

Land Use Committee Meeting #3 – Meeting Minutes

July 21, 2014

3:00 – 4:30 p.m.

Lake County Central Permit Facility, 500 W. Winchester Rd, Libertyville

Committee Members Present: Lake County Board Chairman Aaron Lawlor, Committee Co-Chair; BRAC Committee Member George Ranney, Committee Co-Chair, Lake County; Michael Ellis, representing Village of Grayslake; Trustee Stephen Park, representing Village of Gurnee; Mayor Linda Soto, representing Village of Hainesville; Mayor Joseph Mancino, representing Village of Hawthorn Woods; Michael Talbett, representing Village of Kildeer; President Tom Poyton, representing Village of Lake Zurich; Matthew Dabrowski, representing Lakemoor; Heather Rowe, representing Village of Libertyville; President Angie Underwood, representing Long Grove; Village Engineer Bill Emmerich, representing Mundelein; Planning Commissioner George Monaco, representing Round Lake; Mayor Frank Bart, representing Village of Wauconda; Mayor Wayne Motley, representing City of Waukegan; Brad Leibov, representing Liberty Prairie Foundation; Michael Stevens, representing Lake County Partners; Lenore Beyer-Clow, representing Openlands.

Committee Members Not Present: President Jeffrey Braiman, representing Village of Buffalo Grove; Mayor Linda Lucassen, representing Village of Round Lake Park; Roger Byrne, representing Village of Vernon Hills; President Burnell Russell, representing Village of Volo; Pat Carey, representing Lake County Board; Mike Sands, representing Liberty Prairie Foundation.

Kristi DeLaurentiis (Metro Strategies) took roll call – see attendance list above.

1. Welcome and Introductions– Committee Co-Chairs

- Meeting minutes from the May 8, 2014 Land Use Committee were approved.
- Description of agenda items: the Existing Conditions Assessment and the hot and cool spots analysis

2. Key Findings from the Existing Conditions Assessment (ECA)

Mobility: *Mark de la Vegne, Sam Schwartz Engineering*

The causes of increased congestion were presented, with particular focus on increased population, longer commute distances, limited use of public transit and the lack of a grid roadway system. It was pointed out that mobility issues cannot be addressed solely by building more roadways. They must also be addressed comprehensively with sound planning for smarter land use patterns, improved transit and new transportation demand management strategies.

Market Analysis: *Ranadip Bose, SB Friedman Development Partners*

The market analysis shows Lake County is projected to continue to grow, but at a slower pace than in the past. The Corridor has already captured a proportionately large share of commercial demand relative to the whole county. There is a mismatch between the amount of development planned for under the municipalities' future land use plans and the demand suggested by past development trends, suggesting that communities will not achieve the full build-out depicted in those future land use plans over the next 30 years. The project team will come up with a real forecast of future development later in the process.

- One committee member asked if the capacity of available land will be considered in making the estimate of future development. The project team confirmed that it will consider the land and the FAR and zoning regulations, and will deduct a percentage for roadways, etc.
- A committee member asked what S.B Friedman’s projections are based on. The project team responded that it is waiting for official population and job numbers coming from CMAP. Data distributed by CMAP will not be broken down by industry sector or age demographic, because CMAP looks at jobs based on projections to inform policy, and does not focus on land use. The project team will use industry standards to break out CMAP’s data by industry sector and age demographic.
- Discussion occurred about how the projections and numbers at a corridor-wide scale will translate to a site level. One committee member asked about the “carrying capacity” and wanted to make sure that in the next phases of the project, it will be tested if the amount of vacant land can accommodate the projections. Another committee member wanted to ensure that the details of what is happening “on the ground” are taken into account when determining where projected development should occur.
- A committee member wondered if, given this mismatch of too much non-residential forecast and not enough residential, is it likely that municipalities will receive requests for residential in lieu of the non-residential uses forecasted? Other committee members said this is beginning to be seen, resulting in ad-hoc zoning changes for residential development, and perhaps the over-use of mixed use PUD’s.
- A committee member suggested that roads are being planned for non-residential development that will not occur, rather than for the residential development that will occur.
- A committee member asked if the project team will distinguish between manufacturing uses and wholesale distribution. The project team confirmed that it will break this out. Lake County remains strong for manufacturing uses, but most wholesale land use has moved to Kenosha.

