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Chapter 1 - Introduction

INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTENT

The 2004 Comprehensive Plan for the Village of Glenview updates the 1990 Village Comprehensive Plan. The Village of Glenview and surrounding areas have experienced unprecedented development pressures over the past 20 years. This plan is intended to guide the Village in its planning efforts over the next 10 years. It will provide the tools that the Village may use to preserve and enhance its existing qualities while allowing it to reach its fullest potential as a community.

Purpose of the Comprehensive Plan

In early 2001, the Village of Glenview Comprehensive Planning Committee (Appendix C.4) retained the services of Planning & Design Institute, Inc. and HNTB to develop a Comprehensive Master Plan for the Village. The process included a village-wide traffic analysis and an in-depth study of eight subareas identified by the Village.

Much of the land available for redevelopment in 1990, when the last comprehensive planning process was undertaken, has since been developed. This includes the former Glenview Naval Air Station and the Techny Area. Today, Glenview’s challenges lie in the preservation and enhancement of its stable, high quality neighborhoods, and the redevelopment of transitional areas. The pressure for change and the impact of growth in the region significantly influence the quality of life in Glenview.

This plan will establish a logical, well thought-out set of guidelines and development policies that will guide public and private development within the community. It will provide policies that the Village Board; Planning, and Appearance Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals; the Library Board; the Park District Board; and School District Boards may use to make decisions in order to fulfill a collective vision for Glenview.

Glenview’s Planning History

The 1990 Comprehensive Plan has guided recent growth and development in Glenview. A major amendment to the plan occurred in 1995 when the Glen Redevelopment Plan for the former Glenview Naval Air Station was adopted.

1.2 PLANNING AREA AND BACKGROUND

Glenview's location in Northeastern Illinois is a significant factor in understanding the Village and its challenges.

**Glenview in the Region**

Northeastern Illinois is the historic meeting point of America's East and West. Established at a natural portage between the Great Lakes and the Mississippi Valley, the region has served as the pivotal link in the nation's water, rail, and aviation networks. The region's central city, Chicago, is the economic and cultural capital of the Midwest. Its suburbs, taken by themselves, would be the nation's fourth largest metropolitan area. The six-county metropolitan area is home to over 8 million people with more than 4 million people employed there. The area is home to the headquarters of 34 Fortune 500 corporations. The leading economic sectors include financial services, electrical machinery and equipment, insurance, pharmaceuticals, and retailing. Six county governments; 272 cities and villages; and nearly 1,000 schools, parks, and other special-purpose districts provide public services.

The region encompasses 3,749 square miles of land and water. Nearly 40 percent of this land was still in agricultural production in 1990. Natural assets include 75 miles of Lake Michigan shoreline (over half of it in public ownership); 280 square miles of forest preserves, parks, and other open space (including irreplaceable areas of undisturbed prairie and oak savannah); 138 square miles of wetlands; and extensive river, stream, and lake resources. The 19,000-acre Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie was recently established on the former site of the Joliet Arsenal (source: Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission at http://www.nipc.cog.il.us/aboutreg.htm).

The Village of Glenview is located in northern Cook County, the second tier of communities radiating from downtown Chicago about 20 miles away. The Villages of Wilmette, Northfield, Northbrook, Golf, Morton Grove, Skokie, Niles, Prospect Heights, and the City of Des Plaines immediately surround the Village.

**The Glenview Community**

The Village of Glenview is an established suburban community with approximately 42,000 persons in an area of 13.2 square miles. The Village is located east of Interstate 294, west of Eden's Expressway, south of Willow Road, and north of Golf Road. The population's median age is 41.3 and the 2000 median family income was $80,730. In 1998 the average home value was $252,640; the median home value was $336,000.

Glenview is a “home-rule” community with a Council-Manager form of government. With over 300 employees, the Village operates a full-time Police and Fire Department, as well as Public Works and Development. Through the purchase of private water systems, the Glenview Water Department services some 15,000 users beyond its corporate limits. The largest single revenue source is the sales tax, and the corporate fund property tax rate has been stable for the past decade.

Glenview is predominantly developed, with a number of small areas available for new development. Most of the Village's development occurred in the 1950's and 1960's. The Glen (The Glenview Naval Air Station Redevelopment) and Techny Area are significant recent developments. Though Glenview has little remaining land to be developed, there will continue to be a demand for new residential, commercial, and industrial development in the future. This will likely require the replacement of older existing land uses and the redevelopment of transitional sites.

While Glenview is a predominately single-family residential community, it also includes multiple-family housing and a series of mixed-use commercial districts along its community arterials, industrial lands, and the Cook County Forest Preserve.
2.1 ISSUES LEADING TO THE INITIATION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The planning process for developing the Comprehensive Plan included numerous discussions with residents and community leaders about the future of Glenview, as well as its strengths and weaknesses. The following issues emerged from these discussions.

Development Pressures
Glenview is a community experiencing unprecedented growth and redevelopment brought about, in part, by the 1993 closure and the current redevelopment of the 1,121-acre Glenview Naval Air Station. The Village faces major challenges in assimilating anticipated population and employment base growth over the next 10 years. While the Village anticipates some growth in the next 10 years, it will be at a slower pace than the last 10 years, because large undeveloped parcels of land (such as the GNAS and the Techny Properties) have been developed.

In November of 2000 the Village issued a request for proposal for a New Comprehensive Plan for the Village of Glenview. Following are a list of objectives and issues articulated in the RFP.

Residential Character/Community Character
Glenview views itself as a residential community of predominantly single family homes. In order to maintain this character, the planning process should address:

- Maintenance and enhancement of the residential neighborhoods.
- Treatment of corridors for existing and proposed residential areas that abut major thoroughfares or highways.
- Impact of the urban metropolitan area on the community, specifically O'Hare Airport, and the major highway corridors; Interstate 294 (Tri-State), Interstate 94 (Eden's Expressway), Lake Avenue, Willow Road, Milwaukee Avenue, Waukegan Road and Golf Road.
- Preservation of the unique environmental characteristics and available open space.
- Identity and sense of community.

Quality of Life
Planning will ensure that the quality of life for all Village residents will be preserved and enhanced well into the future. Issues to be addressed:

- What do we want to preserve?
- What do we want that we don’t have now?
- What are the roles of the downtown and the business districts?
- What are the five major concerns?

Commercial and Economic
Since sales and utility taxes are the major source of revenue for the Village, the strength of the community depends largely on its economic vitality. Vitality should be maintained and enhanced. Specific issues to consider include:

- Enhance and diversify the tax base throughout the community.
- Analyze current commercial areas.
- Determine appropriate development for the arterial corridors.

Community Facilities
The attractiveness of Glenview is based largely on the adequacy of the public utilities and facilities and the responsiveness of the municipality to the needs of its residents and businesses. Our goal would be to absorb new development and redevelopment in a manner which maintains that high level of service. Specific issues within this category include:

- Evaluation of municipal facilities.
- Inclusion of the park district, library and various school districts long range plans.
- Analysis of current and potential open space.

Transportation
Glenview is served by public transportation through the Milwaukee Road (Metra Rail), PACE, and the CTA in Skokie. The Village is bordered by the I-294 Tollway on the west and I-94 (Eden's Expressway) to the east. The adequacy of the road network, its
compatibility with adjacent land uses, and perceptions of increased congestion are critical concerns in the community. Specific concerns to address include:

a. Recommend right-of-way widths for collector streets, thoroughfares, and variations of their form. The adequacy of major arterials, particularly east/west streets.
b. Strengthen and articulate Village policy on sidewalk extension and develop a priority ranking for implementation.
c. Recommend pedestrian walkway easements.
d. Propose land development with specific roadway configurations (where appropriate).
e. Examine proper use of private drives and half streets (Glenview Subdivision Code prohibits private streets).
f. Examine the adopted and proposed bikeway system in the Village to determine further expansion and refinement of the plan.
g. Develop traffic calming techniques in residential areas.
h. Review overall traffic circulation within the community.
i. Adopt transit-oriented techniques adapted for local conditions.
j. Analyze railroad signaling options to improve traffic flow at crossings.

2.2 MISSION STATEMENT

Based on prior public discussions of planning issues, and the initial discussions in this planning process, the Comprehensive Plan Committee created a mission statement. This statement incorporates public input gathered at a Village-wide workshop conducted June 24th, 2001, contributions from the Village-wide household survey, confidential stakeholder interviews, meetings with Village officials and staff, and analyses and studies conducted by the consultant team.

The Village of Glenview 2004 Comprehensive Plan will:

a. Provide a long-term vision based on a consensus of the community’s values.
b. Protect and enhance the fundamental features that make Glenview a desirable residential community, especially the high-quality schools and parks, and the safety and security of the neighborhoods.
c. Address specific planning problems regarding traffic and current development/redevelopment concerns, especially the redevelopment of areas along the community’s arterial road system.
d. Create a coordinated framework of regulatory tools to assist in the implementation of the Plan.

2.3 GOALS

The mission statement is further defined with the following goals and objectives:

a. Provide a long-term vision based on a consensus of the community’s values:
   1. Conduct meetings with property owners and residents to define more specific issues.
   2. Conduct a household survey to ascertain the broad spectrum of opinions, attitudes, and values of the community.
   3. Engage in a detailed discussion of numerous options and ideas.

b. Protect and enhance the fundamental features that make Glenview a desirable residential community, especially the high-quality schools and parks, and the safety and security of the neighborhoods:
   1. Strive for sustainable development patterns that support present and future residents of the Village.
   2. Establish sound strategies for maintaining the character of the existing neighborhoods.
   3. Enhance the fundamental features that make Glenview a desirable residential community.
   4. Emphasize high-quality design in physical planning.
   5. Provide guidance for balancing residential, commercial, and industrial investments.

c. Address specific planning problems regarding traffic and current development/redevelopment concerns, especially the redevelopment of areas along the community’s arterial road system:
   1. Include specific sub-area plans as part of the Village’s Comprehensive plan.
   2. Address issues of safety and security in the community.
   3. Address specific planning issues regarding traffic and current development/redevelopment concerns.

d. Create a coordinated framework of regulatory tools to assist in the implementation of the Plan:
   1. Propose methods of managing growth to minimize negative impacts on the community.
   2. Recommend a coordinated framework of regulatory tools to assist the Village in the implementation of the Plan, including key opportunities for public and/or private investments within the targeted areas of the Village.
   3. Recognize and establish standards for services and utilities.
   4. Identify the roles and responsibilities of the various parties involved in the implementation.
   5. Recommend changes in public policies to enable a smooth implementation of the plan.

Subareas and Issues Identified by the Village:

The location of recommendations for the specific subareas are listed after each subarea heading.

A. Old Willow Triangle
   Issue: redevelopment potential within the I-2 Light Industrial District. Property is within the TIF. See Recommendations on page 66.

B. Jefferson/Monroe Area
   Issue: review of progress of the RT-8 redevelopment. Small, older homes - fairly depressed residential - expected to continue. See Recommendations on page 40.

C. LeHigh/Chestnut/John’s Drive Area
   Issue: land use analysis. Property is in the TIF. Underutilized land - salvage yards, auto body shops, major entry into the base. See Recommendations on page 63.

D. Chestnut Ave. South Side from LeHigh East to Cemetery
   Issue: land use analysis. Property is in the TIF. Major entry into the base; much unused land. See Recommendations on page 58.

E. Waukegan Road North of Harrison to Willow
   Issue: focus on ways of strengthening the existing Business District as well as addressing redevelopment concerns and impact on existing and projected traffic flow. Streetscaping amid basic traffic control issues. See Recommendations on page 50.

F. Greenwood and West Lake Avenue Area
   Issue: land use analysis and redevelopment including infrastructure and annexation issues as related to existing and proposed land use and impact on existing and projected traffic flow. Mix of single-family, townhouses, apartments. Lack of infrastructure. See Recommendations on page 60.
G. D-1 District and surrounding R-18 District
Issue: Continuation of discussion already underway with respect to appropriateness of land use as related to D-1 zoning, bulk regulations, density and ultimate redevelopment/build-out with related traffic generation. Analysis of D-1 zoning District. See Recommendations on page 28.

H. Milwaukee Avenue corridor from Greenwood to Willow
Issue: Land Use, redevelopment and annexation analysis. See Recommendations on page 54.
At the inception of the Comprehensive Planning process, PDI, along with the Village staff, formulated a comprehensive strategy to incorporate the community’s ideas, expertise, concerns, and needs into the plan. The multi-phase process included committee meetings, the review of prior studies, field observation, analysis of existing conditions, community-wide and sub-area workshops, a household survey, confidential stakeholder interviews, and the creation of a mission statement.

3.1 COMMITTEE MEETINGS

The Village assembled a 22-person committee with representatives from the Village Board; Planning Zoning & Appearance Commissions; the Park District; School Districts; Library Board; Chamber of Commerce; and local citizens. A close working relationship with the Committee guided the planning process (see Appendix C.1, C.2, C.3 for minutes from Committee meetings, open houses, and Village-wide open houses).

Comprehensive Plan Meeting Schedule

- Meeting No. 1: May 24, 2001
- Meeting No. 2: June 21, 2001
- Meeting No. 3: July 26, 2001
- Meeting No. 4: September 6, 2001

- Meeting No. 5: September 20, 2001
- Meeting No. 6: November 6, 2001
- Meeting No. 7: January 17, 2002
- Meeting No. 8: March 7, 2002
- Meeting No. 9: May 23, 2002
- Meeting No. 10: June 13, 2002
- Meeting No. 11: July 18, 2002
- Meeting No. 12: August 29, 2002
- Meeting No. 13: October 3, 2002
- Meeting No. 14: November 7, 2002
- Meeting No. 15: January 9, 2003
- Meeting No. 16: April 7, 2003
- Meeting No. 17: May 22, 2003
- Meeting No. 18: July 17, 2003
- Meeting No. 19: October 9, 2003

Open House Schedule Sub Areas

- June 21, 2001 - Sub Area G – No.1
- September 20, 2001 - Sub Area A, D, & F - No.1
- October 11, 2001 - Sub Area C - No.1
- October 25, 2001 - Sub Area B & E - No.1
- November 15, 2001 - Sub Area H - No.1
- December 13, 2001 - Sub Area G - No.2
- August 15, 2002 - Sub Area G & Sub Area E - No.2
- September 19, 2002 - Sub Area A, B, C, & D - No.2
- Sub Area H & F - No.2: October 10, 2002

3.2 REVIEW OF PRIOR STUDIES

Reviewing prior planning, traffic, annexation, and other studies undertaken by the Village was an important step in understanding and establishing current conditions, procedures, policies and decisions made in the Village. See Appendix A for a detailed list of all documents evaluated by PDI.
3.3 FIELD OBSERVATION

As a component of the project orientation, a field observation of the community was conducted. Along with Village Staff and Plan Committee members, the consultants walked through critical sub-areas in the community to identify key features, areas of concern, and recent changes.

3.4 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Public participation in the planning process is critical. It affords residents the opportunity to identify and protect special places within the community, utilize local knowledge, and share ideas, values, and concerns. Implementation of the plan is improved when the public is a partner in the planning process. The public participation strategy was comprehensive. It included confidential stakeholder interviews, a community-wide household survey, and community workshops scheduled at key junctures to elicit concerns, present information, discuss findings and conclusions, and establish consensus for the next phase.

