

Land Use Committee Meeting #7 – Meeting Minutes

September 24, 2015

2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

Lake County Central Permit Facility, 500 Winchester Road, Libertyville

Committee Members Present: Lake County Board Chairman Aaron Lawlor, Committee Co-Chair; George Ranney, Committee Co-Chair, 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; Matthew Dabrowski, representing Village of Lakemoor; Heather Rowe, representing Village of Libertyville; President Angie Underwood, representing Village of Long Grove; Trustee Dawn Abernathy, representing Village of Mundelein; Mayor Dan MacGillis, representing Village of Round Lake; Al Maiden, representing Village of Round Lake Park; Mike May, representing Village of Volo; Brad Leibov, representing Liberty Prairie Foundation; and Michael Stevens, representing Lake County Partners. (16 attendees)

Committee Members Not Present President Beverly Sussman, representing Village of Buffalo Grove; President Tom Poyton, representing Village of Lake Zurich; Dave Brown, representing Village of Vernon Hills; Mayor Frank Bart, representing Village of Wauconda; Mayor Wayne Motley, representing City of Waukegan; Mike Sands, representing Liberty Prairie Foundation; and Lenore Beyer-Clow, representing Openlands.

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

1. Welcome and Introductions– Committee Co-Chair Aaron Lawlor

Meeting minutes from the April 16, 2015 Land Use Committee were approved. Committee member Soto moved and committee member Abernathy seconded.

2. Integration of Working Group input – Committee Co-Chair Aaron Lawlor

Co-chair Lawlor reviewed the results of the Working Group meetings.

3. Draft Land Use Strategy Report – Daniel Grove, Lakota

Daniel Grove presented the Corridor Land Use Strategy.

Land Use Committee Discussion

- One committee member commented that some of the language in the document, such as third paragraph pg 7, be revised to better convey that past and current plans are not necessarily imbalanced and unrealistic, but that municipalities plan the way they do in order to build revenue generating uses so critical to municipal budgets.
- One committee member commented that when communities adopt plans, they are conveying that the contents of the plan are the municipality's intent. CMAP and the consultant have done a very good job of softening up the

language of the plan to be permissive, but what will “adoption” by municipalities really mean for them in the future?

- One committee member commented that this land use strategy simply presents another view on what municipalities should consider in planning and development decisions. Perhaps that should be stated explicitly.
- One committee member commented that it was a good plan, but might confuse municipalities if this conflicts with the municipal comprehensive plan.
- One committee member commented that if municipalities do adopt this, they should specify in the language of their resolution or action how it is going to be used, e.g., as an addendum to the comprehensive plan or as an additional guidance document to be considered going forward. This is similar to the County Framework Plan, communities can do what they want with it. But what happens if municipalities don’t adopt it?
- One committee member commented that she supports the strategy and does not feel compelled to have to change her comprehensive plan, and that the land use strategy provides additional useful information.
 - Jason Navota commented that communities may wish to adopt the strategy or update comprehensive plans using information contained in the land use strategy.
- One committee member commented that it is unclear whether this is a guide or will it have some other impact on municipalities? In other words, how is it being positioned?
- One committee member commented that the language isn’t to cast shame on community planning, but to indicate that local decisions in aggregate can have a negative effect on the quality of life in Lake County, which is why coordination is important.
- One committee member commented that the effort has tremendous value, a vision, but needs some wordsmithing.
- One committee member commented that some of the language in reference to the WDO could be misinterpreted, and could it please be clarified?
 - Mike Warner, from Lake County SMC provided some clarifying explanation to the WDO reference on page 29, for example.
 - The Committee member asked whether the Tollway has to comply with WDO requirements?
 - Mike Warner commented that the Tollway works closely with the local governments.
- One committee member commented that many of his remaining comments relate to what will be in the future IGA. For example, if Hawthorn Woods is in two zones, would they have to sign two IGAs? Without knowing what is in the IGA makes it difficult to understand what municipalities will be held to in the future that they may not know about today.
 - Co-chair Lawlor stated that the IGA details are yet to come, and communities will be involved in the discussion.
- One committee member asked if the strong language in the strategy doc is binding?
 - Daniel Grove commented that it is not binding but permissive, presenting ways that things could be done, not how they must be done.
- One committee member asked whether, according to page 41 regarding agricultural land, municipalities are being asked to encumber private land?
 - Daniel Grove responded that no, the plan simply indicates locations where agricultural land could be used for local food production, and then presents possible mechanisms for doing so if desired by a community or other entity.
- One committee member commented that making intentions of landowners known to other, nearby landowners is beneficial and can avoid conflicts in the future.
 - One Committee member commented that language issues can be addressed.
 - Co-chair Lawlor commented that the language is 100% permissive and does not need to be changed.
- One committee member commented that language such as “can be done to support opportunities” is permissive

- One committee member stated that there may be some discrepancies between maps for Hawthorn Woods and would send comments.
- One committee member commented that the same goes for their maps as well.
- One committee member commented that the land use committee has recognized that 1) the IGA has yet to be written, and 2) a design of the roadway has not been revealed by the Tollway. This is an advisory strategy for land around the potential right-of-way, a vehicle for moving forward together, and waiting to see real impact and design of the roadway.
- One Committee member asked if municipalities could be excluded from the Corridor Planning Council if they don't adopt the land use strategy?
 - Co-chair Lawlor responded that no, the CPC will be inclusive.
- One Committee member asked if the Tollway needs this strategy to move forward?
 - Co-chair Lawlor responded that the Tollway wants to see how this process progresses.
- One Committee member commented that the BRAC represents one opinion, and that several Corridor communities were not part of the BRAC, and there is not a consensus about the right-of-way location
- One Committee member commented that some communities will be more impacted by the road than others, and would that be considered in terms of remediation?
 - Co-chair Lawlor commented that weighting might have some merit. Could be worked out in the IGA.
- One Committee member commented that this will be a multi-step process and details for the STF and ERSF will be worked out in the future. There is a precedent in Maryland, but there were lots of steps and details to work out. He commented that he wants the stewardship money to flow where it has the greatest positive impact.

4. Next Steps– *Committee Co-Chair Aaron Lawlor*

Co-chair Lawlor presented the next steps of the planning process.

5. Questions/Public Comment

- Chris Geiselhart: the draft strategy report isn't posted yet.
- Daniel Grove: it will be posted soon.
- Pam Newton: not all communities want economic development, some want to be an oasis from economic development (see, e.g., language on pages 7 and 50)
- Heather Rowe: presentations will be made to municipalities in early 2016?
- Daniel Grove: correct.