Land Use: Daniel Grove, The Lakota Group

The land use presentation pointed out that future land use plans target “greenfield” sites rather than infill sites. This translates into a loss of agricultural and open space land within these plans. Infill development has the potential to reduce that loss. Public transit should be encouraged, but current zoning in the Corridor is not transit-supportive. 85% of the Corridor has density lower than the level of 3-6 units per acre that is necessary to support a bus route of one bus/hour. In sum, existing plans and policies do not adequately support the Corridor’s livability goals.

- Co-Chairman George Ranney reinforced the finding that current zoning laws do not permit the population or employment density necessary to support transit.
- One committee member pointed out that this is purely economics. Without enough riders the buses cannot afford to run.

Environmental: Jay Womack, WRD Environmental

The environmental analysis shows that almost half of the land identified as “Natural Resources” (open space and agriculture) in the Corridor is not protected, and is therefore subject to direct developmental impacts. The streams and waters in the Corridor already suffer from significant impairment due to urban runoff and other human behavior/activity. Maps show a high levels of imperious surface coverage and fragmentation of wetlands, woodlands, etc. Current zoning ordinances do not address many of the environment impacts and these municipal plans and ordinances are the best way to provide protection in the future.

3. Hot/Cool Spots Methodology and Committee Exercise

Jason Navota pointed out that this methodology is just one way to analyze where the appropriate hot and cool spots could be. It is just one tool to identify the areas that should receive future in-depth study, but there will also be a more subjective analysis that follows.

Cool Spots Methodology: Jay Womack, WRD Environmental

The Cool Spots Methodology was presented with proposed scoring system and a draft cool spots map.

- One committee member noted that the coloring on the draft cool spots map washes out the lesser cool spots, making it seem like there are few significant cool spots.
- A committee member indicated it would be interesting to see where water resources are located in relation to the cool spots map. Water resources should be added to the map.
- There was a discussion on how to rank protected lands. In the current scheme, protected lands have a high score (giving them more weight as cool spots), but this logic could be flipped so that sensitive lands that are not protected receive a high score, weighting land that is more vulnerable to impact due to its unprotected status.
- There was a discussion about direct versus indirect impact. Environmental resources within the Corridor can be affected by impacts happening far outside the study area.
- One committee member noted that this is an iterative process. Hydric soils may also have an impact outside the Corridor. For example, on the western side of the County where people rely on wells for water, hydric soils are very important.
- A committee member suggested there may be an opportunity for a map that looks at possible beneficial impacts of policy changes (for example, alternative de-icing methods) on impaired lands.

Hot Spots Methodology: Daniel Grove, The Lakota Group

The Hot Spots Methodology was presented, with three sets of factors: Objective/Market, Municipal Plans/Entitled Sites and Policy. Draft hot spot maps for each set of factors and for all factors combined were presented.

Co-Chairman George Ranney commented that the key on both the Cool Spots Map and the Hot Spots Maps is to have scoring that makes sense, and asked committee members to let the project team know what's going on at the sites, so it can reverse-engineer any wrong conclusions on the hot spots and cool spots maps.

- One committee member suggested the team break out hot spot methodology by the type of development. Ex: residential, office, retail, industrial
- The committee was asked whether it wants to weigh the three sets of hot spot factors (market, municipal, policy) equally or differently.
- A committee member commented that the hot spot analysis as a single bracket doesn't adequately value the different characteristics of the four types of developments. For example, residential development doesn't care if it is within a certain number of miles from a major roadway, while retail does. A suggestion was made to create separate maps for each type of development if possible, with separate consideration for what the factors are.

- The team will work on getting scalable maps onto the website.

4. Public Comment

- No public comment
- Motion to adjourn, approved by unanimous consent, meeting adjourned.