3.5 CONFIDENTIAL STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

Confidential stakeholder interviews were conducted with 38 individuals to discuss strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges within Glenview. Persons interviewed (see list in Appendix D.1 and D.3) included residents, merchants, past and present public officials, builders and developers, representatives from local institutions, and civic leaders.

3.6 COMMUNITY-WIDE SURVEY

In order to gather input from the broadest spectrum of the community, an in-depth household survey was mailed to approximately 23,500 households, 2,873 surveys were returned. The survey was designed to measure the community’s attitudes regarding quality of life issues, such as residential neighborhoods, commercial districts, new development, redevelopment, and traffic. It also attempted to measure the community’s satisfaction with its neighborhoods, amenities and services, and its perceptions of Glenview’s future.

The full compilation of the responses is included in the appendices of this document (Appendix D.1). Some of the most notable information obtained by the survey follows.
Background Information
Of the respondents to the survey, 95.7% were homeowners in the Village, 79.2% lived in single-family homes, 24.7% were in the 45-54 age group and 74% were over the age of 45 years. Also 69.7% had no children while 27.4% have 1-2 children under age 18 in their home. Approximately 3/4 of the respondents lived within walking distance to a park or open space and 1/5 were employed within the Village.

Retail and Business
Of the respondents 61.4% wanted a bakery, 30.4% wanted a gas station, 63.9% wanted a family restaurant, and 55.2% wanted a cinema.

Rating Visual Appearance of Retail Areas and Community Facilities
20% to 40% of respondents view streets, sidewalks and landscaping as good. 60% to 70% of the respondents rate the overall services of Glenview (commuter rail, emergency, police, fire, etc.) as good. Similarly the quality of parks, open space, and recreational facilities were rated highly by the respondents.

Incorporation of Residential and Retail/Office Development
66.2% of respondents see it as very important that multi-family development add little traffic to local residential streets. 63.9% see it as very important for multi-family development to have high architectural quality. 74% see it as very important for single-family development be compatible with surrounding neighborhoods, including scale, size, and setbacks. 53.1% find it very important to locate new retail/office development downtown on Glenview Road. 78.6% see parking as very important.

Village Funds
60.8% of the respondents support funds being used for overall landscape, views, and visual character of the community. 53.5% support improving the appearance/streetscaping of retail areas. 33.0% support a $1-$50 property tax increase to fund the improvements. While 24.8% support a $51-$100 property tax improvement to fund the improvement.

Traffic & Circulation
38.9% rate Waukegan Road as being congested all the time. 40.0% rate the intersection of Waukegan Road & E. Lake Ave. as being congested all the time. 37.9% strongly agree about more parking for retail.

3.7 COMMUNITY-WIDE ISSUES AND SUBAREA WORKSHOPS
Four community-wide workshops were conducted at critical stages in the planning process. An initial workshop helped identify major issues, challenges, and problems facing the community. A second workshop was dedicated to addressing issues of traffic and development/redevelopment. The third workshop was a forum to present findings and initial recommendations to the public, and the final workshop presented a draft of the 2004 Comprehensive Plan. Along with the community-wide workshops, smaller workshops were conducted for the special study areas identified by the Village. Findings from all of the workshops are included in Appendix C.2 and C.3.

3.8 MAPPING AND DATA ANALYSIS
PDI analyzed exiting conditions, and identified trends and patterns via maps and diagrams. Visually representing the community’s characteristics is an analytical tool, which simplifies and highlights the community’s features.

Map 3.1: Downtown analysis map.
4.1 DEVELOPMENT HISTORY AND TRENDS

Although Glenview was incorporated in 1899, with a population of approximately 400, its history dates back to the early 17th century. The Village, an early Indian settlement, grew around the East and West forks of the North Branch River. In 1872, the Milwaukee Railroad (the “Milwaukee Road”) laid a single track primarily to haul timber and supplies for the reconstruction of Chicago after the Great Fire of 1871. A parallel track was constructed in 1892, anticipating increased travel for the 1893 Columbian Exposition in Chicago. Glenview's first commuter residents arrived in 1892.

Village residents adopted the name Glenview four years prior to the 1899 incorporation. In 1999, the Village celebrated its Centennial year.

Glenview’s Early History

Glenview’s first residents purchased land patents from the government at $1.25 an acre, payable in five 25-cent annual installments. Purchasers were required to occupy and improve the land for a three-year period in order to obtain a final title. The present Glenview area was originally known as South Northfield; the western parts of the Village were known as West Northfield; and a Northbrook settlement near present Dundee Road was known as North Northfield.

Initial Development

The 1833 Treaty of Chicago led to a flood of settlers in the Glenview Area. These early settlers all located along established Indian Trails; two of these trails, Little Fort and Indian Lake, are today’s Waukegan and Glenview Roads. As people began working together, it became natural for them to begin thinking about neighborhoods and area-wide relationships for mutual support and protection. The establishment of townships became a natural unit of government. The early settlers in the community were English. The 1850’s saw a second wave of immigration to Glenview, consisting primarily of German families.

The Civil War years were a period of prosperity for farmers in Glenview. Many improved their farms and homes. Then, in 1871, when Chicago was devastated by fire, Chicago’s building needs led to the construction of the Milwaukee Railroad through Glenview. These events all laid the foundation for Glenview to become one of Chicago’s early bedroom communities. Glenview’s easy access to downtown Chicago, its multitude of churches, schools, and businesses, established during Glenview’s early history, all contributed to this status.

The third wave of settlers to Glenview was the Swedenborgian Community. Members of the Swedenborgian Society of Chicago wanted to relocate to “the Country.” In 1892 they settled on a 40-acre tract of land in the Northfield Township. Swain Nelson, a...
renowned landscaper, drew up plans for what would become one of the first planned communities in the United States. He incorporated a suggestion from Hugh Burnham (nephew of the famous Chicago Urban Designer and Architect Daniel Burnham) to set aside a central area of about 10 acres for church uses. A private road swept around this center, with building lots for church members on the perimeter. A pond was made at the center for fire protection. Soil from the pond was used to raise the center so the Church and school would be on a hill. A substantial tree-planting venture turned the cornfields into a “Park.” By 1894 eleven families had moved into the subdivision.

At the same time the early Glenview community was growing. In 1899 Glenview was incorporated and Hugh Burnham was elected the first Village president of Glenview. His first order of business was to lay wooden sidewalks along Glenview road, from Shermer Road to Waukegan Road, and north to Lake Street, connecting Glenview’s early residential communities, commercial development, and churches. Much of this early development still exists today.

The 1850 Cook County census credited Northfield Township, with over 1,000 inhabitants, as being the most densely settled township outside the City of Chicago.

Glenview Gets Its Name
On July 1, 1895, at a meeting at Al Eustice’s tavern (still standing, and in business as the Glenview House), Hugh Burnham, who said he could see a view of the Glen from his home in The Park (the Swedenborgian community at Glenview and Shermer Roads) suggested the present Village name, Glenview.

Early Community Characteristics
Present-day Glenview Road was the Indian Lake Trail, following the south edge of the ‘big swamp’ (the Skokie or Muskoka) from the Des Plaines River to Lake Michigan. The Milwaukee Trail, west of the settlement, led to the Milwaukee tribes in Wisconsin. Waukegan Road, with present-day Shermer Road as a highland alternate in wet seasons, was Little Fort Trail (Roots: A Glenview Story, September 1, 1976).

Stagecoaches traveled along Milwaukee Road as early as 1836, and the mail was dropped off near The Grove, delivered to South Northfield by Pony Express. In 1850, the North Branch Railroad carried passengers and mail to Des Plaines, and again Pony Express relayed them to Glenview. Chicago’s need for building materials after the 1871 fire was the impetus for the single track of Milwaukee Railroad laid in 1872. An increase in the number of visitors and business activity with the World’s Columbian Exposition created the need for the double track, completed in 1892.

The railroad, in turn, affected Glenview’s development. Prior to 1872, Glenview farmers concentrated largely on crops like onions, hay, oats, or horseradish, because distance combined with poor gravel roads made truck gardening impractical. Because of the railroad, milk became an important product. There were three morning milk trains and in 1880 Herman Rugen and his son Charles built a cheese factory on Shermer Road. Business improved, and William Hutchings opened a general store, which he sold to Charles Rugen and Henry Appleyard in 1892. There was a drainage tile factory just north of the station, on Waukegan Road. The Hutchings brothers had a sawmill and gristmill.

Downtown
Downtown Glenview dates back to the early 1800’s, when trading posts were established at the corner of Glenview and Waukegan Roads. As Glenview grew into one of Chicago’s most desirable suburban communities, its downtown also grew. As an outer-ring suburb adjacent to other communities with strong commercial components, Glenview’s downtown functioned as part of a regional commercial and retail network. As a result, Glenview’s downtown evolved primarily as a convenience-oriented retail-service center for the community.

The development of Golf Mill, Edens Plaza, and Old Orchard shopping centers in the late 1950’s provided Glenview area residents...
with a wealth of regional shopping choices. As an automobile-oriented community, shopping centers continued to supplant downtown retailing, and their anchor stores became larger and more regional in scope.

Finally, the growth of Glenview to the north and west provided market support for the development of additional retail concentrations at Willow and Pfingsten, and along the Milwaukee Avenue corridor during the 1970's and 1980's. Subsequently, Glenview's downtown area, with a historically small retail component, has evolved into an automobile-oriented commuter and service center, rather than a center of specialty retailing. Nonetheless, the downtown area has maintained its role as the cultural and civic center of the community by virtue of the post office, the train station, the Library, Jackman Park, and the seasonal community-wide activities held downtown (Downtown: A Vision for the Future, Planning Resources Inc. & Real Estate Planning Group Inc., 1994).

### 4.2 ANNEXATION AND GROWTH

The Village, as a policy, does not solicit annexation, believing that residents of adjoining unincorporated areas should take the initiative. Through "Voluntary Annexation," only property owners who were eager and willing to accept the responsibilities of living in Glenview will become residents and enjoy its benefits. There is also a process of "involuntary annexation" by which a municipality may annex an area of 60 acres or less, provided that either it is completely surrounded by one or more municipalities, or else it is bounded by a municipality on three sides, with a natural boundary (navigable river, lake, or forest preserve) on the fourth side. It is Village policy to annex these unincorporated areas. There are some instances when annexation is the result of a combination of voluntary and involuntary procedures, as when a referendum is held to decide whether an area should be annexed. All qualified voters of the area may then vote on the proposition, and a simple majority prevails (Glenview Annexation, 1987).

#### History of Annexation and Development

Historically, the policy for annexation established by the Village of Glenview was based upon the use of the Glenview water system and on the ability of the Village to provide essential services to adjacent areas. All unincorporated areas that use Glenview water are annexed when they become contiguous to Glenview corporate lines. Very little annexation occurred in Glenview during its first forty years. In the 1950's and 1960's, the Village began to annex modest amounts of land in areas north and southwest of the initial Village boundaries. The 1970's marked some of the Village's largest annexations, with the Glenview Naval Air Station annexation occurring in 1971; most annexation during this period occurred northwest of the initial Village boundary. Through the 1980's and 1990's, the Village maintained a steady stream of annexation.

As annexation has slowly brought community boundaries together, the Village of Glenview has established a series of annexation agreements with adjacent communities:

- Willow Road Corridor Agreement, March 1990
- Milwaukee Road and Sanders Road Corridor Agreement, April 1997

Five unincorporated areas in and around the Village of Glenview were identified for closer analysis, in order to develop the Village's Annexation Policy (See Section 10.2).

#### Significant Annexations

The past quarter century has seen a series of significant annexations; of these, the Glenview Naval Air Station is the largest land tract to have been annexed. Other large annexations include:

- Indian Ridge Subdivision, 1977
- Northshore Corporate Park, 1990
- Glenlake Estate Subdivision and Industrial Areas, 1990
- Milwaukee Avenue Corridor, 1990
- Northfield Woods Subdivision, 1991
- Multiple annexations along Milwaukee Avenue

### 4.3 TWENTIETH CENTURY GLENVIEW

Glenview was incorporated as a village in 1899 with Hugh Burnham as its first mayor. It had an adult population of 325, according to Village Profile. Its first governing board installed wooden planked sidewalks and gas streetlights on Waukegan Road, but the gravel streets were not paved until the 1920's. The Village remained primarily a farming community, and as late as 1930 had fewer than 2,000 residents. The population grew slowly until 1950, when the census recorded 6,142 residents. Spurred by the opening of the Edens Expressway (Chicago's first expressway to the northern suburbs) along the eastern boundary of the Village (the western boundary is now 3.5 miles away and includes the Illinois Tri-State Tollway), the population of the Village expanded to 18,132 in a land area of 5.1 square miles, according to the 1960 Census. A Special Census in 1963 recorded a total population of 22,364. The 1970 Census reported a population of 24,880 in a land area 6 of square miles, up nominally from the 1963 Special Census, indicating the limited land area available for future growth and a restrictive Village policy towards multiple-family housing. The population of the Village increased to 32,060 in the 1980 Census (10.9 square miles) and to 37,093 in the 1990 Census.
Glenview Naval Air Station
Nationally, Glenview is identified with the Glenview Naval Air Station, located directly in the heart of the Village. The Navy had been present in Glenview since 1937, when an airstrip was implemented at what was then the Curtiss-Reynolds Airport, to handle new, high-speed aircraft. The Curtiss-Reynolds administration building was converted into “Hangar 1.” Construction of additional buildings began in 1942, and in 1946 the airport officially became the Headquarters for the Naval Reserve Training Command. The base consists of 1288 acres of land, annexed into the corporate limits of the Village of Glenview in June 1971 (Source: The Village of Glenview at a Glance, 2000).

In 1993 the Department of Defense announced the closure of the Glenview Naval Air Station (GNAS). At this time GNAS employed over 300 civilian support personnel with more than 1700 active duty Navy, Marine, Army, and Coast Guard personnel. To ensure that the property was expeditiously redeveloped, the D.O.D. designated the Village as the Local Redevelopment Authority. Initial discussions on the reuse of the base were conducted under the 1990 Comprehensive Plan. In July of 1997, the Village completed negotiations to receive the GNAS property for a total cost of approximately $2.1 million.

The Glenview Naval Air Station Redevelopment Project Master Plan and Design Guidelines were adopted as an update to the 1990 Comprehensive Plan in 1998. The Village is the Master Developer for the entire site (hereinafter “The Glen”) and in that capacity engaged a real estate development/management firm to serve as a development advisor. The implementation process for the redevelopment has involved the Village, the Glenview Public Library, the Glenview Park District, and the two Elementary School Districts that serve property to be redeveloped. A key component of the redevelopment plan implementation was the establishment of a Tax Incremental Financing District for The Glen.

The final site development plan included 417.6 acres designated for public land, and 714 acres of non-public land (See Appendix F1 for land use acreage breakdown). Assuming moderate growth of the TIF, the Village expects build-out within the next eight years, and complete payment and/or provision for payment of all redevelopment costs (including debt service) in approximately 11 years (Source: Official Statement, General Obligation Bonds Series 2001; R.V. Norwe & Associates, Inc.).
5.1 DEMOGRAPHICS

The demographic overview provides an evaluation of historic population trends within Glenview, as well as how Glenview compares to similar adjacent communities. It includes an analysis of residents, household size and composition, age, race, income, and employment characteristics. An understanding of the community’s population provides a foundation for addressing issues and elements of the 2004 Comprehensive Plan.

