



Land Use Working Committee

Minutes

Wednesday, October 21, 2015

9:00 a.m.

Cook County Conference Room
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 800
Chicago, Illinois

- Members Present:** Ed Paesel (Chair), Judy Beck, Thomas Chefalo (for Eric Waggoner), Kristi DeLaurentiis, Lisa DiChiera, Michael Horsting (for Heather Tabbert), Michael Kowski, Paul Lauricella, Robert McKenna, Mark Muenzer, Paul Rickelman, Todd Vanadilok, James Wilson (for Susan Campbell), Adrienne Wuellner, Ruth Wuorenma.
- Members Absent:** Curt Paddock, Arnold Randall, Dennis Sandquist, Heather Smith, Mark VanKerkhoff (Vice-Chair), Nathaniel Werner, Nancy Williamson.
- Staff Present:** Stephen Ostrander (committee liaison), Nora Beck, David Clark, Kristin Ihnchak, Jason Navota, Elizabeth Schuh, Tina Smith, Berenice Vallecillos.
- Others Present:** Elaine Bottomley (WCGL), Alison Buchwach (Metra), Brian Hacker (Metra), Mike Klemens (WCGL), Karen Ann Miller (Kane County), Mike Walczak (NWMC), Diane Williams (Evanston Historic Preservation Commission).
- 1.0 Call to Order**
Ed Paesel called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.
- 2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements**
Berenice Vallecillos announced the new round of projects selected as part of the LTA program.

Ed Paesel noted the success of the committee's field trip to the 606/Bloomington Trail, and encouraged committee members to begin thinking of ideas for next year's trip.
- 3.0 Approval of the Meeting Notes – August 19, 2015**
A motion to approve the minutes of August 19, 2015, was made by Judy Beck and seconded by Paul Rickelman. All in favor, the motion carried.
- 4.0 Next Regional Plan: Broad Priorities – Kristin Ihnchak, CMAP**
Building on prior guidance from the CMAP board and a staff charrette conducted in August 2015, Kristin discussed the overarching vision, priorities, and audiences for the

next comprehensive regional plan.

One member asked Kristin whether there was a list of all partners who will be a part of the development of the next regional plan. Kristin responded that they are currently developing that list, and encouraged members to stay tuned. Ed Paesel suggested that committee members should give any suggestions for potential partners to Stephen Ostrander (committee liaison) to give to Kristin and Liz Schuh. The committee member responded that instead it would be easier and more efficient for committee members to receive a list that they can respond to.

5.0 Next Regional Plan: Socioeconomic Forecast – David Clark, CMAP

CMAP is developing its approach to the next long-range socioeconomic forecast. As a part of this process, we have identified a list of enhancements that we would like to see in the next forecast; also, several firms with expertise in the field were invited to give informational presentations on forecasting and modeling techniques to help staff understand the range of approaches available. David's presentation summarized these activities and outlined the next steps.

One member mentioned that it had seemed to him that there had been a disconnect in previous CMAP forecasts regarding local allocations (e.g. suggesting expected growth in the City of Chicago, and perhaps underestimating potential growth in other areas). He observed that there seemed to be a tension between forecasting based on market forces and forecasting based on CMAP's goals for the region (i.e. growth might occur in areas where CMAP would rather not see growth). David responded that he would take these comments in mind. Another member said that it would be helpful to assess what could be improved on from GO TO 2040's forecast (i.e. what missteps were made).

The member asked when it was expected that the consultant would be selected by. David answered by January or February.

Another member suggested that factors such as water availability should be taken into consideration.

A member asked whether the forecast will take into consideration things such as whether or not Route 53 is built. David responded that improvements such as Route 53, since they are included in the GO TO 2040 Plan, will be included in the forecast.

Ed Paesel observed that the forecasts developed by the firm of the late Suhail al Chalabi would look at national forecasts. David responded that he expected that the chosen consultant would take a similar approach. Ed followed up, asking whether CMAP would be developing a land use model; David answered that they were not, but Liz Schuh added that land use factors would be integral to the forecast. Ed said that he would like to see more discussion about land use considerations at future Land Use Committee meetings. Another member recommended reconciling the overall "grand" model with more targeted models (e.g. transportation).

6.0 Next Regional Plan: Reinvestment and Infill Strategy Paper – Liz Schuh, CMAP

GO TO 2040 broadly sought “to direct investment toward strengthening existing communities and find opportunities to encourage new development and redevelopment in livable communities that are denser and designed for mixed uses.” This project will explore refinements to that recommendation through discussion of what types of areas might be the most appropriate focus for reinvestment, definition of barriers to and opportunities for reinvestment, and identification of transportation, land use, and funding policies and strategies to increase investment throughout the region’s existing communities. Liz provided an overview.

A member asked whether actual projects will be highlighted in the strategy paper (to illustrate points which are raised in the report). Liz responded that it would.

