
MEMORANDUM

Date: November 15, 2019
To: Jeff Rogers AICP
Cc: Commissioners
From: Adam Sidoti on behalf of concerned residents of Glenview
Re: GW Properties
P2019-024 – 2660 Pfingsten Road – GW Properties Multi-Tenant Retail

Dear Commissioners:

We have submitted several “briefs” on our position relative to the development at Pfingsten and Willow (“The Hart Property”). All of those arguments are incorporated herein and we ask that you please reconsider and revisit the concerns that were expressed. We understand that development needs to occur in this area. Despite frustration on the lack of notice and the inability to discover the ordinance that provided for a change of zoning, we are comfortable with the notion that development must occur.

As residents in a neighborhood that is changing as new people move in and update aging homes, we are keenly aware that progress is critical. We mustn’t allow fear of change to get in the way of progress. Progress must also be responsible. It is alarming that all of the commissioners expressed some concern about the impact a dense development would have on the surrounding area, yet felt powerless to exert their influence to encourage GW Properties to reduce the intensity. As appointed officials, it is our expectation and hope that we will not let strict interpretation of zoning regulation get in the way of responsible development.

Respectfully, Mr. Goltz’s lack of attention to detail has resulted in our return to the Plan Commission. Make no mistake, we are not here because Goltz wants to extend an olive branch to the residents. Materially changing the plans just weeks after gaining the Plan Commission’s recommendation is the latest example of his failure to comply with the village. At some point, we need to ask ourselves when Mr. Goltz will be held accountable.

Members of the commission have used the term intensity to refer to the density of this project. Interestingly, intensity does not contain a legal definition within the municipal code, and thus can be subjectively applied. However, we can rely on precedent. In the Village of Glenview, this would be the first development of its size or greater to fail combine truck/delivery traffic with that of patrons. Jeff Rogers has stated on numerous occasions that this may not be required by code, but it is considered best practice and has a stated impact on mitigating traffic and safety issues. Speaking candidly after the latest Plan Commission meeting, one Commissioner stated that Goltz has “done everything he could to squeeze every dollar out of every space.” While sympathetic to a Developer’s financial constraints, we must not let Goltz’s bottom line get in the way of good sense and safety. With all due respect to experienced truck drivers, we have the option to make this significantly safer and easier, and we are blatantly disregarding it.

Goltz’s latest change to the residential component of the property is now the second time he has acted with complete disregard to the Village of Glenview. Initially, Goltz set out to develop all 8 acres of property, contrary

to the zoning and the Comprehensive Plan. After receiving push back, he then said he was going to build the same development but squeeze it into 6 acres, reserving the southern 2 acres for extension to Charlie Ct, which he would dedicate to Glenview, and for homes. In fact, Goltz tried to curry good favor with the Commission and residents by stating that his improvements to the development via his underground detention would help those existing homes and new homes. After countless changes and re-shapes of the development, including the topography, dimension, location and shape of buildings, he eventually settled on a plan that was put to vote. Goltz has continually made changes and used his go-to phrase of "his team will do it in a first-class way." Thus far, his "first-class" method has resulted in numerous missteps, mistakes, and omissions. More importantly, it has been a drain on the Commission, on the staff, and on the residents. His latest change, again contrary to the comprehensive plan, is a material change to the overall development, and yet it does nothing to solve the main concerns.

All of the commissioners, in passing the plan, expressed concern on traffic. Ciolek was concerned left turns onto Willow, but didn't make any comments about Pfingsten. There is no solution to minimize congestion. Commissioners Witt and Fallon noted that the petitioner has the right to zoning without interference. However, they did have issues with intensity of this use. They are concerned with internal traffic flow, and said it was way too tight. Witt believed more work is needed to constrict size of development so users are safer in terms of turning radius. Her choice would be to tweak the plan to constrict the building.

Burton disagreed, relying on the engineering plans. However, the engineering plans are not complete and are full of mistakes. The engineering plans do show that trucks would have to go up on the curb to make a turn. Bucklin agreed about the traffic concerns, and acknowledged the issues exist particularly in the rush hours. Bucklin was concerned about what people will do to avoid the traffic. He then said he relies on traffic studies, none of which talked about diversion of traffic to local village streets. Bucklin called the intersection "not great," and said the developer has a right to build nonetheless. We do agree. He said the circulation within the site is a real problem for him. He is concerned that they will have to traverse through the parking lot. All these concerns were expressed clearly, but ultimately, with their hands tied to strict interpretation of the zoning, the vote was ultimately in favor of recommending approval.

The plan commission can apply additional restrictions and can also encourage less intensity (lesser build) by the developer. Instead, the Plan Commission, in passing the most recent plan, gave tacit approval to build a development that is nothing short of dangerous. Goltz talked about how every change has an impact. The one change that has been requested is to reduce the buildings to improve circulation. He has failed to do so. Now, Goltz is looking to squeeze yet another dollar out of the plan, by removing the component of the plan that everyone was in favor of. The comprehensive plan is clear, and Goltz has decided that he needs more money, and so decided to change the plans yet again. Even knowing that the Plan Commission has concerns with turning radius, internal circulation and external traffic flow, the only changes Goltz made were those that would positively impact his bottom line. This is not the plan that the Plan Commission approved, and takes a key improvement away from the development.

Respectfully submitted,

Adam Sidoti

Adam Sidoti, Esq., on behalf of concerned residents of Glenview