This analysis is based on secondary source material received from the Village of Glenview, the U.S. Bureau of the Census, the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission (NIPC), and interviews with key persons knowledgeable about Glenview. For the purpose of this study, Glenview’s demographic information was compared with nine Illinois communities (Highland Park, Northbrook, Wilmette, Naperville, Buffalo Grove, Park Ridge, Wheaton, Arlington Heights and Palatine) with populations over 25,000, and similar economic statistics. Household size, age, and sex demographics were compared to Cook County.

Population

Glenview’s population in the 2000 census was 41,847; this was a 12.8% (4,754 absolute) increase from 1990. It is projected that the Village population will increase by 26.7% by the year 2020 to 53,036 (see Appendix E1). Glenview’s projected population growth is unmatched by any other comparable community. Naperville comes the closest with a projected rate of 21.2%, while Wilmette and Park Ridge both anticipate negative population growth. Historically, Glenview’s rate of growth has outpaced both the County’s and State’s rate of growth. Glenview’s strong population growth trend can be attributed to its annexation history (See Appendix E.1.1: Population to Village square acres).

Age Distribution

Glenview’s median age is 41.3, similar to the communities of Wilmette, Highland Park, and Northbrook. Cook County and the Village of Naperville have median ages of 33.6 and 34.2 respectively. The prevailing trend in Glenview and other communities is towards a more aged population (the median age in 1990 for the Village was 37.5 - see Appendix E.3.2).

52% of Glenview’s population is female. 74% is over the age of 18 years and 16% is over 65 years of age. These population trends are mirrored in each community to which Glenview was compared. Cook County has fewer persons over the age of 65 years (12%).

Figure 5.1: Change in population growth between Census years.

Figure 5.2: U.S. Census Population data for Glenview.
Racial/Ethnic Distribution

The majority of Glenview’s population is white (83%), although this percentage has been decreasing since 1970. The Village’s fastest growing ethnic group is Asian (10.1% of the population, compared to the County average of 4.8%), which includes Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Korean, and Vietnamese. The Korean population, the largest among Glenview’s Asian ethnicities, amounts to 4.5% of Glenview’s population. 1.6% of Glenview’s population is African-American, which is comparable to other communities, but far less than the County’s (26.1%). 4.1% of Glenview’s population is Hispanic, compared to 19.9% for the County (see Appendix E.3).

Housing Characteristics

The 2000 Census showed 15,464 housing units in the Village, a 13.7% increase from 13,348 units in 1990. 88% of these units were owner-occupied and 12% were rented. The vacancy rate in Glenview was 2.45%, a slight decrease from 3.02% in 1990 compared to the County average of 4.8%), the vacancy rate amongst homeowners was 0.7% and 3.2% for renters. In 1990, 81.75% of the housing units in the Village were single-family; 4% of the housing units in the Village were valued at under $100,000, 36% between $100,000-$199,999, 29% between $200,000-$299,999, and 31% at $300,000 or more; the median housing value was $310,000 (Source: Village of Glenview Miscellaneous Statistics, December 31, 1998; See Appendix E.2.1).

Housing Trends

Glenview, at 88%, has seen a slim 3% increase in owner-occupied housing over the last decade. Again, this is consistent with the other communities to which Glenview was compared in this study; the County showed fewer owner-occupied housing units at 58%. The 2000 Census showed 24.9% of the housing units were for sale, 15.7% for rent, and 18.5% were designated for recreational or occasional use.

Households

Glenview expects the number of households to increase by 5,560, or 26.7% by 2020, which is the largest projected increase among similar communities. Naperville, for example, projects household growth at 19.3%, while adjacent Wilmette anticipates only 1.3% household growth. Glenview’s projected increase may be attributed to the projected development of housing units in the Glen (See Appendix E2.1).

According to the 2000 Census, Glenview’s average household size of 2.67 persons was on average with the household size of similar communities, and slightly lower than the 1990 figure of 2.75 (See Appendix E2).

Income Distribution

Glenview’s 1990 median family income was $67,412, which was 74.4% greater than the State of Illinois’ $38,664, and 91.4% greater than the United States’ $35,225. Amongst municipalities in Illinois with a population of 25,000 or more, Glenview ranked fifth; Highland Park, with a median family income of $82,712, ranked first; and Palatine, with $57,376 ranked tenth (See Appendix: E4). Preliminary median family income figures list the Village of Glenview with $113,965 for the year 2000 (Source: Chicago Tribune Community Profile).

Glenview’s median household income in 1990 was $59,020, which was 83% greater than the $32,252 value statewide, and 96.4% greater than the national median of $30,056. The Village’s 1990 per capita income of $30,531 was 100.8% greater than Illinois’ $15,201, and 111.7% greater than the national number.

Employment

Based on 1990 Census information, Glenview’s work force by industry was relatively similar to that of Cook County, the Chicago Metropolitan Statistical Area, and the State. The Village does show slightly elevated numbers in ‘finance, insurance, real professional services’, and lower figures for persons employed in “manufacturing” (See Appendix E.5.4).

Glenview’s employed work force by industry is similar to Cook County and the State, and serves to insulate the Village from economic problems with any particular industry. Glenview’s employed work force...
is predominantly comprised of executive/professional occupations, which further protects Glenview’s economy from negative trends in manufacturing sectors (Source: Official Statement, General Obligation Bonds Series 2001: R.V. Norene & Associates, Inc.).

The 1990 Census shows 45.2% of the Village’s employed persons in executive/professional occupations, which is very high compared to 27.6% in Cook County and 26.5% statewide. 37% of persons, by occupation, are classified as “technical, sales, and administrative support;” 7% as “service occupation;” 0% as farming, forestry, or fishing; 6% as “precision production, craft, and repair;” and 5% as “operators, fabricators, and laborers” (See Appendix E.5.5). The unemployment rate for the Village of Glenview in 2001 was 2.3% (Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics).

By late 2003, the ten largest employers in Glenview are Kraft Foods, ITW/Signode, AON, Glenbrook Hospital, Glenview Community Consolidated School District #34, Scott Foresman, Glenbrook South High School, Village of Glenview, and Guaranty Trust Life Insurance. They provided over 7000 jobs in Glenview (See Appendix E.5.6).

5.2 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TRENDS

The Market Overview presents an analysis of the demand potentials for market-related land uses within the Village of Glenview. The analysis includes residential, industrial, office, and commercial uses. This information will be the basis for land development and redevelopment strategies that will be proposed in later sections of the Plan. Supporting statistical and demographic information related to this analysis is in Appendix E.
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Village of Glenview Comprehensive Plan

Market Overview

The market potential for the Village is influenced by economic conditions found throughout the Chicago Metropolitan Area. The addition of 1.78 million (to a total of 9,045,000) and 1.43 million (to a total of 5,280,000) jobs between now and 2020. These increases represent a 25% gain in population and a 37% growth in jobs over the 1990 base year total. It is also projected that this growth will take place largely outside the Chicago city limits. The revised 2020 forecasts indicate that the largest numerical gains in population will occur in Cook and Will Counties. Will and McHenry Counties will experience the largest percentage gains in population. Gains in the number of jobs, will still be the largest in Cook County. The next highest numerical gains are expected in DuPage and Lake Counties.

In 1993, the nine-county Metro Area supported 3,700,000 non-agricultural workers. The region trailed only the New York and Los Angeles regions in total non-agricultural wage and salary jobs (Source: Toward 2020; Population, Household, and Employment Forecasts for Counties and Municipalities in Northern Illinois, Sept. 27, 2000).

The Glenview market area includes nine townships: Maine, Niles, Northfield, Deerfield, Elk Grove, New Trier, Vernon, West Deerfield and Wheeling. This area added 118,400 new jobs during the period from 1983 to 1993. It also added 57,180 housing units, 4.8 million square feet of office space, and 5.3 million square feet of retail space (Source: Glenview Naval Air Station Concourse Redevelopment, Tracy Cross & Associates, 1995).

Recently completed commercial development within the Village includes; Willow Creek Retail Development, Heatherfield Commercial Area, Optima East and West, and Glen Oak Plaza. The following are projects under construction or in planning stage; E-Z Go Service Station Redevelopment, North Shore Country Club, Sand Mill Crossing, 1015-1031 Waukegan Road, Ihop, Steak n' Shake, and Jennings' Volkswagen (See Appendix E.7 ‘The Village of Glenview at a Glance’).

Residential Land-use

A variety of factors affect residential demand potential, including the quality of residential neighborhoods, location, schools, parks, and low crime. Glenview is characterized by mature residential neighborhoods, built-out for the most part, and with limited potential for infill or reuse of existing land parcels. According to the 1990 Census, there were 13,384 housing units in the Village of which 9,310 (81.7%) were in single-unit structures. The median home value was reported at $235,600, 191.2% greater than the statewide median of $80,900. Moreover, 96.8% of the homes in the Village were valued above $100,000 (the statewide median value was $80,900), and significantly, 31.7% were valued above $500,000. From the available 2000 Census data in Glenview, there were 15,464 occupied housing units, of which 88% were owner-occupied.

The Glen redevelopment offered a unique opportunity for new residential development within Glenview. Of the 714 acres of non-public land, 224.9 acres were designated for single-family residential, 48.2 acres for multi-family residential, and 30.6 acres for senior housing.

As the demand for housing and larger housing units increases, the challenge for Glenview will lay in the preservation of its residential neighborhoods. Policies that regulate the massing and siting of new homes and ‘tear downs’ will need to be implemented. They are clearly outlined in the Village Zoning Code.
5.3 LAND USE PATTERNS, ACTIVITIES AND USES

An inventory of existing conditions in Glenview was conducted. The Village is made up of a variety of residential neighborhoods, commercial/industrial, and other areas. These elements have been organized according to districts, corridors, and places (See Map 5.2).

Proposed Land Use Map

The proposed land use map for the Village of Glenview is organized around three specific types of places: Districts, Corridors, and Places. Districts within the Village are defined as areas that include a mix of land uses that create a neighborhood. The districts in Glenview include the Downtown District, Business Districts, and the Residential Districts. Corridors are defined by their linear characteristic of land development. Many of the corridors include land adjoining traffic arterials. The corridors in the Village include Regional, Community and Neighborhood Corridors, Railroad Corridors, and Environmental Corridors. Places are defined by a single or concentrated land use pattern. The places in the Village include; significant green/open space, civic/institutional buildings and neighborhood commercial nodes (See Map 5.3: Proposed Land Use Map).
Along with the Village-Wide Comprehensive Plan, recommendations for eight subareas within the Village were made. These recommendations have been incorporated within the land use framework of districts, corridors and places. The eight subareas are as follows:

A. Old Willow Triangle
   Issue: redevelopment potential within the I-2 Light Industrial District. Property is within the TIF.

B. Jefferson/Monroe Area
   Issue: review of progress of the RT-8 redevelopment. Small, older homes - fairly depressed residential - expected to continue.

C. LeHigh/Chestnut/John's Drive Area
   Issue: land use analysis. Property is in the TIF. Under utilized land - salvage yards, auto body shops, major entry into the base.

D. Chestnut Ave. south side from LeHigh east to Cemetery
   Issue: land use analysis. Property is in the TIF. Major entry into the base; much unused land.

E. Waukegan Road north of Harrison to Willow
   Issue: focus on ways of strengthening the existing Business District as well as addressing redevelopment concerns and impact on existing and projected traffic flow. Streetscaping amid basic traffic control issues.

F. Greenwood and West Lake Avenue Area
   Issue: land use analysis and redevelopment including infrastructure and annexation issues as related to existing and proposed land use and impact on existing and projected traffic flow. Mix of single-family, townhouses, and apartments. Lack of infrastructure.

G. D-1 District and surrounding R-18 District
   Issue: continuation of discussion already underway with respect to appropriateness of land use as related to D-1 zoning, bulk regulations, density and ultimate redevelopment/build-out with related traffic generation. Analysis of D-1 Zoning District.

H. Milwaukee Avenue corridor from Greenwood to Willow
   Issue: land use, redevelopment and annexation analysis.
Map 5.5: Recent Development in the Village.
LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT RECOMMENDATIONS - DISTRICTS

6.1 TYPES OF DISTRICTS

Districts within the Village are defined as areas that include a mix of uses to create a neighborhood. For instance, a residential district could be comprised of residential uses, along with other complimentary activities that support the district’s primary identity. A series of districts have been identified within the Village: the Downtown District, Business Districts (those areas exclusively set aside for industrial or business parks), and several Residential Districts.

The Downtown District

Downtown Glenview is commonly identified as the commercial area along Glenview Road, from the Waukegan Road intersection west to the Glenview Public Library. The surrounding residential district, and the mix of commercial/retail establishments from Grove Street south to Harmony Lane, closely identify themselves with the Downtown. The R-18 zoning district currently regulates most of this area. The Downtown District is defined by the D-1 Downtown Business District, a zoning district designed to provide a compact core in which retail stores and personal service establishments predominate, attract pedestrian consumers, and promote commerce. The R-18 Residential District is designed for multiple family dwellings at a density not exceeding 18 dwellings per acre (specifically, not less than 2,440 square feet per dwelling unit) (Source: Zoning Ordinance of the Village of Glenview, revised February 6, 2001- Ordinance No. 1400).

As concluded in the Downtown Architectural Study of 1998, “The historical context and density of the downtown can provide amenities for the suburban center not met by the vehicular strip and can reinforce the community’s sense of history.”

Development and land use along Glenview Road reflects its history. Compared to Waukegan Road’s typical arterial roadway-oriented businesses, the lots downtown are smaller, the buildings are built at the lot line, and the floor area of the one and two story structures is relatively small. Parking is typically located in lots behind the buildings or along the street.

Glenview Road is a community-oriented commercial corridor with a wide range of small retail, service, and office uses. Downtown Glenview is also host to a number of civic/institutional buildings: the Library, Post Office, Train Station, Fire Station, and Our Lady of Perpetual Help Church and School. Later redevelopments, such as the Renneckar’s building and Bess Hardware, are set back from Glenview Road with parking in front. The pedestrian quality of Glenview Road has slowly declined over the past three decades. The lack of continuity in both land use and development patterns creates problems for the retail businesses.
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Business Districts
The Business Districts in Glenview include office, light industrial, and commercial uses, in areas outside of transportation corridors. The traffic patterns, location, and organization of these campuses are oriented entirely towards vehicular access. They include the AON Office Park, North Shore Corporate Park, Willow Triangle Commercial area, and the proposed Glen Office/Industrial Campus.

Residential Districts
The quality of the residential neighborhoods is fundamental to Glenview's high standard of living. Glenview has a wide variety of housing types: single family, duplex, town homes, condominiums, and apartments. The residential neighborhoods have evolved as an extensive collection of distinctive and diverse neighborhoods. Housing densities range from one-acre single-family estate housing to multi-family densities. The predominant density is between two and four dwelling units per acre, found in older neighborhoods such as Glenayre, Glen Oak Acres, Swainwood, and newer neighborhoods such as Glenlake Estates. There are very few “gated” or “walled” residential subdivisions. Most of these are found in areas adjacent to a major thoroughfare, and are recent developments.

6.2 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE DOWNTOWN DISTRICT (SUB AREA G)
The Downtown has been designated a Village “Land Use District” due to its unique and complex role within the Community. The Downtown actually consists of many different components, which can be categorized and subdivided in different ways. These recommendations are predicated on a view of the Downtown that regards this district as comprised of distinct subareas and places. Each of these has its own distinctive character and pattern of development, which collectively form Glenview's Downtown. Each of these subareas and places represents a coherent component of the Downtown, which deserves customized recommendations tailored to its unique opportunities and challenges.

