

**Village of Lemont**  
**Planning and Zoning Commission**  
Regular Meeting of August 21, 2013

A meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission of the Village of Lemont was held at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, August 21, 2013 in the second floor Board Room of the Village Hall, 418 Main Street, Lemont, Illinois.

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**A. Pledge of Allegiance**

Commissioner Sanderson called the meeting to order at 6:36 p.m. He then led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**B. Verify Quorum**

Upon roll call the following were:

Present: Kwasneski, McGleam, Messer, Sullivan, Sanderson

Absent: Maher and Spinelli

Planning and Economic Development Director Charity Jones, Planner Martha Glas, and Village Trustee Ron Stapleton were also present.

**C. Approval of Minutes**

Commissioner Kwasneski made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McGleam to approve the minutes from the July 17, 2013 meeting with no changes. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

**II. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS**

Commissioner Sanderson stated that Chairman Spinelli was not present tonight, so he will be leading the meeting.

**III. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

None

**IV. ACTION ITEMS**

**A. Lemont 2030 – Comp Plan Update Status Review**

Presentation to be made at meeting.

Mrs. Jones stated because there are several new people on the Commission, she would like to go over a presentation that talks about the Comprehensive Plan in general and

our current Comprehensive Plan. She said the planning process is a continuous circle of observing: create plans, implement plans, and then evaluate the implementation of the plans. She stated a few principles to keep in mind for good local planning are continuing, inclusive, consensus based, integrated, coordinated and sustainable. Mrs. Jones said there are several different types of plans. Some mentioned were Comprehensive Plan, Sub Area Plan, Economic Development Plans, Capital Improvement Plans, and Bike and Pedestrian Plans. She stated some of the tools that are used to implement the Plans are regulations and initiatives.

Mrs. Jones said in Illinois, Comprehensive Plans are not regulatory but are more advisory. She stated they can cover up to a mile and half beyond the municipal limits and they do have to be reviewed by the Plan Commission. She said lastly they are adopted by the Village Board.

Mrs. Jones said the Comprehensive Plan is the center piece of your local planning program. She stated it is the framework within all the other plans and activities of the Village should function. She said it is the guiding principles for the Village's day to day operations. Mrs. Jones further stated that they provided the basis for land use decisions. She said they are based on public input and consensus. She stated the plan is formally adopted so there is an expectation by the public that the plan will be upheld. Even though the Comprehensive Plan is not regulatory it is considered by the Court.

Mrs. Jones stated the typical components of a Comprehensive Plan is background, data and analysis, public participation, functional elements, maps, capital improvement schedule, and general improvement schedule. She said some of the functional elements which are generally addressed in a Comprehensive Plan are land use, natural resources/environment, transportation/mobility, economic development, housing, community facilities, and historic preservation. Mrs. Jones talked briefly on each these subjects.

Mrs. Jones said Comprehensive Plans are usually long range, which is about 20 to 30 years. She stated they are based on facts and values. The Comprehensive Plans can get really big, so you need to focus on inspiration, clarity and priority. She said the Plan is the only place where the community memorializes its vision for the Village. She stated that vision should inspire action. Developers and homeowners can look at the Plan and see where Lemont is going and who they are. Mrs. Jones stated as far as priority, the Plan does address many things. She said you really need to focus on priority so it is an actionable document.

Mrs. Jones stated in 2011 they did a survey with the community. She said they had 416 respondents. There was a good geographic distribution with a decent distribution of age groups. She stated out of that survey they created the vision statement and guiding principles.

Mrs. Jones then went through what the survey covered and the response they received.

Mrs. Jones stated during the public workshop that presented the findings of the survey, the draft vision statement was created. Some of the completed items since the fall of 2011 are the vision statements for each of the elements, the Active Transportation Plan, and the Target Industries Report, a draft Economic Development Element, and a draft Housing Element. She stated for those Commissioners who have not seen any of those documents she would be willing to give them what was provided in the past. Mrs. Jones said to expect to see the draft economic development and draft housing element again.

