got better. The changes made to the intersection would at best only keep up with the increase in traffic. He said it was that the feeling of the residents that any changes would bring about more unwanted traffic, but he felt the best scenario was the one being proposed. He explained that Stage 1 of the project was the rezoning, and further developments would have to be brought before the Commission. He liked the fact that the Wirkus property would remain as is and the North Shore property would be a limited development of boutique shops, from a traffic standpoint. He stated that the vacant stores in Plaza del Prado were the developer's concerns. He said that he would like to see a buffer built into the recommendation for the southwest property and felt this was a good compromise for people living next to commercial property. He concluded by saying that he was sympathetic to what was voiced at the hearing, but felt that the proposal was better than many other alternatives.

Ms. Appert asked if the Commission could recommend to the Village Board to examine a stop sign at Miller Drive.

Chairman McCreery stated that recommendations had been made on ancillary issues and the points being raise about traffic from outside their neighborhood impacting their lives should be addressed and the information would be forwarded to the Village Manager's office and the Police Department to deal with it.

In response to a question from Mr. Brandt, Chairman McCreery explained that the Board decided to make a recommendation to rezone the proposed properties, and it was the Plan Commission's responsibility to respond to proposals made to the Village.

Mr. Matchin pointed out that even though the Commissioners could not conceive of residential homes at the corners of Willow and Pfingsten, the Hart property did have a home on it behind the shrubbery.

Mr. Silver commented that Mr. Hart lived there before the area had been developed and before traffic problems became evident.

Mr. Randall suggested that regarding the buffer, the Board may want to hold back because the structures along the northern boundary of the Wirkus property was part of Northbrook.

Mr. Fuller stated that 20 years ago there was no activity at the corner of Willow and Pfingsten and it was necessary to look at the area as it exists now and for the future, and he felt that there was a need to look at the proposal and determine if it was acceptable. He said he also felt that the boundary on the Wirkus property should be buffered.

Mr. Silver stated that with regard to the Wirkus property, if a 100 ft. buffered were to be recommended it would take out 48,000 sq. ft. from the property or one acre from the 6 or 7 acres in use. He said he felt this would take away from the Wirkus property unjustly and would put Mr. Wirkus in a compromising position. He said he thought that the time to look at the buffer would be when the property was subdivided in the future, but the problem of appropriate screening as required by zoning should be looked into.

Mr. Fuller pointed out that the Commission could incorporate the recommendation of a buffer on the Wirkus property to the Board at the time of zoning, the alternative being the recommendation for zoning and recommended use. He specified the buffer as being devoted to landscape planning. He said the buffer could be anywhere from one foot to 100 ft., and there were no requirements built into the ordinance.

Mr. Geitner stated that he felt there were two separate buffer issues.

Chairman McCreery said he was concerned about the issues, but he felt it was appropriate for the buffer issue to come about at a later date

after further development on the Wirkus property. He felt it was important for the issues to be raised, but the recommendations should only be made for the buffer along the northern edge of the Wirkus property to meet the needs of the residents in that area.

Mr. Fuller said that he was looking at the buffer issue from an aesthetic impact and that the residents were concerned about their children getting onto the Wirkus property. Ordinance did not specify a fence, only screening and vegetation.

Ms. Appert stated that one question not addressed was whether the residents had complained to the County, and if a remedy would be made with regard to the fence.

Mr. McCreery agreed that it was an important issue, and he would have liked to see a recommendation put forward to the Board.

Mr. Fuller moved, seconded by Mrs. Mers that in the matter of P-88-07, the Plan Commission recommends approval of the application for rezoning of 2660 Pfingsten from R-1 to B-1 and R-4.

Upon roll call the vote was:

Ayes: Ms. Appert, Mrs. Mers and Messrs. Geitner, Fuller, Silver and McCreery.
Nays: None
Motion carried.

Mr. Fuller moved, seconded by Mrs. Mers that in the matter of P-88-08, the Plan Commission recommends approval for rezoning of 2895 Willow Road from R-1 to R-4 and meets the criteria by the ordinance.

Upon roll call the vote was:

Ayes: Ms. Appert, Mrs. Mers and Messrs. Geitner, Fuller, Silver and McCreery.
Nays: None.
Motion carried.

Mr. Fuller moved, seconded by Ms. Appert that in the matter of P-88-09, the Plan Commission recommends approval for rezoning of the northwest corner of Willow and Pfingsten from R-1 to B-1.

Upon roll call the vote was:

Ayes: Ms. Appert, Mrs. Mers and Messrs. Geitner, Fuller, Silver and Silver.
Nays: None.
Motion carried.

Moved by Ms. Appert and seconded by Mrs. Mers that in the matter of P-88-13, the Plan Commission recommends approval of the annexation of the Lock-Up at 747 Milwaukee Avenue.

Upon roll call the vote was:

Ayes: Ms. Appert, Mrs. Mers and Messrs. Geitner, Fuller, Silver and McCreery.

Nays: None

Motion carried.

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Francine Flaminio

1
2
3
4