The three significant areas of the Downtown District are:
A. Glenview Road – “The Main Street”
B. Jackman Park – “Train Station Square”
C. Supportive Residential Districts

There are also three other significant areas that intersect the Downtown District:
• Waukegan Road – “The Community Arterial”
• Environmental Corridor
• Rail Road Corridor

As issues and opportunities within the downtown district were analyzed, a number of recurring themes arose. These themes form the basis from which the recommendations for the downtown district have been made:

• Social Preservation - the preservation of the social experience of a pedestrian-friendly downtown, which serves the needs of the immediate neighborhood as well as the community at large.
• Physical Preservation - the preservation of community favorites (historic buildings or places such as the “Dairy Bar”).
• Higher aspirations for “suburban main streets” - the aspects of other North Shore communities (such as Deerfield, Highland Park and Winnetka) with which residents identify.
• New Retail - the need for specialty shops, restaurants and family destinations within the Downtown.
• Civic Uses - the future of significant civic buildings within the downtown (the Library, OLPH, Train Station, Park District Building, Fire Station, and Post Office).

The following recommendations are intended to balance and integrate these overlapping themes.
A. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR GLENVIEW ROAD – “THE MAIN STREET” IN THE DOWNTOWN DISTRICT

Glenview’s downtown “Main Street” is Glenview Road from the intersection of Waukegan Road to Washington Street. This street should be the major location for the social and economic life of Downtown. Currently it has a mix of specialty shops, offices, stores (dry cleaners, paint shop, hardware, etc.), restaurants, a fire station, elderly housing, OLPH, the Library, and vacant storefronts. Important anchors within the downtown currently include the Library, grocery store and the train station.

The primary problems are: the non-continuous nature of retail business along the main street, caused by substantial amounts of non-retail uses at ground level; and the location of retail uses away from the street edge. While some lack of continuity can be accommodated within an active retail street, and may in some cases create a desirable pattern of diversity, too many discontinuities can prevent a main street from achieving a sustainable, memorable pattern of social activity.

To remedy this situation, Glenview Road should be characterized by continuous pedestrian-scale development, which accommodates automobiles and parking in the back, and in limited degrees, along the sides of buildings. Land uses should be retail whenever possible. Offices and/or residential development should be encouraged in upper levels because they provide daytime and evening traffic, (“eyes on the street” activity).

Downtown’s civic buildings are also an integral part of its history. These civic buildings should remain in the downtown district and, to whatever extent feasible, become an integral part of the social fabric of the downtown.

Civic buildings should create a public identity within the district and serve as gathering places for social events. In some cases, they help activate the street during evening hours and bring more people to the downtown. To function in this capacity, such civic buildings may activate the street during evening hours and bring more people to the downtown. To function in this capacity, such civic buildings may activate the street during evening hours and bring more people to the downtown.

Gateway features should signal the entrance into the Downtown District. These features could include traditional gateposts, landmark architectural features (such as a turret), landscape elements, paving patterns, and signage. They should serve as a feature and be designed to emphasize the transition into the downtown. There are opportunities for two major gateways at the intersection of Glenview and Waukegan Road and the Amtrak/Metra Rail Station. To some extent the train station and some of the corner buildings at Waukegan and Glenview Road create gateways. There are also opportunities for the creation of five minor gateways; the intersections of Grove Street and Waukegan Road, Dewes Street and Waukegan Road, Lehigh Avenue and Washington Street, Glenview Road and Washington Street, and Dewes and Washington Street.

Activities and Uses (Glenview Road – “The Main Street”)

a. Retail Activity
   - Locate retail activity (retail goods, specialty shops, services, or restaurants) on the ground floor.

b. Office
   - Locate additional businesses, and offices on upper floors (2 to 3 story buildings).

c. Residential
   - No exclusive residential allowed. Additional residential can be located on upper floors (2 to 3 story buildings) as permitted under D-1 zoning.

d. Office and Other Commercial Uses
   - Allow office and other commercial uses at the ground level in mixed-use buildings located on side streets (i.e. Optima West).

e. Library
   - While the primary option for the Library is to expand in its current location, if this is not feasible, the option to locate the Library centrally in the Downtown Areas should be considered. (See proposed land use diagram for Glenview Road).

f. Grocery Store
   - A grocery should remain in its current location.

After much evaluation, the Committee along with the consultants generated a land use plan diagram (Map 6.4) as a guide for future land use in the downtown district. All future land use options which were considered by the Committee can be found in Appendix F-4.

Redevelopment Process (Glenview Road – “The Main Street”)

a. Special Purpose District
   - Include Glenview Road within a special purpose Downtown District under Village control to expedite the revitalization and redevelopment process for the main street area. This process should include development initiatives that directly link the Village social, economic and aesthetic aspirations to specific economic advantages for the developer. Redevelopment of the downtown area will occur incrementally and involve detailed discussions with existing business operators and property owners. Preservation of locally owned businesses adds a unique and valuable character to the downtown area and should be recognized.
Village intervention in the redevelopment process. Among other variables, this analysis should inventory the size and distribution of retail and non-retail floor areas. Other data to be collected should include amenities (restrooms and handicapped accessibility), parking, and vacancies.

c. Street Front Retail
Increase opportunities for street front retail by considering relocation and redevelopment of non-retail uses along Glenview Road. To do this, consider relocation of the Fire Station within the downtown area. Consider incentives to property owners to modify office uses to retail uses. Also encourage the use of the street front buildings of OLPH along Glenview Road for retail or other public uses, and restrict changes that would be inconsistent with increased pedestrian activity along Glenview Road.

d. Redevelopment Plans
Create detailed redevelopment plans for commercial blocks along Glenview Road that can be used as guidelines for approving new investments proposed by property owners. For example, if and when the owners of the Renneckar's block choose to undertake remodeling or redevelopment of their property, a detailed building plan could be established to guide the approval process. Other blocks along Glenview Road would include Colonial Court and the Olympia Mall.

e. Maintenance and Management of Special Features
Assign maintenance and management of special features (such as banners, kiosks or seating) to local property owners or businesses. Alternatively, establish financing mechanisms that provide additional funds to public agencies for maintenance and management of these features.

Traffic, Parking and Circulation (Glenview Road – “The Main Street”)

a. Pedestrian Activity
Encourage street level pedestrian activity. Require front entries for the general public, but allow additional side or rear entry conditions for the public. Maintain sidewalks on all streets.

b. Parking
Use on-street parking wherever possible, including angle parking (when feasible or on side streets) to slow through-traffic, but still create a pleasant and safe driving experience. Design the paving of parking surfaces with strong visual distinctions to illustrate the flow of pedestrians and vehicles through the parking areas. When additional parking is needed, place parking in the back of buildings, in mid-block courtyards (with main street entry), underground, or in parking structures. Integrate these areas with the other architectural features and public space elements of the street. As new uses are developed, and existing uses are modified, use easements to require shared parking for all non-residential uses. Relax parking requirements when residential uses can take advantage of mass transit, pedestrian access to services and shared parking. Shared parking should include: cross-easements that allow sharing among adjacent uses within a block; use of retail parking for non-retail uses during off-peak periods; and use of non-retail parking for retail uses during off-peak periods. In mixed-use buildings, underground parking should be used where financially feasible. Access to this parking should be from the rear or side of the building.

c. Service Access
Where possible, allow a mixture of vehicles for both services and customers (except frequent semi-truck deliveries). Locate service access in the rear and design it with landscape, screening, and architectural features that match the surrounding site conditions.
Physical Characteristics (Glenview Road – "The Main Street")

a. New Buildings
   New buildings along Glenview Road should reinforce the continuity of the street. Existing buildings should be updated, while critical historic characteristics are preserved and enhanced (Refer to 1998 Downtown Architectural Study; Anne McGuire & Associates). As shown in Figure 6.7, underground parking, pedestrian arcades at the street level and setting back the upper floors will help maintain the low building height profile of Glenview’s Main Street.

b. Retail Building Fronts
   Locate retail-building fronts on property lines with little or no space between buildings. An exception to this rule would be mid-block passages from rear parking to the street front. Outdoor sitting areas can be accommodated alongside buildings or where feasible in the public right-of-way.

Encourage buildings with strong front facades and corresponding alignment of fenestration (openings in buildings) and ornamentation. Encourage large windows at ground level that allow people to see activities and goods inside.

Integrate the design of signs, awnings, and facade treatments with the architectural character of the building facades.

Plans for retail spaces should be sufficiently flexible, as much as can be reasonably expected, to accommodate different retail activities as changes occur in consumer behavior and retail market needs.

c. Civic Buildings
   Make civic buildings more prominent than surrounding buildings by creating a distinctive architecture with features that correspond to the surrounding development. This can be done with materials, color, texture, and composition.

In some cases civic buildings could be set back further than adjacent buildings to create a small public place such as a gateway, plaza, or square. In such cases the major facade of the building should face the primary public space and the edges of the building should parallel the edge of the associated public places.

d. Landscape Elements
   If landscape elements are used they should reflect and match the geometry of surrounding buildings. Alternate designs for the riverwalk and park should be pursued.

e. Gateways
   Use gateways to signify the entrance into the Downtown District. Reinforce the shape of the gateway with trees, plantings, and streetlights. When appropriate for local activities, use banners, flags, or other colorful elements that make the gateway a special place.

Create gateways with features on prominent buildings, which serve as landmarks from a distance (such as a tower, monumental entry, or roof form).

f. Public Art
   Include the use of public art and/or strong visual elements to establish a sense of place and develop the desired character of the area. Key points may be at entrances, in the parking plaza, or at building corners.
B. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR JACKMAN PARK AREA–“TRAIN STATION SQUARE” IN THE DOWNTOWN DISTRICT

Jackman Park and the surrounding uses represent a distinct social place that overlaps the activity of Glenview Road and provides a major amenity for the surrounding residential neighborhood. Both of these attributes need to be preserved as natural changes occur in the land market and redevelopment process (See Map 6.3 for current land use).

Jackman Park and the surrounding features have been enhanced as a prominent public green space for residents, commuters, shoppers, and others who use the downtown. The strong sense of enclosure created by surrounding buildings should be preserved. Memorable aspects of this place, in addition to the park itself, include the Park District building, streetscape amenities, and the train station. Hard-surfaced parking areas must also be maintained as a critical functional aspect of the area.

Activities and Uses (Jackman Park Area)

a. Preservation of Architectural Character
   As the land values increase, so too will pressure for the housing along the west edge of Jackman Park Area to be redeveloped.
   Preservation of historic single family architecture is the ideal.

b. Retail Activity
   If the Post Office does not remain in this location, the south west corner of Prairie Street and Lehigh Avenue should become retail.

b. Recreational Uses
   Use of Jackman Park for a wide variety of social/recreational uses should be retained and encouraged. Such uses would include passive recreation, as well as, neighborhood-based activities for outdoor festivities associated with residential and business uses.

c. Public Events
   Continue off-peak use of parking areas for events.

Redevelopment Process (Jackman Park Area)

a. Special Purpose District
   Include the non-residential uses, south of Prairie Street, within a special purpose Downtown District to continue the enhancement and revitalization of Jackman Park and the train station area.

b. Redevelopment of Library Block
   Consider redevelopment options for properties on the Library block (assuming the Library is relocated). Regard potential economic benefits from such development as a mechanism for assisting the Library’s relocation and enhancement of Jackman Park and Glenview Road.

Traffic and Circulation (Jackman Park Area)

a. Pedestrian Activity
   Encourage street-level pedestrian activity. For new retail buildings, require front entries for the general public and allow additional side or rear entry conditions for the public. Include sidewalks on all streets.

b. Parking
   Use on-street parking wherever possible, including angle parking (when feasible or on side streets) and other patterns, which slow through-traffic, but still create a pleasant and safe driving experience.

   Create parking in courts along the Rail Corridor and create clear signage for public parking.

   Design the paving of parking surfaces with strong visual distinctions to illustrate the flow of pedestrians and vehicles through the parking areas.

   As new uses are developed, and as existing uses are modified, require shared parking for all non-residential uses. Shared parking should include: cross-easements that allow sharing among adjacent uses within a block, use of retail parking for non-retail uses during off-peak periods, and use of non-retail parking for retail uses during off-peak periods. In addition, shared parking options with the train station area should be considered (such as shared parking for night-time residential use, restaurants, or other uses with major parking needs outside standard business hours).

c. Service Access
   Where possible, allow a mixture of both service and customer vehicles (except frequent semi-truck deliveries). Locate service access in the rear and design it with landscape, screening, and features that match the surrounding architectural features and site conditions.

Physical Characteristics (Jackman Park)

a. Paved Areas
   As new improvements are made, Jackman Park and the...
surrounding paved areas should be further integrated into a coherent and continuous pattern of public places.

b. Building Fronts
Preserve the characteristics of the existing residential buildings.

Encourage large windows at ground level that allow people to see activities and goods inside.

Integrate the design of signs, awnings, and facade treatments with the architectural character and building facades.

c. New Buildings
New buildings, including any new civic buildings, should reinforce the continuity of the street. Existing buildings should be updated, while preserving and enhancing critical historic characteristics.

d. Retail Spaces
Plans for retail spaces should be sufficiently flexible to accommodate different retail activities despite changes in consumer behavior and retail market needs.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DOWNTOWN SUPPORTING RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS

This district includes traditional residential development on the edges of the district, as well as multi-family housing immediately adjacent to businesses and the train station. This district, regulated by the R-18 zoning district, provides opportunities for a variety of residential housing types and densities that have emerged over several decades. This should be continued. Some of the housing in this area has significant historical character. Compared to other residential areas in the Village, this neighborhood has smaller lots, smaller homes, apartments, and a strong pedestrian-friendly character suitable to the downtown district. Preservation and enhancement of this diverse but smaller-scale character is the major goal for this district (See Map 6.6).

Activities and Uses (Downtown Supporting Residential)

a. Zoning
Continue the R-18, moderate- and higher-density developments provide a broad spectrum of options for consumers, supporting downtown retail in an especially pedestrian-friendly manner.
b. Residential Land Use
Allow a variety of residential uses including single family, duplex, and multifamily buildings.
c. Mixed Use
Allow for mixed-use live-work (residential units with an in-home office) units, as allowed under current zoning.

Redevelopment Process (Downtown Supporting Residential)

a. Residential Development
Allow for ongoing residential redevelopment that closely matches the character of the lots and building sizes in the existing neighborhood. This residential development should include higher-quality townhouses and apartments consistent with the architectural materials and details of existing homes.
b. Historic Preservation
Encourage the historic preservation of the existing residential housing stock.
c. Discourage Retail
Discourage expansion of retail commercial activities into these areas.

Traffic and Circulation (Downtown Supporting Residential)

a. Garages
Garages and access to parking should be on side streets or alleys whenever possible.
b. Parking
Parking requirements should encourage opportunities to reduce or diminish the need for parking spaces. Toward this end, shared parking, street parking, and reduced parking requirements for pedestrian-friendly developments should be allowed.
c. Guest Parking
Do not require additional guest parking for multi-family housing developments, guests may park on the streets or in available parking aprons.