Mrs. Jones said tonight they will look at some preliminary information related to transportation and mobility element and the natural resources and recreational element. She stated next month they will see drafts for those two elements and the introduction to built environment and the community life element. She said later this fall there will be some more public workshops which will be related to future land use planning. The goal at that time is to have drafts of all the other elements done, so when people come to those workshops they can pick up copies of the draft elements, review them, and provide comment. Mrs. Jones stated this is a different course than most planning processes take for a Comprehensive Plan. She said most start with the future land use element. She stated staff has consciously chosen to do it last because they want the future land use to be guided by the other goals of the community.

Mrs. Jones stated they will now move on to the next section which is transportation and mobility.

## **B. Lemont 2030 – Transportation and Mobility**

Mrs. Jones said what they plan to do this month and next is introduce the topics, talk about what they did in the 2002 Comprehensive Plan and any major changes, then look to see if there is anything from the 2002 Plan that they might want to carry forward.

Mrs. Jones stated back in 2002 the biggest change was I355 had not gone through and it was still in the planning stages. She said it has brought good and bad to the community. She stated there is not much left to address regarding the interstate because it already exists. Similarly most of the arterial roadway system is in place, but there are some changes that are noted in the staff report. Mrs. Jones stated one change would be to the Route 83 and Main Street area, however, most of the infrastructure is there.

Mrs. Jones said one other big change is that they adopted the Active Transportation Plan (ATP). She stated their idea with that Plan since it was approved last year, is to adopt it by reference in the Comprehensive Plan and call out the big issues with that Plan. She said they can set some goals for accomplishments from the recommendation in the Active Transportation Plan. Mrs. Jones stated the ATP has mid, near, and long-term goals. She said within the Comprehensive Plan they can set a goal that they seek to accomplish all of the near and mid term recommendations or all the recommendations. She stated they can discuss this, but they will not go into detail about bike or pedestrian improvements because they have done all that work. Mrs. Jones said they will make

reference to major issues, but a lot of the detail in the ATP will not be in the Comprehensive Plan. She then asked if the Commissioners had any questions or thoughts regarding the ATP. None responded.

Mrs. Jones stated she would like to get the Commissioners feedback on the vision and guiding principles for the Transportation and Mobility element. She said they will go through the items that were in the 2002 Comprehensive Plan to see if they want to include them in the update.

Mrs. Jones said they will start with the vision and guiding principles. She stated the vision is what came out of the public workshops. She then read the vision statement and the guiding principles. She asked if the Commission had any additions, deletions, or changes. None responded.

Mrs. Jones stated they will now move to the table of the 2002 recommendations in that Comprehensive Plan. She said the 2002 had policies recommendations and program recommendations. She stated the policies are just what the Village policy is and program recommendations is more of what the Village should go out and do. Mrs. Jones said she had broken them up into those two categories. She stated the first policy recommendation is to protect right away for existing arterial roads and planned arterial road improvements from encroachments. She said she is not sure if this is needed and is not aware of any issues.

Discussion continued as to what would be an encroachment and if there is anywhere in the Village where this problem would exist.

Mrs. Jones said she does not feel this issue of encroachment is applicable; instead they can tailor the language in the right away dedication recommendations.

Mrs. Jones stated the next policy is to separate industrial truck traffic from passenger vehicles to the greatest extent possible. She said obviously this was a concern in 2002, but is it still a concern today. She stated the Village does have some limits on our control of truck traffic, however if it is a road available for federal aid then they can not prohibit truck traffic. Mrs. Jones said on the local roads they can make whatever restrictions they want, but if it is a State or County road they can't. She stated this issue befuddled her and she will look into it more when they come back next month.

Mrs. Jones said the next one talks about having Bell Road and Route 83 be strategic regional arterial and it is. She stated IDOT had identified it as one before the 2002 Comprehensive Plan was adopted so it is no longer needed.

Mrs. Jones stated requiring the submittal of a traffic study for all proposed developments that have an impact on the arterial road system is the next policy. She said the Village requires traffic studies for all new developments under the UDO; however the application guidelines indicate the Planning and Economic Development

Director has discretion to waive that requirement. She stated in practice they really only require them for PUD's.

Commissioner Messer said when they did his subdivision development it was based on the number of units in the subdivision.