Another member encouraged including a “cross-cutting analysis of place” (e.g. considering the impact of infrastructure investments on place).

A member encouraged a balanced analysis of both infill and growth in adjacent areas.

7.0 Next Regional Plan: Undeveloped, Agricultural, and Natural Areas Strategy Paper – Nora Beck, CMAP

GO TO 2040 focuses on encouraging compact and infill development, while also containing several strategies for those areas of the region that are currently undeveloped, in agricultural use, or contain natural resources. CMAP is exploring this topic further for the next plan by evaluating where and how development and preservation efforts have occurred and then evaluating the existing message, policies, and programs currently in place. The goal is to identify effective strategies for preserving these areas as well as guidance on where and how development on these lands can reduce negative impacts and support community livability. Nora described the project scope and schedule.

Ed Paesel asked whether the Land Use Committee could send a liaison to different working groups (such as the one helping to guide this strategy paper). Nora replied that while that might be a good idea, she will be returning on a regular basis to report to the committee and take feedback from the entire committee.

Another member asked whether the approach will consider areas with multiple uses and benefits. Nora responded that they will have another paper which will be focused on “co-benefits” of certain lands.

Tom Chefalo asked whether the process will include the involvement of actual

owners of agricultural land, in order to better understand the practical challenges they face. Nora replied that they are currently trying to involve people like this in the advisory group. Tom and Judy Beck both said they would forward suggested contacts in this area.

8.0 Preservation Challenges in the Chicago Suburbs – Lisa DiChiera, Landmarks Illinois and Diane Williams, Evanston Historic Preservation Commission
Landmarks Illinois and the Illinois Association of Historic Preservation Commissions (IAHPC) have heard many stories in the past year of difficult preservation decisions and policy changes in suburban communities throughout the Chicago metropolitan area. They also continue to hear about struggles many suburban preservation commissions are experiencing specifically related to local landmark designation efforts, preservation ordinances, demo delay ordinances and threats to designated local landmarks. In response, they recently conducted a survey to gauge the level of support for historic preservation in suburban communities. Lisa and Diane reviewed the survey results and discuss future challenges and strategies.

A member asked whether Landmarks Illinois has had any involvement in the preservation of historical workforce housing—for example, smaller, postwar houses that might fit emerging markets (e.g. millennials who are interested in small, more convenient houses that are affordable). She thought it might be a good idea to develop an historical designation system (easy for average, busy, modest-income homeowners) of some sort, which could add value to these sorts of properties. Lisa and Diane agreed, and suggested that the key is having preservation folks work in collaboration with planning commissions, etc. they also mentioned recent successful bungalow initiatives that had served a similar role. Lisa also mentioned that she thought that more “nitpicky” issues should generally be handled by staff, not preservation commissions.

Mark Muenzer commended Diane for her good work on the Evanston preservation commission. He observed that the City of Evanston often finds it necessary to consider economic development concerns, and there is a perception among some that the commission isn’t willing to compromise to find a workable solution.

A member mentioned that he recently attended a session at a Midwest planning conference in which a presentation stated that studies have shown that older homes hold their value better than newer homes. Lisa responded that she was aware of the study, and added that it is worth considering preservation as part of a larger sustainability strategy, especially as landfill is a significant concern.

Another member mentioned that Landmark Illinois’ annual “most endangered” lists are helpful, because they “add weight” to the efforts of local preservation groups trying to save local properties.

A member wondered about the criteria being used, especially in light of the fact that mid-century buildings are “starting to become old,” and while some of them may have been underappreciated, some of them have inherent design problems (e.g. car-oriented design in urban pedestrian areas) and therefore may not be worth saving. He said the challenge is to clarify and agree-upon the criteria for determining what is a landmark. Lisa responded that ultimately this is decided by each municipality, based on local criteria, and that they don’t believe that landmarking is the solution to everything. Diane added that the Chicago region is just now catching up with the nationwide trend of appreciated midcentury architecture.

Lisa also mentioned that Landmarks Illinois is currently developing (with DPD) a sample conservation district for the Englewood neighborhood, where the key issue is how to support preservation in areas where there has been a lot of modifications over the years.

9.0 Other Business

Judy Beck brought to the committee’s attention a recent issue involving the possible expiration of a 40+ year-old Planned Unit Development (P.U.D.) in Northbrook called Mission Hills.

Michael Horsting announced that the RTA had just finalized their list of proposed projects for the agency’s Community Planning program.

10.0 Public Comment

Karen Ann Miller from the Kane County Development Department offered a brief comment on the importance of green infrastructure to the next regional plan, which included mention of some of the County’s recent green infrastructure initiatives, along with others in the region, such as the Chicago Region Trees Initiative.

11.0 Next Meeting

The committee was scheduled to next meet on December 2, 2015.

12.0 Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Committee Liaison
November 27, 2015