Physical Characteristics (Downtown Supporting Residential)

a. Residential Street Edges
Create uniform residential street edges. Design lots and lay out new buildings to form a single street edge with a uniform sight line, setbacks, and evenly spaced buildings. The buildings on each side of the street should collectively create a continuous alignment. Use rhythmic planting of shade trees and street lights to reinforce the continuous street edge.
b. Character of Residential Streets
The character of residential streets is heavily reliant upon balance and symmetry in housing development on both sides of the street. New developments, or modifications to existing structures, should be carefully scrutinized to ensure visual compatibility with adjacent structures and structures on the opposite street front.
c. Architectural Standards
Develop and enforce criteria for architectural materials, openings, roof pitches, and porches, to match the character of the surrounding homes. Due to the variety of styles in the neighborhood, these criteria will vary from project to project.
d. Building Heights
Discourage new structures whose heights, as measured both from eave lines and rooflines, do not match the typical pattern of development on the street.

D. Recommendations for Downtown Waukegan Road – “The Community Corridor”
Waukegan Road is the “Community Corridor” that creates the eastern edge of Glenview’s downtown district. An essential aspect of Glenview’s Downtown and its future is this corridor, which brings not only local residents, but residents from adjacent communities to the area. The heavy traffic along Waukegan Road also creates a number of challenges for the downtown. Creating additional curb cuts should be avoided along Waukegan Road, especially between East Lake and Dewes Street, and wherever possible, existing curb cuts should be eliminated as new developments occur. Buildings should play a prominent role at the edge of the street, and parking should be accommodated in the rear. Shared parking options should be implemented. Development should be pedestrian in character, and should visually complement Glenview Road’s development. Streetscaping features along this section of Waukegan Road should also tie into the scheme along Glenview Road. Landscaping standards should be established and implemented where current parking exists and as future developments are proposed.

E. Recommendations for Downtown Environmental Corridor
The West Fork of the North Branch of the Chicago River crosses Glenview Road just west of Waukegan Road. This natural feature, as it passes through the Downtown District, should be utilized as a public amenity. The enhancement of West Fork Green and a new riverwalk development should be implemented.

F. Recommendations for Downtown Railroad Corridor
The railway corridor and its station in the downtown area was a significant reason for the development of Glenview’s downtown at the intersection of Glenview Road and Waukegan Road. Today the railway continues to be a key commuter option for local residents. The corridor itself presents many challenges with its tendency to create physical and visual barriers within the district. Development, which occurs along the railway corridor within this district, should address the corridor. Buildings should face the rail corridor and be visually appealing to commuters. Street and landscaping should follow the scheme along Glenview Road. Commuter service businesses (deli, grocery store, dry cleaners, etc.), offices, and mixed-use developments should be encouraged.

6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BUSINESS DISTRICTS
Industrial, business or mixed-use developments will be concentrated in these areas. They will be located in areas where the infrastructure and utilities can support such development. By focusing development in these areas, the character of the Village will be better preserved. To ensure safety, limited access points should be allowed off major arterials. Internal circulation should be required for all plans. These recommendations are intended to be used as a checklist for reviewing new development plans.

Activities and Uses (Business District)

a. Provide for Light Industrial, Business, or Mixed-Use Parks
Provide opportunities for developments that have site regulations and architectural guidelines. Developments should be located in areas in close proximity to regional or community arterials.
b. Allow Mixed Business Uses
Allow a variety of uses (such as offices, retail, and limited light industry) to create an active environment throughout...
c. Encourage Outdoor Activities and Pedestrian Uses  
Integrate uses such as bikeways, outdoor eating, seating, gathering spots, and other park elements that encourage pedestrian use. Provide entrances to these areas between buildings via pathways from the parking.

d. Link Building Interiors to the Outdoors  
Promote views into the buildings to attract customers and provide a connection between the indoor and outdoor environments.

Redevelopment Process (Business District)

a. Ensure Effective Maintenance Procedures  
Ensure long-term maintenance by either the landowners or the Village (with assessment to the landowners). Consider the use of landscape easements to assign and specify land ownership and control.

b. Reduce Maintenance Costs  
Reduce the need for major maintenance in this area by selecting appropriate landscaping and screening elements. Select materials that can be replaced and repaired cost-effectively (in case of vandalism or graffiti).

Physical Characteristics (Business District)

Landscaping and fencing should be designed to establish a clear edge along the side of the site, visible to motorists and others passing by or viewing the site. The only openings or breaks in this edge, or in surfaces designed for parking and vehicular movement, should be those allowed for entries, signage, or other provisions described in these standards. The ground surface should be grass or other planting material unless otherwise noted.

b. Design Entries as Gateways  
Along major edges there should be gateways for vehicular entrances. These entrances should be marked with decorative columns, fence lines or similar features that are visually more prominent than the other features surrounding the site or road. The construction materials should be similar to those used for the building and other site amenities.

c. Encourage Roadside Signage and Make Sign Structures Attractive  
All signs along the edge of a property should be the same design in terms of materials, graphic design, and character within each development. A sign should be located within the “Roadside Edge,” near the road or at main entrances to the development, and should have height restrictions to maintain effective profile. Signs should have a masonry base.

d. Use Buildings to Form Public Places  
Building locations should emphasize the shape of public plazas, courtyards, gateways, and significant landscape features. Buildings should have connections to pedestrians with appropriately-scaled design details, windows along the parking areas and pedestrian pathways, and special features at public entrances.

e. Design Off-Street Parking Lots as Public Places  
Parking lots should have strong edges to define them as spaces. This can be achieved with either building forms, landscaping, fencing, light fixtures, or combinations of these elements. The geometry should be orthogonal and parallel to major buildings. Parking areas should include distinctive paving patterns and material changes as a feature to identify travel lanes, parking areas, and pedestrian paths. The paving patterns and material changes should create an identity for the parking area and entrances into the space from surrounding development.

f. Encourage Landscape Continuity (not Fragmentation)  
Landscape plans should encourage the use of a limited number of tree and shrub species for the edge, which are native to Illinois, low maintenance, resistant to salt, with a relatively fast growth rate. All trees and shrubs planted in groups of up to ten shall be of like species or similar to the existing vegetation.

g. Save Existing Trees  
Incorporate existing trees where possible to form clusters of older and younger trees.

h. Integrate Road Drainage with the Site Design  
Allow for proper road drainage but consider options that allow for landscaping near the road edge.

i. Create Significant Landscapes  
Create significant landscapes between buildings that are meant to be occupied by people. Include seating areas to encourage the use of the space. The landscaping should be grouped together to create a significant place (such as a garden or a grove), instead of being scattered throughout the parking area. Connect new landscape to existing landscape.
3.8 Traffic and Circulation (Business District)

a. Make Vehicular Entrances Appealing to Motorists
Create an easily-identifiable entry place for motorists to pass through, which has a distinctive gate-like feature. Signs should be used to highlight the entrance and attract motorists. Such gateways and entrances should be designed such that they allow for sufficient sight lines for traffic movement.

b. Encourage Vehicular Linkages Between Sites
Along side yard edges, the plan should include options for vehicular linkages between off-street parking lots open to the public for general business purposes. Such options should be created when an off-street parking lot, or a driveway servicing such a lot, is located adjacent to the edge of the site. Such options should consist of driveway alignments and parking alignments designed to facilitate vehicular movement by the general public from one off-street parking lot to another, across the edge separating the lot from the adjacent lot. This should provide for a safer entrance area onto the street.

c. Make Service Areas Attractive
Service areas can be visible but should be designed as visually attractive components of public areas, or else they should be visually separated from such areas. Acceptable dividing elements for service areas can be any combination of fence or hedge to provide visual screening at least 60” high.

6.4 GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ALL RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS AND NEIGHBORHOODS

Glenview is a residential community with many high quality residential neighborhoods supported by excellent school districts and open space/recreation facilities. The strength of Glenview’s residential community is at the heart of the communities desirability as a north shore suburb. Preserving and enhancing the residential neighborhoods in the Village is key to the long term vitality of Glenview.

Glenview’s residential neighborhoods can be viewed as falling into several historic periods. They are the initial development, housing the Post-World War II period of suburban residential development, Glenview faced rapid growth. The popularity of suburban living, the ease of commuting to jobs, parks and good schools all made Glenview an attractive place to live. The ranch house became the signature style of home. The densities in these neighborhoods are approximately two to four dwelling units per acre.

During the “Post-World War II” period of suburban residential development, Glenview faced rapid growth. The popularity of suburban living, the ease of commuting to jobs, parks and good schools all made Glenview an attractive place to live. The ranch house became the signature style of home. The densities in these neighborhoods are approximately two to four dwelling units per acre.

The post-1980 residential areas saw the development of medium density residential neighborhoods. Much of the residential development in the 1990’s was not limited too, but concentrated in the GNAS redevelopment area. Approximately one quarter of the land in the GNAS was designated for residential development. This was guided by the “Master Plan and Design Guidelines: Glenview Naval Air Station Redevelopment Project” (McDonald, Orms & Merrill L.L.P. & Peter Lindsay Schaudt L.A. Inc. 1996). This included a variety of housing options:

- Low Density Housing (average two to four dwelling units/acre)
- Moderate Density Housing (average five to eight dwelling units/acre)
- Higher Density Residential such as senior housing (governed by planned development guidelines)

The guidelines emphasize a strong relationship between the street and home. Regulations require housing to be placed at setback lines with front doors oriented to the street. A variety of densities are encouraged to provide a mix of housing options. These recommendations are intended to be used as a checklist for reviewing any development or redevelopment proposals.

Activities and Uses (Residential Districts)

a. Include Shared Open Spaces
Design shared open spaces and natural features to attract home buyers who value a direct connection to natural
b. Allow a Variety of Residential Uses
Allow a variety of residential uses that are compatible with existing uses and existing underlying zoning, including single family, duplexes, and multiple-family buildings. The following categories represent the areas where multi-family is proposed: 1. Areas where the existing land uses are multi-family (Map 5.1); 2. Areas where the existing zoning allows multi-family - D-1, R-18, RT-8, and MURC; and 3. Redevelopment areas as identified in the document for Downtown Supporting Residential District, Waukegan Road, and Jefferson/Monroe Area.

c. Adaptive Reuse of Historic Buildings and Structures is Encouraged
Allow for the adaptive reuse and restoration of buildings and structures to encourage continued use.

d. A Mix of Uses is Encouraged in Historic Buildings and Structures
Accommodate all compatible use and reuse of historic buildings and structures to facilitate their continued use and maintenance.

Physical Characteristics (Residential Districts)
These guidelines are intended for any infill or redevelopment occurring in existing residential districts.

a. Uniform Street Edge

Redevelopment Process (Residential Districts)

a. Use Preservation Techniques to Protect the Land
Require deed restrictions, covenants and easements that guarantee land control and management of natural areas. Create restrictions that are difficult to change without broad public approval (such as referenda, unanimous agreements, and so forth).

b. Require Common Property Maintenance
Require property owner associations to guarantee maintenance of common areas, including options for public intervention if homeowners fail to maintain the land.

c. Historical Buildings, Structures, and Significant Elements Shall be Maintained
Maintain the exteriors of permanent structures. Do not alter or disguise the main architectural elements.

d. Provide Similar Setbacks
Setback requirements should not vary more than five feet between adjacent properties and properties across the street from one another. This will help to create a continuous edge along the street.

e. Garages Should Not Be the Prominent Feature
Where feasible, garages shall have a side entry. Alternatively, a garage may be detached and located to the rear.

f. Create a Strong Visual Order
Use rhythmic planting of shade trees and street lights to reinforce the continuous street edge.

g. Enforce Bulk and Scale Regulations
Enforce bulk and scale regulations as designated in the Village Zoning Ordinance. The application of these criteria will vary from project to project as residential development in Glenview occurred at various historical periods.

h. Design of Large Multifamily or Elderly Housing Complexes
When zoning allows, these projects should be designed in such a manner that they comfortably integrate themselves with single-family residential neighborhoods.

i. Preserve the Existing Natural Features
Preserve and incorporate the natural features on and around the site (existing hedge rows, older mature landscape, ponds, creeks, or wetlands)

Traffic and Circulation (Residential Districts)

Design lots and lay out buildings to form a single street edge with a uniform sight line, setbacks, and evenly-spaced buildings. The buildings on each side of the street should collectively create a continuous alignment with existing homes.

b. Provide Similar Setbacks
Setback requirements should not vary more than five feet between adjacent properties and properties across the street from one another. This will help to create a continuous edge along the street.

c. Garages Should Not Be the Prominent Feature
Where feasible, garages shall have a side entry. Alternatively, a garage may be detached and located to the rear.

d. Create a Strong Visual Order
Use rhythmic planting of shade trees and street lights to reinforce the continuous street edge.

e. Enforce Bulk and Scale Regulations
Enforce bulk and scale regulations as designated in the Village Zoning Ordinance. The application of these criteria will vary from project to project as residential development in Glenview occurred at various historical periods.

f. Design of Large Multifamily or Elderly Housing Complexes
When zoning allows, these projects should be designed in such a manner that they comfortably integrate themselves with single-family residential neighborhoods.

g. Preserve the Existing Natural Features
Preserve and incorporate the natural features on and around the site (existing hedge rows, older mature landscape, ponds, creeks, or wetlands).

Traffic and Circulation (Residential Districts)
a. Design Street System for Local Traffic
   Design streets to slow traffic and create vistas within the development. Discourage cut-through traffic by using traffic calming techniques, signage, and enforcement.

b. Allow for Street Parking
   Allow for on-street parallel parking when permitted by the rights-of-way, or where applicable.

c. Link Streets Together
   Layout streets to link with one another, and link to streets in adjacent developments. Plan for future road extensions.

d. Include Sidewalks or Create Walking and Hiking Trails
   Include sidewalks on all new or redeveloped residential streets. Also, create walking and hiking trails, that are adjacent to public roads and any existing public area where sidewalks do not exist.

6.5 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR JEFFERSON/MONROE AREA
(SUB AREA B)

The Jefferson/Monroe subarea represents a typical challenge in the redevelopment of existing suburban communities. Many similar neighborhoods have evolved adjacent to community arterials that have expanded their commercial activities over the years. The juxtaposition of commercial activities next to older residential areas often results in conflicting aesthetic and functional circumstances that reduce the potential value of such residential areas (See Map 6.7).

An additional issue in this neighborhood is the modest size of older residential single-family homes. As these homes are unlike some of the higher-value residential neighborhoods that abut community arterials in other parts of Glenview, this area has become a location for redevelopment with newer, higher density housing - apartments, condominiums, and similar types of structures.

Currently, many of the remaining single-family houses sit on land planned for medium densities (Official Map shows RT-8 zoning); this raises their potential value and increases the likelihood that such buildings will, in the long run, be replaced. Yet the area still has a positive visual quality, especially with the older, mature landscape and smaller scale homes.

Critical issues in the Jefferson/Monroe subarea include:

- Redevelopment of existing single-family homes with higher
a. Development Guidelines
Establish site development guidelines and a review process for this district. Allow for ongoing residential redevelopment that matches closely the character of the lots and the building size of the existing neighborhood. Residential development should include higher-quality forms of townhouses and apartments. New development should follow principles of traditional neighborhood design. Encourage saving all mature trees and other vegetation as land is redeveloped. Allow for coordination with the west edges of adjacent commercial development.

b. Street Maintenance
Implement zoning provisions for developers to upgrade and repair any damage to existing streets and infrastructure during the redevelopment process.

c. Historic Preservation
Encourage historic preservation of any significant historic residential housing.

d. Natural Areas
Require deed restrictions, covenants and easements that guarantee land control and management of natural areas. Create restrictions that are difficult to change without broad public approval (such as referenda, unanimous agreements, and so forth).