Mrs. Jones stated he was right and that it was typically more of a judgment call at the Village staff level depending on the type of development and whether it would have significant traffic issues. She said it also depends on if there are zoning entitlements in place or not. She stated what she is proposing is to make minor word changes to the policy to reflect their current practice. She said it would state that they do require them where it is warranted.

Mrs. Jones said the next couple are kind of the same. She stated requiring dedication of right-away as a condition of plan approval wherever their adjacent to an arterial roadway and the existing right-of-way is substandard. She said there is no explicit section of the UDO that requires this, but is required in the UDO as a matter of practice. Mrs. Jones stated it is still an important policy to have in the plan to show they still require it.

Mrs. Jones stated the next policy states to support programs and plan that increase the convenience of access to transit. Mrs. Jones said this is already consider in the ATP and will be reflected in the Comprehensive Plan but without a specific policy. She stated same with including a bicycle and pedestrian facilities plan as part of the Official Map. She said the Official Map is really the Future Land Use Map and she feels it doesn't need another layer with this and it can just be referenced back to the Active Transportation Plan.

Mrs. Jones said the next is dedications are required as a condition of subdivision or development plan when bikeway right-of-way and construction of bikeway facilities' improvements are recommended by official map. She stated this does need to have a policy in the Comprehensive Plan with reference to the ATP. She said the ATP recommends the improvements and states where a bike lane, trail or sidewalks should go. However, the Comprehensive Plan is where a policy should be stating what new developments are required to provide if the ATP shows a facility is planned for that area.

Mrs. Jones stated next is requiring all property along the Sanitary and Ship Canal to comply with the Lemont Subdivision Regulations. This will create clearer identities for parcels, delineate boundaries between users, and require investment in land improvements as a condition of subdivision approval. She said she is not aware of any subdivisions taking place since 2002 along the Sanitary and Ship Canal. She stated she is not sure if this is a transportation policy. Mrs. Jones said most of the property along the Canal is owned by MWRD and they lease it out. She stated her recommendation would be to leave this one out, because she can't see exerting that much time and

resources with MWRD to make this happen. She asked if the Commission agreed and they all stated yes.

Mrs. Jones said next is all streets shall be constructed in compliance with the Standard Specifications. She stated it is required in the UDO and there is no need for it in the Comprehensive Plan. Next, all streets shall be dedicated public streets, except streets that serve restricted areas such as small industrial development where no connectivity with public streets is practical, or residential developments that are designed as “gated” communities. She said the UDO does require dedicated public streets, but then says unless requirement is waived. Mrs. Jones stated there should be a policy on the guidance for new streets. It should state whether they want public or private streets and where. She said they might want it to address commercial developments that might have private streets, similar to the industrial developments in the 2002 Plan. She stated from a planning perspective she would discourage “gated” communities because it goes against their objective of having a well connected street network and connected neighborhoods.

Trustee Stapleton said another problem is when their streets need to be repaved they think the Village pays to have them repaved.

Commissioner Messer stated many communities have not looked favorably on them for quite sometime.

Mrs. Jones said she agrees however, there is nothing in the Comprehensive Plan that states they are not preferred.

Commissioner McGleam asked besides not being a connected community what other negatives are there.

Mrs. Jones stated that is the primary one. She said you are gating the entire subdivision off so it is completely disconnected from the rest of the community and the neighborhood to the north and south can’t get through at all.

Trustee Stapleton said we provide water to these houses. If there is a water main break our Village workers are now going in on private property.

Commissioner McGleam said if there is some language in the Comprehensive Plan that states the Village is not in favor of “gated” communities, and then if a PUD came before the Commission, they would have some basis to say it doesn’t comply.

Mrs. Jones said yes it does give some policy guidance.

Commissioner Kwasneski stated he would discourage “gated” communities because it does not fit the overall goal. He asked people can still bring it forth before the Commission if they wanted.

Mrs. Jones stated yes they can still apply and bring it before the Commission.

All Commissioners agreed to discourage “gated” communities.

Mrs. Jones asked if they still wanted to keep the language in there to allow the private streets in limited circumstances for commercial or industrial developments.

Discussion continued where this might apply.

All Commissioners agreed.