Physical Characteristics (Jefferson/Monroe Area)

a. Character of Residential Streets
The character of residential streets depends heavily on a general balance or symmetry of residential development on both sides. New developments or modifications to existing structures should be carefully scrutinized from the standpoint of matching both adjacent structures as well as those on the opposite street-front.

b. Architectural Standards
Develop and enforce criteria established for architectural materials, openings, roof pitches, and porches, that match the character of the surrounding homes. Due to the variety of styles in the neighborhood, these criteria will vary from project to project.

c. Building Heights
Discourage new structures whose heights, as measured both from eave lines and rooflines, do not match the typical pattern of development on the street.

d. Garages
Garages shall not be the prominent feature and, where feasible, shall have a side entry. Alternatively, the garage may be detached and located to the rear.

e. Natural Features
Preserve and incorporate the existing mature landscape...
Traffic and Circulation (Jefferson/Monroe Area)

a. Streets
Design streets to slow traffic and create vistas within the neighborhood. Layout streets to link with one another and link to streets in adjacent developments. Plan for future road extensions.

b. Connections To Adjacent Commercial Arterial Uses
Create pedestrian and bicycle linkages to existing commercial activities along Waukegan Road. In some cases, new vehicular linkages should also be created – these links, however, should include traffic-calming devices that discourage cut-through traffic.

c. Traffic Calming
At the intersection of Monroe and Jefferson Streets create a traffic-calming feature to deter cut-through traffic. See transportation recommendations for further detail. As redevelopment occurs, eliminate cul-de-sacs and allow for a more network-like traffic flow that diminishes the need to use any single street as a primary collector within the neighborhood.

d. Street Parking
Allow for parallel parking on the street.

e. Guest Parking
Reduce requirements for additional guest parking for multi-family projects, allow such uses to take advantage of street parking.

f. Sidewalks
Include sidewalks on all residential streets. Create walking and hiking trails that are adjacent to public roads and any existing public areas with no sidewalks.

g. Bicycle Movement
Encourage the creation of transportation connections that facilitate bicycle movement. This can take the form of bikeways linked to surrounding residential streets.
LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT RECOMMENDATIONS
- CORRIDORS

Corridors are linear patterns of development in the Village. Corridors are identifiable as man-made: the railroads, state and interstate highways, regional and local streets or as naturally occurring: rivers, streams or forest preserves. The character of land uses along these corridors plays an important role in defining the character of the district.

Corridors in Glenview have been identified as:

- Regional Corridors
- Community Corridors
- Neighborhood Corridors
- Railroad Corridors
- Environmental Corridors

The recommendations for transportation arterials have been organized around this series of corridor classifications.

The Village has identified a number of critical planning sub areas Milwaukee Avenue, Waukegan Road, Old Willow Triangle, Lehigh & Chestnut Avenue all of which fall into the corridor classifications.

The enhancement and preservation of the environmental corridors is critical to the long-term well-being of the community and the environment. Ensuring public access to these amenities while regulating adjacent land use is an important element of this plan.

7.1 TYPES OF CORRIDORS

**Regional Corridors**

Eden's Expressway I-94 and Tri-State Toll Way I-294 move along the eastern and western edge of Glenview, north to Wisconsin and south to Chicago, Indiana and beyond. These corridors impact the Village in two critical ways: the increased traffic along local streets (generated within the region), over which the Village has limited control; and the development opportunities at intersections and along regional corridors.

**Community Corridors**

Community corridors link communities within the region. They accommodate both regional and local traffic. Regional traffic has longer trip distances, higher speeds, and less land use access, compared to, local traffic that has lower speeds and traffic volumes containing local destinations.

The large traffic volumes along community corridors have historically attracted high concentrations of commercial and retail development. An increase in traffic volume, curb cuts, and access to businesses along community corridors has caused concerns about safety and accessibility. Much of the development along these community corridors occurred prior to the land being brought under Village jurisdiction. Development tends to be visually non-harmonious and some uses are unacceptable.

**Neighborhood Corridors**

Chestnut Avenue, Patriot Boulevard, Glenview, Central, Shermer, Greenwood, Wagner, Sunset Ridge, Landwehr, West Lake, Old Willow, Johns, and Pfingsten Roads are neighborhood arterials in Glenview. They link neighborhoods within the community.

**Rail Road Corridors**

Two railway lines bisect the Village. The Metra Milwaukee District Line connects downtown Chicago to Fox Lake, Illinois. Glenview is home to two Metra stops, one downtown and the other recently opened at the Glen south of Willow Road. The downtown Glenview station provides service for Amtrak intercity passenger rail, as well as, Metra.

In addition, the Union Pacific Railroad has a freight line that runs from southwest to northeast through the Village, this line is also used by Canadian Pacific (former Milwaukee Road) freight trains.

Land use along rail lines in the Village has traditionally included industrial development, as well as, The Glenview Naval Air Station.
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The redevelopment of the latter has changed the economics of land use, especially along the Metra line, in recent years. Specific recommendations for the downtown, Old Willow, and Lehigh Triangle, address the changing land use needs along Glenview’s rail road corridors.

Environmental Corridors

Three major Environmental corridors move through the Village. They are the North Branch of the Chicago River, the West Fork of the North Branch of the Chicago River, and the Des Plaines River. The Village is also flanked by the Cook County Forest Preserve to the west and the east.

West Fork and the Techny Basin

The West Fork of the North Branch of the Chicago River, together with the Techny Flood Basin, forms a major part of the natural ecosystem of the Village. Most of the West Fork has been dredged into a steep-sided drainage ditch, its floodplain and wetlands have been filled, and all of its tributaries have been put into pipes. In the segment from Willow Road to Valley Lo, portions of the flood plain have been reestablished, wetlands have been recreated and sunshine supports grasses and flowers along the water’s edge.

The Techny basin consists of an 70 acre storm water detention basin that temporarily holds water from the West Fork several times a year during large storm flow events. It fills by gravity flow over a spillway and is pumped out thereafter. Vegetation in the basin consists primarily of grasses. Native species have been seeded in the area, and it supports a limited population of grassland birds - primarily meadowlarks and redwing blackbirds. An asphalt jogging path surrounds the basin and connects to the 10 acre park between the basin and Willow Road, the residential areas to the east, and the west side of the river at its southwest corner. Use of the basin is for flood control, passive open space, and bird habitat. It is owned by the Village of Glenview, but is subject to easements held by the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District, which owns and operates the discharge pumps. The primary management activity will be in control of invasive species, (i.e., weeds).

Lot 16, is a 10 acre parcel immediately to the south of the Techny Basin, bounded by the West Fork on its north and east sides. The ditch that carries the outlet flow from a) Lake Glenview and b) the North Navy Ditch (that bounds the west side of the parcel) empties into the river and into the basin during high river flows. The Village acquired Lot 16 for use as passive open space and wildlife habitat.

Lot 16, is a 10 acre parcel immediately to the south of the Techny Basin, bounded by the West Fork on its north and east sides. The ditch that carries the outlet flow from a) Lake Glenview and b) the North Navy Ditch (that bounds the west side of the parcel) empties into the river and into the basin during high river flows. The Village acquired Lot 16 for use as passive open space and wildlife habitat.

The river and wetlands are owned by the Village and are being managed as passive open space and wildlife habitat. Weed control is the primary management activity here.

The North Navy Ditch extends from Lehigh Avenue (near the junction of Johns Drive and Old Willow Road) to the River. It conveys the outlet flow from Lake Glenview to a spillway at the southwest corner of the Valley Lo Golf Course. From that point, flows are routed north to the River. During floods the flow enters the detention basin. During extreme conditions, flows from the lake go over the ditch spillway, eastward down the remainder of the ditch, directly to the river downstream of the basin.

The river from Valley Lo to Chestnut Street is confined to a narrow ditch, except for a small wetland area of about 4 acres immediately south of the mouth of the Navy Ditch at the toe of the fill on the former Lutter dump.

The Baxter property is a 4.5 acre site located directly west of the West Fork of the North Branch of the Chicago River. The parcel is significant as it will provide one of the final necessary links of open space in the Village of Glenview that runs along the West Fork of the Chicago River south from Willow Road to Chestnut Avenue, a distance of almost three-quarters of a mile. Pursuing the purchase of the necessary land to complete the path at this time is critical.
From Chestnut to Grove Street, the river is mostly confined to a narrow ditch with steep banks. Treatment by homeowners varies greatly, from efforts to restore it as an amenity to blatant abuse (including filling in an armoring of the flood plain and flood way). Two small parks (Tall Trees and Sleepy Hollow) are located along this segment, and provide opportunities for stream bank restoration. Information and outreach to homeowners could encourage improvement of fish and wildlife habitat as a wildlife corridor.

From Grove Street to Waukegan Road, the river flows through the downtown area as a ditch with steep banks. A major exception is the east bank immediately south of Glenview Road, where the Village has acquired property and attempted to provide naturalized open space. Improved habitat and development of a river walk are possibilities in this area.

From Waukegan Road to the corporate limits, the river flows adjacent to Kraft Inc., homes, and Riverside Park. In this segment, the Friends of the Chicago River is working with homeowners, Kraft, and the Park District to encourage stream bank restoration. Improved habitat and wildlife corridor functions are possibilities here.

North Branch, Harms Woods, and Blue Star Memorial Woods

The main stem of the North Branch runs through Forest Preserves on the east side of the Village. The river has been subjected to some dredging in the past, but the floodplains have not been filled, and provide an important habitat despite dramatic modifications from pre-settlement conditions. Changes include dredging, changes in flow amounts and patterns, and major changes in vegetation. The North branch bike trail extends from the Botanic Garden to Devon Avenue and passes through this area.

The Harms Woods Forest Preserve extends south from Glenview Road to Golf Road. It is a mix of woodlands and forest with small areas of wetland. Its ecological richness is not even suspected by most Glenview residents, with the possible exception of those who know of its impressive show of spring wild flowers.

Small-scale volunteer efforts have been underway for nearly 20 years to improve conditions in the woods. There is an opportunity for the Village to cooperate with the Cook County Forest Preserve District and to support volunteers in restoring both the woodlands and the stream banks.

The Blue Star Memorial Woods Forest Preserve extends North from Harms Woods. It is not being restored and is gradually being degraded by invasive species.

Des Plaines River and Forest Preserves

The Des Plaines River runs through forest preserves on the west side of the Village. The River and associated woodlands provide important habitat and includes the River Trails Nature Center operated by the Cook County Forest Preserve District. The River runs through natural flood plains and is flanked by extensive forest and woodland areas. The flow and sediment burden of the river is substantially altered from historic conditions as is the surrounding vegetation.

### 7.2 Recommendations for Regional Corridors

Industrial, business, or mixed-use developments will be concentrated along regional corridors or at interchange intersections. With approximately 113,000 vehicles passing by the Village along the Tri-State Tollway, opportunities for development should be pursued. Development should follow recommendations for Business Districts in Section 6.

### 7.3 Recommendations for Community Corridors

The community corridors that bisect or follow along the edges of Glenview, link Glenview with other suburbs in the Chicago Metro region. Many of these corridors were developed under regulation by the County or other communities and do not follow the general characteristics of the Village. They are also heavily-trafficked arterials with a variety of land uses along them. The intent of the guidelines is to give direction to the development pattern along these corridors as properties are upgraded and/or redeveloped to create visually appealing developments with greater visual harmony and compatibility between sites.

The recommendations for community corridors work within a framework of three basic corridor characteristics. The three types are: the landscape parkway, the walkable neighborhood, and the commercial arterial. Portions of Milwaukee Avenue may be characterized as landscape parkway and commercial arterial. Along Waukegan Avenue, south of Lake and north of Dewes Streets can be characterized as walkable neighborhoods while other portions will fall into the category of commercial arterial. These characterizations simply recognize the variety of different community corridors that edge and bisect the Village.

The Community corridors in Glenview are Waukegan Road, Milwaukee Avenue, Willow Road, East Lake Avenue, and Golf Road.

While specific recommendations for the Waukegan Road and Milwaukee Avenue community corridor are discussed later, general recommendations for all corridors follow.

### Activities and Uses (Community Corridors)

a. **Retail Activity**

Encourage retail activity (retail goods, specialty shops, services, or restaurants) where retail currently exists on the ground floor, and allow additional businesses, offices, and residential units (for elderly and retirees) on upper floors (one additional story).

b. **Mixed Uses**

Encourage mixed uses where retail currently exists, in corridors where the creation of walkable neighborhoods is desired, to create an active environment throughout the day. For example, offices, shops, and residential units all have peak activities at different times of the day and week. Such diversity is likely to diffuse traffic patterns and provide opportunities for shared parking. Mixed use includes Multi-Family only as defined in other parts of this plan.

c. **Outdoor Activities**

Encourage outdoor activities and events (including retail activities) in the parking areas, seasonal events, temporary structures, and outdoor eating and gathering spots. Integrate

---

**Figure 7.4: Milwaukee Ave.**
Map 7.2: Environmental features in the Village of Glenview.
uses such as bikeways, outdoor eating, seating, gathering spots, and other park elements that encourage pedestrian use. Provide entrances to these areas between buildings along a pathway from the parking. Link these activities to residential neighborhoods in the area via pedestrian paths.

d. **Green Spaces & Parks**
To the extent that efficiencies in uses and traffic will allow; encourage the creation of small green spaces and parks that are integrated with, and open to, surrounding activities.

e. **Civic Uses**
Encourage the integration of civic uses with surrounding uses. For example, new public buildings could be located such that they share parking with commercial areas and provide for integrated pedestrian movement.

**Redevelopment Process (Community Corridor)**

a. **Special Purpose Corridor Redevelopment District**
Include the commercial, industrial, and public land uses along community corridors within a special purpose Corridor Redevelopment District (along Waukegan Road-Subarea E and Milwaukee Avenue-Sub Area H) to expedite the revitalization and redevelopment process for the area. This process should include development initiatives that directly link the Village's social, economic, and aesthetic aspirations to specific economic advantages for the developer. This tool may be used along other community corridors when deemed necessary by the Village.