Mrs. Jones stated next policy is special service areas or special assessment districts should be considered to improve existing public streets in subdivisions that are annexed to the Village. She said this tool has not been in use since 2002 and the Village has not annexed any existing subdivisions. However, this is an issue that might come up in the future. She stated there are some unincorporated subdivisions where the homeowners have expressed interest to be annexed into the Village. Mrs. Jones said Cook County is very much about getting property out of unincorporated counties and into municipal boundaries. She stated she would recommend to keep a policy like this to ensure the Village has a policy to cover themselves and they are not taking on someone else’s problem.

Mrs. Jones said continue to work with Pace to increase the level of service of transit in the community is next. She stated this is already reflected in the ATP. She said what that plan recommends is that they work with Pace on service and the express route. They will also work with Pace to see if they can get buses back and forth between our train station and Downers Grove station as an interim measure until they get better service on the Heritage Corridor line.

Mrs. Jones said another is in general, support regional airport plans that reduce overall travel times and relative travel costs for Lemont. She stated this recommendation they will keep.

Mrs. Jones stated now they will get more into physical improvements and program recommendations. Improve and maintain the Lemont arterial roadway system to handle existing and projected traffic volumes without delay or compromise of public safety. She said they have roads that the 2002 Plan identifies as arterial that are not under local jurisdiction. Any road that is an arterial roadway is typically County or State road jurisdiction. Mrs. Jones stated they do not have a lot of control over those roads.

Discussion continued as to which roads are arterial and the traffic on 127<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mrs. Jones said she feels this should be reworded as more of an advocacy position, because they don’t have control over improvements for arterial roads. She stated no delay is also an unreasonable goal for an arterial roadway.

Discussion continued on what up-and-coming roadwork projects are coming for IDOT.

Mrs. Jones stated the next recommendation is upgrade all intersections to a level of service "B". She said the Plan does not state what level of service "B" is and she is not sure what it would be for an intersection. She stated she recommends this be removed.

Next, she said would be to install safe pedestrian crossings at all intersections. She stated this is reflective in the ATP and it identifies all the areas in community that need improvement with recommendations.

Mrs. Jones stated another is establish a street system that connects different neighborhoods such that there is more than one means of approach to all neighborhoods. She said again they do require this for new development, but they don't retroactively go in and create streets where there are no streets.

Mrs. Jones said next is expanding Metra service on the Heritage Corridor line. She stated this is still a key priority for the Village. She said it is mentioned in the ATP and they will probably reiterate in the Comprehensive Plan because it is a high priority. Mrs. Jones stated not just for transportation but also for economic development for the downtown area.

Next, she stated is increase the opportunities for interaction between Metra riders and downtown businesses. She said she is recommending they don't include this because she is not sure what they meant by this.

Mrs. Jones said another is adding a Metra station at the east side of Lemont to serve the east Lemont Township, Willowbrook, Burr Ridge, and Homer Glen areas. She stated this has not been done and she is recommending to not include it. She said they had talks with Metra about this awhile back and Metra said no. Mrs. Jones stated it is not feasible and her recommendation is that their efforts would be better served in trying to improve the existing station.

Mrs. Jones stated next is complete a "Transit-Oriented Development" study of the downtown. She said this was completed in 2004 based on the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan. She stated even beyond that when Marquette came in there was a downtown vision initiative that took place. She said this recommendation will no longer be needed.

Mrs. Jones said to increase the percentage of the work force commuting by train is another goal. She stated this goal was not achieved. She said she has checked the numbers and the numbers had decreased from 5.8% in 2000 to 4.5% in 2010. She stated it is an admirable goal, but there are a lot of factors that influence a person's commute choice. Mrs. Jones said she feels this is talked about in other ways. She stated she is not sure if they also need this as an objective or goal.

Discussion continued in regard to Metra an adding another line.



Mrs. Jones stated next is complete the existing sidewalk/bikeway and crosswalk system of the Village. She said this is addressed better in the ATP.

Commissioner Kwasneski asked if it was a priority in the ATP.

Mrs. Jones said it is and they could reference that as well.

Mrs. Jones stated connecting the I&M Canal path to regional trails is next. She said again this is referenced in the ATP and in the recreation element as well.