**Physical Characteristics (Community Corridor)**

a. **New Buildings**
New buildings along community corridors should reinforce the continuity of the street. Buildings with critical historic characteristics should be preserved and enhanced. Encourage buildings with strong front facades and corresponding alignment of fenestration (openings in buildings) and ornamentation.

b. **Architectural Quality**
Encourage the design of appropriately-scaled buildings that utilize high-quality materials. Also encourage energy efficiency in the design of buildings through the placement and orientation of landscape and the use of natural lighting.

c. **Court Yards and Public Places**
Use buildings to form courtyards and public places by emphasizing the shape of spaces between buildings and create continuous pedestrian-friendly edges along the perimeter of such courtyards and public places.

d. **Design Entries as Gateways**
Along major edges, there shall be gateways for vehicular entrances. These entrances should be marked with decorative columns, fence lines, or similar features that are visually more prominent relative to the other features surrounding the site or road. The construction materials shall be similar to those used for the building and other site amenities.

e. **Retail Buildings**
For retail structures, encourage large windows at ground level to allow people to see activities and goods inside. Integrate the design of signs, awnings, and facade treatments with the architectural character and building facades. Ensure that plans for retail spaces are sufficiently flexible that they can be reasonably expected to accommodate different retail activities as changes occur in consumer behavior and retail market needs.

f. **Encourage Roadside Signage and Make Sign Structures Attractive**
All signs along the edge of a property shall be of similar design in terms of materials, graphic design, and character, within each development. The sign shall be located within the “roadside edge,” have a minimum height restriction that provides a low profile, and be located near the road, or at main entrances to the development. Signs should have a masonry base.

g. **Areas Between Lots**
Along side lot lines and between lots, establish strong, integrated visual edges with continuous landscaping and ornamental fencing. Create clearly marked gateways and linkages along these edges for shared movement of pedestrians and vehicles. Where feasible, use areas between lots and along side lot lines to create significant landscapes, such as groves and gardens between buildings that encourage active use.

h. **Civic Buildings**
Make civic buildings more prominent than surrounding buildings by creating a distinctive architecture with features that correspond to the surrounding development. This can be done with materials, color, texture, and composition. Create features on civic buildings that serve as landmarks from a distance (such as a tower, monumental entry, or roof form). Allow for public access along the periphery with views of the civic building’s appealing features.

i. **Public Art**
Use public art and/or strong visual elements to establish a sense of place and develop the desired character of the area. Key points may be at the entrances, in the parking plaza, or at building corners.

j. **Landscape Elements**
Along the edge of the right-of-way, create strong edges using landscape elements. These landscapes will differ amongst the subsections of the corridor. Encourage landscape continuity by limiting the variety of tree and shrub species. Incorporate existing trees into the development wherever possible. Design roadside entries as visually prominent gateways that have adjacent, but distinct, vehicular and pedestrian entrances. These entrances should be marked with decorative columns, fence lines, or similar features that are visually more prominent than the other features surrounding the site or road. The construction materials shall be similar to those used for the building and other site amenities.
Within courtyards and development parcels, create landscape elements that reflect and match the geometry of surrounding buildings. Within these areas, use light poles and other visual amenities to reinforce the edges and the geometric pattern of public places. Avoid saw tooth and diagonal placements of lights and plantings. Parking lots should have strong edges to define them as spaces. This can be achieved with building forms, landscaping, fencing, light fixtures, or combinations of these elements. The geometry should be orthogonal and parallel to major buildings. Parking areas should include distinctive paving patterns and material changes as a feature to identify travel lanes, parking areas, and pedestrian paths. The paving patterns and material changes should create an identity for the parking area and entrances into the space from surrounding development.

k. Encourage Landscape Continuity (not Fragmentation)
Landscape plans should encourage the use of a limited number of tree and shrub species for the edge, which are native to northern Illinois, low maintenance, resistant to salt, and have a relatively fast growth rate. All trees and shrubs planted in groups of up to ten shall be of like species, or similar to existing vegetation.

l. Save Existing Trees
Incorporate existing trees where possible to form clusters of older and younger trees.

m. Integrate Road Drainage with the Site Design
Allow for proper road drainage, but consider options that allow for landscaping near the road edge.

n. Create Significant Landscapes
Create significant landscapes between buildings to be occupied by people; include seating areas to encourage the use of these spaces. The landscaping should be grouped together to create a significant place (such as groves or gardens) instead of scattered throughout the parking area. Connect the landscape to existing landscape around the site.

o. Discourage Artificial Berms and Similar Topographic Changes
Berms and other topographic changes, which appear clearly artificial, should be discouraged, especially as visual barriers. Topographic changes should be allowed when needed to accommodate drainage, reduce erosion, or otherwise enhance or preserve the natural environment. When a visual screen is needed, a double or single row of trees or shrubs should be used.

Traffic, Parking, and Circulation (Community Corridor)

a. Bicycle and Pedestrian Movement
Encourage the creation of transportation connections that facilitate bicycle and pedestrian movement. This can take the form of bikeways linked to surrounding residential streets along the back (rear of lot) easements. Design parking paving with strong visual patterns to facilitate the flow of pedestrians and vehicles through the parking areas.

Create continuous linkages designed for pedestrian movement and bike paths between sites.

b. Shared Access
As existing uses evolve or change, require the creation of links for shared access in the front of commercial structures. Use such easements to facilitate the reduction in curb cuts along the community corridor.

As shared movement patterns increase, provide signage and clear paving patterns that encourage drivers to use the secondary system of easements to access different commercial uses.

c. Shared Parking
As existing uses evolve or change, require the creation of links for shared parking along the sides and rear of commercial structures. This should take the form of required cross-easements to allow for shared parking and traffic movements.

Shared parking should include cross-easements that allow sharing among adjacent uses within a block, use of retail parking for non-retail uses during off-peak periods, and use of non-retail parking for retail uses during peak periods.

As shared parking opportunities and curb cuts are reduced along the community corridor at commercial developments, they should not negatively impact the residential development along the corridors.

Over time, encourage drivers to seek access through new easements, or through a more limited pattern of median cuts and curb cuts.

d. Signage
Create a pattern of signage that encourages the use of

Figure 7.6: Conceptual diagram of shared parking and shared access.
to the sense of economic disrepair and lack of order. While total consistency and sameness are undesirable features in commercial corridors, a proper balance between diversity and order has yet to be achieved in this case and should be considered as a reasonable long term goal.

This corridor also represents a historic gateway or entrance into Glenview. It intersects the Downtown District at Glenview Road. While this may not be the busiest intersection, it is symbolically the most important crossroads in the Village. Moreover, the central section (Chester Avenue to Dewes Street) of Waukegan Road is the only major arterial corridor integrated physically and visually with a preponderance of major commercial and civic uses.

Taking into consideration patterns of development, land use, and road characteristics (number of driving and parking lanes, rights-of-way, landscaping, etc.), four subsections to the Waukegan Road Corridor have been identified. They are:

A. Waukegan Road North – Willow Road to Chestnut Avenue
B. Waukegan Road Central
   a. North – Chestnut Avenue to Lake Avenue
   b. South – Lake Avenue to Dewes Street
C. Waukegan Road South – Dewes Street to Golf Road

Waukegan Boulevard, North and South, is both the major challenge and opportunity for future redevelopment. Waukegan Boulevard South (Lake Avenue to Dewes Street) offers the greatest opportunity for creating a pedestrian-friendly commercial district. The two other subsections, Waukegan Road North and Waukegan Road South, also offer unique conditions and opportunities; the physical characteristics and economic activities of these segments differ from the central section of Waukegan Road. These components of the Waukegan Road Corridor call for similar, but still distinctive, sets of recommendations.

A. Waukegan Road North (Willow Road to Chestnut Avenue)

This north subsection of the Waukegan Road corridor contains some retail, multi-family housing, civic, and commercial uses. The retail uses, south of Wildberry Drive, on the west side of Waukegan Road, have many of the same characteristics as the ‘central subsection,’ with many small commercial and retail developments.

An important land use for this segment of the Waukegan Road corridor is the car dealerships along the west side of Waukegan Road. They provide considerable value to the Village in terms of tax revenue. They are also a typical, traditional component of automobile corridors in suburban areas. The concentration of dealerships along this corridor offers an opportunity to create special district regulations that are suited to the unique visual and functional characteristics of this land use. Recommendations within this district should regulate the placement of buildings, parking areas, lighting, and landscaping.

The narrower road width in this area makes it difficult to consider the same type of traffic management options as recommended for the central section of this corridor.
B. Waukegan Road Central (Chestnut Avenue to Dewes Street)

This central section is comprised of two sub sections, the north boulevard segment from Chestnut Avenue to Lake Avenue, and the southern boulevard segment from Lake Avenue south to Dewes Street. The significant difference between these two segments is the strong pedestrian activity which will be encouraged along the southern boulevard as redevelopment and improvements occur along Waukegan Road.

The central portion of Waukegan Road has two major community intersections: Lake Avenue and Glenview Road. While Glenview Road is the historic pedestrian main street, this section of Waukegan Road will remain the primary vehicular main street. Many suburban cities possess, as a central feature, a strong, commercial, automobile-oriented corridor. This is a social and economic asset that needs to be preserved and enhanced. This section of the corridor requires substantial improvement. On the other hand, the nature of the existing businesses and heavy traffic patterns suggests that such improvements must be sensitive to the current needs and anticipated evolution of economic activities.

The primary recommendations concern the incremental creation of a median landscape that would simultaneously make some left turn movements easier and safer, while incrementally eliminating the continuous left turn movement opportunities. Similarly, changes are needed to allow for shared parking and signage, both of which can substantially improve access movements and traffic management. Related to these improvements, guidelines should be used to incrementally change the aesthetic features that make this section of Waukegan Road a primary component of the social and economic character of Glenview.

In addition to improvements for commercial areas, there are civic and open space opportunities that should be addressed. The Village owns the land on the northwest corner of Lake Avenue and Waukegan Road; this offers significant potential for a future civic building or as a significant public plaza linked to commercial and public uses. Other major civic buildings near this intersection include the Village Hall, Police Department, and Lyons School. While these facilities may change over time, the use of Waukegan Road as a major site for civic buildings should be continued.

Finally, Waukegan Road is the site of the Kraft Research and Development Facility. This structure is near the critical juncture with the river and the Downtown District. The current level of landscape and visual order remains relatively high on this property, and there have been few public comments about this facility. Nevertheless, it should be emphasized that this complex (and its related facilities) forms a major visual feature that must be maintained and enhanced over time.

C. Waukegan Road South (Dewes Street to Golf Road)

There is a significant reduction in traffic congestion south of the Glenview Road intersection. In fact, south of Golf Road, Waukegan Road has shown traffic count decreases in the past four years. A median is not proposed in this area, but significant landscaping should be encouraged. There are a number of large industrial facilities along this stretch of Waukegan Road.

Activities and Uses (Waukegan Road)

a. Retail Activity

In particular, encourage mixed uses that include residential units in locations that might support the retail uses in the Downtown District.

b. Grocery Store

Retain the operation of a major food service grocery store near the corner of Waukegan Road and Glenview Road. While the existing grocery operation may not stay, a grocery store at this location should be profitable, and provides a critical public service to the primary pedestrian-friendly neighborhood in the Downtown District, as well as the immediate vicinity of the Waukegan/Glenview Road intersection.

Redevelopment Process (Waukegan Road)

a. Market Study

Conduct a market study to attract desirable retail businesses to the Waukegan Road corridor, and estimate the associated fiscal impact of Village intervention in the redevelopment process. Among other variables, this analysis should inventory the size and distribution of retail and non-retail floor areas. Other data to be collected should include amenities (restrooms and handicap accessibility), parking, and vacancies. Specific attention should be given to contacting grocery store operators to assess their current and long-term interest in operating a facility to serve the interests of current patrons, and the surrounding neighborhood in general.

b. Detailed Redevelopment Plans

Create detailed redevelopment plans for commercial blocks along Waukegan Road to use as guidelines for approving new investments proposed by property owners. For example, if and when the owners of the existing grocery store choose to undertake a remodeling or redevelopment of their property, a detailed building plan could be established beforehand to guide the approval process (including the creation of a new grocery store).

c. Development Guidelines
Maps 7.3 - 7.5: Waukegan Road current land use from Willow Road to Golf Road (red line represents boundary of Downtown Sub Area G).

**Land Use Key**
- Single-Family Residential
- Multi-Family Residential
- Retail
- Sports/Leisure
- Industrial
- Institutional / Civic / Government
- Office
Establish site development guidelines and a review process for this district. Allow for ongoing residential redevelopment that matches closely the character of the lots and the building size of the existing neighborhood. Residential development should include higher-quality forms of townhouses and apartments. New development should follow principles of traditional neighborhood design. Encourage saving all mature trees and other vegetation as land is redeveloped. Allow for coordination with adjacent commercial development.

Physical Characteristics (Waukegan Road)

a. Landscape Elements
Along the edge of the Waukegan Road right-of-way, create strong edges using landscape elements. These landscapes will differ amongst the subsections of Waukegan Road.

Traffic, Parking, and Circulation (Waukegan Road)

a. Median and Intersection Improvements
See transportation recommendations for specific roadway improvements for Waukegan Road.

7.5 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MILWAUKEE AVENUE CORRIDOR FROM GREENWOOD TO WILLOW (SUB AREA H)

Milwaukee Avenue is a “community corridor” bordering the Village of Glenview on its western edge. The variety of land uses along the corridor includes commercial, retail, civic, light industrial, and residential development. The Grove and the County Forest Preserve District also abut Milwaukee Avenue.

Milwaukee Avenue is a northwest/southeast diagonal four-lane divided arterial roadway and is designated SRA (strategic regional arterial) Route IL 21. It originates at Skokie Highway (US 41) in Gurnee, IL, and continues south to the intersection of Canal Street and West Lake Street in Chicago; in length it spans about 40 miles. At different locations in Glenview, the posted speed limit along Milwaukee Avenue varies from 35 mph to 40 mph (HNTB Report).

In 2004-2005, the construction of dual left-turn lanes is planned for the intersections of West Lake Avenue and Milwaukee Avenue. Peak hour intersection operation data gathered by HNTB show that the Milwaukee Avenue intersections with West Lake Avenue and Central Road currently operate below the acceptable level of service (LOS D).

The intersections along Milwaukee Avenue - Sanders Road, West Lake Avenue, Glenview Road and Central Road - present significant traffic issues. This is a result of increased traffic, and the land development pattern along Milwaukee Avenue. Multiple driveways, strip parking, and aging facilities characterize the clusters of commercial development at major intersections along the corridor. Residential subdivisions such as Timber Trails have experienced increasing difficulty in accessing Milwaukee Avenue.

The land adjacent to Milwaukee Avenue, which is similar to the Waukegan Road corridor, has been developed under County guidelines and jurisdiction. A large component of the land still falls under County jurisdiction, including the County Forest Preserve District. Given this situation, the Village's annexation policy will have a significant influence on the future of this corridor.

Critical concerns expressed by citizens at the public open house revolved around the following general themes:

- Traffic and Circulation
- Annexation
- Quality of Land Use
- Crime and Safety
- Visual Quality

Recommendations for the Milwaukee Avenue Corridor will begin by addressing two critical issues, traffic and circulation and annexation.

Milwaukee Avenue HNTB Transportation Recommendations

Milwaukee Avenue should be reconstructed to a six-lane divided roadway.

At the Milwaukee Avenue intersection with West Lake Avenue, it is recommended that an additional left-turn lane be provided for all approaches, resulting in dual left-turn lanes. An additional northbound and southbound through-lane on Milwaukee Avenue is recommended, resulting in a six-lane facility. Exclusive right-turn lanes for the northbound and southbound approaches on Milwaukee Avenue are recommended.

At the Milwaukee Avenue intersection with Dearlove/Glenview Road, it is recommended that an exclusive right-turn lane be provided for the southbound and westbound approaches.

At the Milwaukee Avenue intersection with Central Road it is recommended that an additional left-turn lane on the northbound approach be provided, resulting in dual left-turn lanes. An additional northbound and southbound through-lane on Milwaukee Avenue is recommended, resulting in a six-lane facility. An exclusive eastbound right-turn lane is recommended.