Next, is extending pedestrian paths to the Bowl recreation area. Mrs. Jones stated there are sidewalks that go around the perimeter of the school. She said she is not sure if they meant there should be some kind of path from the sidewalk to the bowl. She stated she is not sure of the intention or if it is a high priority to where it should be mentioned in the Plan. All Commissioners agreed.

Mrs. Jones said performing a comprehensive sidewalk inventory is another recommendation and it was already done in the ATP.

Mrs. Jones stated improve the safety and efficiency of freight handling and transportation in the planning area. She said she feels that this is a vague recommendation and not very useful. She stated if there were any specific concerns regarding freight like trucks pulling out and making dangerous left turns from Old Lemont Road that could be included in the Plan. She said she would like to hear any specific suggestions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Sanderson asked how they can deal with all the trucks on Route 83 and Main Street. He stated he is not sure what will end up going there but he is sure they would not appreciate a lot of truck traffic. He said there might not be much they can do since it is there already.

Mrs. Jones said she thinks the improvements to the intersection will help.

Commissioner Messer stated Mrs. Jones was referring to Lemont Road and Old Lemont Road. He said that is what they had talked about at the last meeting with the school buses.

Mrs. Jones said the COW considered the bus terminal on Monday night and one of the Trustees stated maybe this will be enough to get a signal down there.

Mrs. Jones stated next is create an orderly system of planned and platted roadways constructed according to Lemont Standard Specifications, from existing public roads to the freight-handling facilities along the Sanitary and Ship Canal. She said again she is not sure what is meant by this recommendation by create an orderly system of planned and platted roads. She stated Old Lemont Road where it comes off of Lemont Road and

goes down to Des Plaines River Road, that is Village owned and maintained. Mrs. Jones said Des Plaines River Road and Donohoe Road are owned by MWRD. She stated the lessees have an agreement with MWRD that every so often they have to repave it and maintain it. She said the point of this recommendation could have been to get jurisdiction of Des Plaines River Road from MWRD. Mrs. Jones stated she is not sure if the Village wants that, because there is a lot of heavy truck traffic which requires more maintenance. She said the Village might be better letting the users maintain those facilities.

Commissioner Messer said another property that could end up looking like that is the property being considered for the Sports Complex. He stated who wants to leave that land that could end up being considered heavy commercial instead of a recreational area.

Mrs. Jones stated it is prudent but they might want to reword it to address that issue

Commissioner Sanderson asked if since 2002, nothing has been designed or worked on to get the streets to come together.

Mrs. Jones said there has not been anything done on this recommendation to her knowledge. She stated she does not see the upside of taking over a road that is used by industry. She said in regard to Commission Messer's point she will try to come up with a recommendation for that point.

Mrs. Jones stated the next recommendation is introduce "traffic calming" measures in all planned streets and existing streets where speeding occurs. She said she has not heard back from Public Works and would like to wait to talk about them next month. She stated paving all the alleys was a goal for the Village, but she is not sure if it has been completed. She said she will check into them.

Mrs. Jones said lastly, review reports and studies on the Third Airport. She stated this does not need to be in the Comprehensive Plan. She said they get a variety of reports thru different channels. She stated there is already a recommendation in the Plan to support good access to airports for residents and reduce travel times to airports. Mrs. Jones said this will conclude her report.

### **C. Lemont 2030 – Natural Resources & Recreation**

Mrs. Glas stated she will be covering the next section. She said the Natural Resource Element from the 2002 Plan only focused on the natural resources. This time they are going to add a recreational piece because a lot of the natural resources are used for active recreational purposes.

Mrs. Glas said as Mrs. Jones mentioned in terms of the Comprehensive Plan you want to continue with what the thought process was and revise where needed. She stated in terms of what we have available as current stock, in 2002 there were five

recommendations that came out of that plan and the 2009 Green Lemont Initiative with eight goals.

Mrs. Glas stated the Recreation part will be new to this element. There are two items that they can work from and they are the Heritage Committee Concept Plan for the Heritage Quarries Recreational Area and the Park District is in the process of doing a Master Plan for all the parks.

Mrs. Glas said she will start with the 2002 Comprehensive Plan. She said out of the five recommendations that were mentioned in the 2002 Plan, they are recommending to carry forward three of them. She stated one of them she would like to discuss tonight and the other one they feel has already been addressed since 2002 or maybe address it in a different way.

Mrs. Glas stated the first recommendation is to maintain the unique physical landscape as much as possible, with its opportunities for interesting vistas, and plant and wildlife communities. She said as Mrs. Jones had mentioned this had helped with the issue of billboards on Interstate 355. She stated they would like to carry this over and just add or touch up some of the verbiage on this.

Mrs. Glas said secondly, avoid loss or degradation of forest, wetlands, and stream courses. She stated this would be included but mentioned in a way that coincides with our current regulations. She said they have updated the UDO to include soil erosion, control sedimentation, flood plain regulations, and storm water management. Mrs. Glas said it has been bolstered quite a bit since the 2002 Plan. She stated they would like to enhance it around their current framework.

Mrs. Glas said third is use an overlay map of know wetlands to preserve wetlands. She stated this was at a time when there was a court decision that took away the regulations for isolated wetlands. She said since that time there has been recognition that those are important in terms of stormwater management controls. Mrs. Glas stated there is more regulations in regards to that, even in the UDO there are measures that would address that.

Mrs. Glas stated next is adopting setbacks from stream courses to protect both the stream course and the property owner from flooding and erosion. She said this is mostly covered in the UDO the way it is written right now. She stated MWRD currently has a watershed management ordinance that is up for public review. Mrs. Glas stated their intent is to be more in-line with what other counties are doing. She said they are going to monitor that and make sure that they are in-line with what MWRD recommends.

Mrs. Glas said the fifth recommendation is to obtain Tree City USA status for the Village. She stated there are currently 175 communities in Illinois that have this designation. She said it is a recognition stating that the community values urban forestry practices. Mrs. Glas stated in order to be a designated community there are four standards that you have to apply in order to participate in this program. She said the

standards are you have to have a Tree Board, a Tree Care Ordinance, a Community Forestry Program with an annual budget of \$2 per capita, and lastly an Arbor Day observance. She stated what Lemont currently has is a Village Arborist that they consult with when they have subdivision plans or development plans that require site development or tree preservation. There is also an Environmental Advisory Committee, but this is not currently in their scope to do this. Mrs. Glas said the UDO already has tree preservation chapter. She stated this is open for discussion for if the Commissioners feel this is something worth pursuing.

Commissioner Messer asked if this would go better in the Green Plan rather than the Comprehensive Plan.

Mrs. Jones stated that the Green Plan was not formally adopted. It was prepared and presented to the Village Board in 2009. She said they can update it and formally adopt it.

Commissioner Messer asked it could be adopted in with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mrs. Jones said they could. She stated the Green Plan focuses on some things that aren't that appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan. She said they can take excerpts from the Green Plan and put them in the Comprehensive Plan or they can adopt it formally and just reference it.

Mrs. Glas said it was adopted and it could be amended. However, there are some things in the Green Plan that aren't appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan. She stated you would not want to put the whole plan in there; however, pieces should be referenced.

Commissioner Sullivan stated he hasn't really paid attention to the importance with the trees until recently over the past couple of years. He said by becoming part of the Tree City there are rules that have to be followed. He stated he feels it would be important and it might help the problem with all the Ash Tree devastation. Commissioner Sullivan said if there is a diversity of trees, then if a natural predator comes in it won't wipe out all the trees in the area. He stated any kind of tree plan is important and this might help with making public works more knowledgeable about the trees.

Mrs. Jones said it does underlie the importance of biodiversity.

Mrs. Glas stated a Tree Care Ordinance would be like an Urban Forestry Plan where you would have some guidelines on how you want to manage your trees because they are a resource. She said Public Works would have an inventory of the trees and would know their species composition. She stated when they have a type of development we can know what types of trees we need more of in the community to maintain diversity and keep developers from over planting a species that is most affordable at the time.

Commissioner Messer stated this is a critical component and instead of putting limiting verbiage in there can't you state that there is this adopted Green Plan and reference it out that way.

Mrs. Glas said the 2009 Green Plan identified eight goals. She stated some of them aren't necessarily appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan. She said like the first one where it speaks to the Village government about conserving resources, reducing waste, and limiting pollution. She stated these are good goals and were implemented when they redid the building.

Mrs. Glas stated next is establish Lemont as a community that conserves energy and recycles waste; important to include in terms of encouraging green building design, energy efficiency, or conservation minded development. She stated not necessarily that verbiage but the idea of energy conservation in building and development design will be put into the Comprehensive Plan.

Mrs. Glas said third is realizing benefits from Native Landscaping and Water Conservation at home. She stated the Green Plan focused on educating residents and what they can do to help conserve water quality. She said it is important, but more so in the concept and not necessarily in the wording. She stated the concept will be carried over to the 2030 Comprehensive Plan from the perspective of stormwater, best management practices and water quality.

Mrs. Glas stated next is amending Village regulations and practices to encourage or mandate stormwater best management practices. She said again from the perspective of stormwater it will go under one topic, because it seems like it crisscrosses there.

Mrs. Glas said fifth is ensuring stewardship of natural areas. She stated she feels this one is important and should be expanded on. She said it is important with the conservation easements that are turned over to homeowners associations and the Heritage Quarries. Mrs. Glas stated there are benefits to having natural areas but if they are not maintained it will grow out of control. She said it is like a home sitting abandoned with no measures in place, like a home without winter weatherizing, it will degrade. She stated natural areas are the same you have to maintain invasive species. Mrs. Glas said whether it is working with the Park District or working with other agencies that have management plans for these types of areas. She stated for homeowners associations they like to encourage easements that have tree preservation or natural easements. However, after it is built if you leave it to the homeowners association, they can get overwhelmed with the little things that they don't even know what to do with the natural area. She said outside of educating them, there should be some kind of management plan. Mrs. Glas stated this is something the MWRD is currently proposing that any naturalized easement must have a land management plan in place. Whether it is the person who developed it or some other entity there has to be someone responsible for it. She said so this might be something they have to comply with.

Mrs. Glas stated next is promoting green buildings. She said this would transfer over and it is important to keep from an energy and water conservation perspective. She stated the more you can get that kind of terminology in, whether it is from the building code side or when a person comes in to develop a whole subdivision development, conservation of resources should be promoted. Mrs. Glas said to consider those kinds of measures it does help from a water conservation perspective in terms of water use, water supply, and energy conservation.

Mrs. Glas said the last two speak more towards education and co-ordination with other agencies. She stated they are very important, but they would use them more as strategies for the different recommendations rather than goals. She said they are going to be included but specifically for whatever environmental issue that is being addressed at that time.

Commissioner Messer asked if they had any kind of report card on that goal.

Mrs. Jones stated there has not been any subsequent status reporting. She said she can say some of the things have been done.

Commissioner Messer asked if there has been any campaign done for community wide awareness.

Mrs. Jones said they advertise the public works recycling for electronics, and periodically in the newsletter they put things in about the availability of rain barrels from the Conservation Foundation. She stated there hasn't been an ongoing conservative effort.

Commissioner Messer stated he thinks it is a great plan and all the points are really important, but he feels that there hasn't been any major push for public awareness.

Mrs. Jones said they have done some things for public awareness but there has not been a "major" push. She stated it could be something that they are more strategic with in their recommendations.

Commissioner McGleam asked about LEED Certification for municipal buildings.

Mrs. Glas stated she had seen reference with the new Police Station, that they had considered it. She said there were concerns with the cost for certification.

Discussion continued in regards to "Green" buildings, LEED Certifications and business recycling.

Mrs. Glas said in regards to the Recreation Element they do not really have anything to present other than what the Heritage Committee has come up with as their Master Plan for the area. She stated next month they will have more developed on the Recreation

part, and it will include something in regards to the Quarries. She said the Village leases this land from MWRD.

Mrs. Jones stated there is some property that the Township owns, but most of it is leased for recreational uses. Mrs. Jones then showed on the overhead the area of Quarries.

Discussion continued in regards to how to get down to the Quarries and signage for the Quarries.

Ms. Glas said this would conclude their presentation.

## **V. GENERAL DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Sanderson asked if there was anything for next month.

Mrs. Jones stated they might have a fence variation and more Comprehensive Plan items.

## **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Sanderson called for a motion to adjourn.

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Messer to adjourn the meeting. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

*Minutes prepared by Peggy Halper*