Activities and Uses (Milwaukee Avenue)

a. Provide for Light Industrial Parks and/or Business Parks
Provide opportunities for development that has site regulations and architectural guidelines. The parks should be located in areas with close proximity to access points. In order to accommodate future development and/or redevelopment markets, accept a variety of development strategies.

b. Residential Use
Allow a variety of residential uses, including single family, duplexes, and multifamily buildings. Multifamily residential development should occur where there is existing multifamily. Access to new residential development adjacent to Milwaukee Avenue should be from side streets, or from shared access points.
Maps 7.6 - 7.8: Milwaukee Road current land use from Willow Road to Golf Road

**Land Use Key**
- Single-Family Residential
- Multi-Family Residential
- Retail
- Sports/Leisure
- Industrial
- Institutional / Civic / Government
- Office
7.6 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEIGHBORHOOD CORRIDORS

Intent: Neighborhood Corridors shall create a pleasant “public space” for surrounding residents. The streets should provide a network of circulation options. The neighborhood corridors in Glenview are: Chestnut Avenue, Patriot Boulevard, Glenview, Central, Shermer, Greenwood, Wagner, Sunset Ridge, Landewehr, West Lake, Old Willow, Johns, and Pfingsten Roads. These roads link neighborhoods and districts within the Village.

Activities and Uses (Neighborhood Corridor)

a. Residential Development
   Allow for a variety of residential developments compatible with adjacent residential neighborhoods along neighborhood corridors.

b. Community Uses
   Encourage integration of community uses, especially where residential streets connect to other public spaces such as squares or plazas.

Redevelopment Process (Neighborhood Corridor)

a. Maintenance and Operation
   Follow customary procedures for maintenance and management (in which property owners maintain the pedestrian areas in the right-of-way and the Village maintains and manages the infrastructure).

Physical Characteristics (Neighborhood Corridor)

a. Street Edge
   Design lots and buildings to form a single street edge with a uniform sight line, setbacks, and evenly spaced buildings. The buildings on each side of the street should collectively create a continuous alignment. This does not mean, however, that all projections or recesses from the front facade must be prohibited.

b. Setbacks
   Establish setbacks for new housing that respond to the existing setbacks on either side of, and across the street from, new development. Setbacks should be measured from the property line and should not differ by more than five feet from adjacent setbacks.
c. Garages
Garages shall not be the prominent feature along the street. They shall have a recessed side entry or be detached in the rear.

d. Visual Order
Establish lot widths similar to surrounding sites. Create a symmetrical street cross-section and repetitive visual rhythm that reinforces the perception of the street as a simple, unified public space.
Create a strong visual order using parallel, rhythmic planting of shade trees and streetlights.
Maintain constant building heights on each edge of the street.

e. Architectural Quality
Enforce criteria established for architectural materials, fenestration, roof pitches, and porches, that match the character of the surrounding houses. Due to the variety of styles in the neighborhood, these criteria will vary from project to project.
Architectural quality of some businesses is discordant with some of the newer uses.

f. Corner Lots
Design corner lots such that the residential structure creates an effective facade along both streets, and if possible, use a garage or small residential structure to front the side street.

7.7 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHESTNUT AVENUE SOUTH SIDE FROM LEHIGH EAST TO CEMETERY (SUB AREA D)

These areas contain older retail and businesses that predate the Glen, and reflect older patterns of land use and circulation. It is highly likely that these areas will experience redevelopment over the next decade. Given the critical location of these areas at a major traffic node careful redevelopment planning is essential.
As issues and opportunities within these areas were analyzed, a number of recurring themes arose; these themes form the basis from which the recommendations for the districts have been made:

- The land values have shifted in the last decade.
- The newly-created Lake Glenview and the Park District building have made the area attractive for other land uses, such as residential or retail development.
- Long-term goals of landowners may not match those of tenants.
- The visual quality of the areas along the tracks is poor.
- Are there other areas in Glenview that existing businesses could move to?
- Glenview residents currently use the many businesses located in this area.
- Business owners are concerned about the cost of upgrading their businesses.

Activities and Uses (Chestnut Avenue South Side from Lehigh East to Cemetery)

- Replacement of Existing Businesses
  Encourage new retail/commercial development along Lehigh Avenue and Chestnut Avenue.

Redevelopment Process (Chestnut Avenue South Side from Lehigh East to Cemetery)

- Redevelopment Plan
  Develop a long-term redevelopment plan for the district. The plan should entertain mixed uses, such as residential above retail or commercial. This should include several

options to reflect different patterns of land assembly. Allow redevelopment to occur incrementally according to the pattern of ownership, if land is assembled development should be done based on a master plan. Any redevelopment plans for the area should consider and be coordinated with potential redevelopment of the Scott Foresman property to the south. A natural boundary, along the east-west drainage swale, should be considered in the differentiation of future land uses on the Scott Foresman property. (See Map)


b. Zoning

Allow zoning to change to reflect future mixed-use districts retail, commercial, and residential uses.

c. New Road Easements

As property ownership and use changes, implement the new redevelopment plan, including new public access and easements along property lines for a new roadway system (as identified in the redevelopment plan).

d. Public Services

As property ownership and use changes, update public services such as water, sewer, and drainage to meet Village standards.

Physical Characteristics (Chestnut Avenue South Side from Lehigh East to Cemetery)

a. New Buildings

The character of new streets should follow traditional neighborhood design principles used in the Glen. For retail structures, encourage large windows at ground level to allow people to see activities and goods inside. Integrate the design of signs, awnings, and facade treatments with the architectural character and facades of surrounding buildings. Ensure that plans for retail spaces are sufficiently flexible to accommodate different retail activities as changes occur in consumer behavior and retail market needs.

b. Existing Businesses

Along side lot lines and between lots, establish strong, integrated visual edges with continuous landscaping and ornamental fencing. Create clearly marked entrances and linkages along these edges for shared movement of pedestrians and vehicles. Where feasible, use areas between lots and along side lot lines to create significant landscapes such as groves and gardens.

Lighting in parking and outdoor areas should be designed to minimize the impact on surrounding land uses.

c. Landscape Elements

Along the edge of Chestnut, create strong edges using landscape elements to create a landscaped parkway image. Encourage landscape continuity by limiting the variety of tree and shrub species. Incorporate existing trees into the development wherever possible. Design roadside entries as visually prominent gateways that have adjacent, but distinct, vehicular and pedestrian entrances. These entrances should be marked with fence lines or similar features that are visually more prominent relative to the other features surrounding the site or road. The construction materials should be similar to those used for the building and other site amenities.
Traffic, Parking, and Circulation (Chestnut Avenue South Side from Lehigh East to Cemetery)

a. Bicycle and Pedestrian Movement
Encourage the creation of transportation connections that facilitate bicycle and pedestrian movement. Design the paving of parking surfaces with strong visual patterns to facilitate the flow of pedestrians and vehicles through the parking areas.

b. Shared Access
As existing uses evolve or change, require the creation of links for shared access in the front of commercial structures. Use such easements to facilitate the reduction of curb cuts along Chestnut.

c. Shared Parking
As existing uses evolve or change, require the creation of links for shared parking along the sides and rear of commercial structures. This should take the form of required cross-easements to allow for shared parking and traffic movements. Parking should not be allowed along the street front.

Shared parking should include cross-easements that allow sharing among adjacent uses within a block, use of retail parking for non-retail uses during off-peak periods, and use of non-retail parking for retail uses during off-peak periods.

d. Service Areas
Make service areas attractive as components of public areas, or visually separated from such areas through the use of fences and hedges. Locate service access in the rear, and design it with landscape, screening, and features that match the surrounding architectural features and site conditions.

7.8 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR GREENWOOD AND WEST LAKE AVENUE AREA (SUB AREA F)

Immediately west of the Glen redevelopment project, this neighborhood is bisected by West Lake Avenue. North of West Lake is an older industrial district that developed along the railroad tracks. South of West Lake Avenue is an older mixed-density residential district.

Annexation is a critical issue in this neighborhood, as this neighborhood is predominantly unincorporated. Recent developments in the area have occurred under the jurisdiction of Cook County regulations.

Some local residents have voiced a desire to become annexed into the Village of Glenview.

Critical concerns in the area include the possible redevelopment of land at densities greater than desired by the neighbors (this is allowed under County zoning). Increased land values in the area have led to the redevelopment of single-family residential lots with multi-family developments. The quality of public infrastructure, including streets and services, and the long-term maintenance of this infrastructure is also a concern. Traffic, crime, safety, and the visual quality of the area’s industrial facilities and multi-family developments, were also concerns raised by area residents.

Activities and Uses (West Lake and Greenwood)

a. Allow a Variety of Residential Uses
Allow a variety of residential uses including single-family, duplexes, and multi-family, with densities and standards as allowed under Village zoning code. Existing multi-family should remain and be updated to meet Village building standards. Lower density multi-family can be developed along West Lake and Greenwood, and the interior segments of this district should remain single family. Design guidelines should be used to make sure that new multi-family buildings are compatible with remaining single-family homes.

b. Include Shared Open Spaces
Design shared open spaces and natural features to attract home buyers who value a direct connection to natural landscape elements, natural environmental features, fields, woodlands, and walking and biking trails. The spaces could be used for either passive or active recreational activities.

c. Industrial and Commercial
Allow the existing industrial and business uses north of West Lake Avenue to remain.

d. Civic and Institutional
Allow existing civic and institutional uses to remain.

Redevelopment Process (West Lake and Greenwood)

a. Annexation
It is recommended that this district be annexed into the Village.

b. Design Guidelines
Follow design guidelines as stated in ‘residential districts’ recommendations.

c. Street Maintenance
Upgrade and repair any damage to existing streets and infrastructure during the annexation process.

d. Natural Areas
Require deed restrictions, covenants, and easements that guarantee land control and management of natural areas.
Create restrictions that are difficult to change without broad public approval (such as referenda, unanimous agreements, and so forth).

e. Park and Open Spaces
   Require developers to dedicate park and open spaces to residential developments. The location and size of these parklands will become an important element of the site plan approval process. Residential neighborhoods, when possible, shall be organized around these central public places. Parkland shall not be limited to unbuildable land such as woodlands.

Physical Characteristics (West Lake and Greenwood)

a. Residential Street Edges
   Create uniform residential street edges. Design lots and lay out new buildings to form a single street edge with a uniform sight line, setbacks, and evenly spaced buildings. The buildings on each side of the street should collectively create a continuous alignment. Use rhythmic planting of shade trees and street lights to reinforce the continuous street edge.

b. Character of Residential Streets
   The character of residential streets depends heavily on a general balance or symmetry in residential development on both sides. New developments, or modifications to existing structures, should be carefully scrutinized to ensure that adjacent structures, as well as, those on the opposite street front, match properly.

c. Architectural Standards
   Develop and enforce criteria established for architectural materials, openings, roof pitches, and porches that match the character of the surrounding homes. Due to the variety of styles in the neighborhood, these criteria will vary from project to project.

d. Building Heights
   Discourage new structures whose heights, as measured both from eave lines and rooflines, do not match the typical pattern of development on the street.

e. Garages
   Garages shall not be the prominent feature; where feasible, they shall have a side entry. Alternately, the garage may be detached and located to the rear.

f. Natural Features
   Preserve and incorporate existing mature landscape features in and around the neighborhood.

g. Existing Industrial and Businesses
   Establish site regulations and architectural guidelines for the refurbishing of existing industrial business uses north of West Lake Avenue. Along side lot lines and between lots, establish strong, integrated visual edges with continuous landscaping and ornamental fencing. Create clearly marked entrances and linkages along these edges for shared movement of pedestrians and vehicles. Lighting in parking and outdoor areas should be designed to minimize the impact on surrounding land uses.

h. Landscape Elements
   Along the edge of West Lake Avenue, create strong edges using landscape elements. Encourage landscape continuity by limiting the variety of tree and shrub species. Incorporate existing trees into the development wherever possible. Design roadside entries as visually prominent gateways that have adjacent, but distinct, vehicular and pedestrian entrances. These entrances should be marked with fence lines or similar features that are visually more prominent than other features surrounding the site or road.

The construction materials shall be similar to those used for the building and other site amenities.

Traffic and Circulation (West Lake and Greenwood)

a. Streets
   Design streets to slow traffic and create vistas within the neighborhood. Lay out streets to link with one another and link to streets in adjacent developments. Plan for future road extensions.

b. Connections to Adjacent Commercial Arterial Uses
   Create pedestrian and bicycle linkages to existing commercial activities along West Lake, and within the Glen. In some cases, new vehicular linkages should also be created; these links, however, should include traffic-calming devices that discourage cut-through traffic.

c. Traffic Calming
   At necessary intersections, create traffic-calming features to deter cut-through traffic. See transportation recommendations for further detail. As redevelopment occurs, eliminate cul-de-sacs and allow for a more network-like traffic flow to diminished the need for any single street to function as a primary collector within the neighborhood.
d. **Street Parking**
   Allow for parallel parking on the street.

e. **Guest Parking**
   Reduce requirements for additional guest parking for multi-family projects; allow such uses to take advantage of street parking.

f. **Sidewalks**
   Include sidewalks on all residential streets. Also create walking and biking trails adjacent to public roads and any existing public areas lacking sidewalks.

g. **Bicycle Movement**
   Encourage the creation of transportation connections that facilitate bicycle movement. This might take the form of bikeways linked to surrounding residential streets along the back (rear of lot) easements.

7.9 **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RAILROAD CORRIDORS**

The railroad corridors are a significant representation of the Village as many Northshore residents use the rail lines to commute to work on a daily basis. Improving the visual quality of development along the rail line is important.

Also commercial mixed use development and light industry should be focused in areas where the infrastructure and utilities can support the development. This includes the rail road corridor. By focusing this type of land use in these corridors, the residential neighborhoods and retail centers of the Village will be better preserved.

The railroad corridor has traditionally attracted industrial development; this is not only because materials and products can be transported easily, but also because railroads are often seen as aesthetically displeasing, and noisy, physical barriers. Another factor that contributed to industrial development along the railroad corridors was the Glenview Naval Air Station.

Today, with the redevelopment of the GNAS and the subsequent impact on land economics, these railroad corridor districts are feeling growing pressure for change.

Recommendations for the railroad corridor recognize the historical characteristics of development, and encourage an area in which viable businesses may remain, and new businesses may relocate to, while creating a visually cohesive and attractive area that is responsive to market demands.

**Activities and Uses (Railroad Corridor)**

a. **Existing Businesses**
   Recognizing that uses are in transition, allow existing businesses to remain as redevelopment occurs. While property owners should be allowed to change uses, this should not happen if they are not compatible with, and supportive of, the other recommendations for this subarea.

b. **New Retail Activity**
   Locate retail activities in clear, cohesive groups of adjacent buildings. Encourage non-retail activities (including business, industrial, recreational, and institutional uses) to be grouped nearby, or to be interspersed occasionally within retail areas. Locate retail activity (retail goods, specialty shops, services, or restaurants) on the ground floor, and locate additional businesses, and offices on upper floors (2 to 3 story buildings in the downtown area).

c. **Office, Industrial and Other Commercial Uses**
   Allow office, industrial, and other commercial uses on side streets.

d. **Outdoor Activities**
   Encourage outdoor activities and events, including retail activities in parking areas, seasonal events, temporary structures, outdoor eating, and gathering spots. Integrate uses such as bikeways, outdoor eating, seating, gathering spots, and other park elements, to encourage pedestrian use. Provide entrances to these areas between buildings along a pathway from the parking. Link these activities to residential neighborhoods in the area via pedestrian paths.

e. **Green Spaces and Parks**
   Encourage the creation of small green spaces and parks that are integrated with, and open to, surrounding activities.

f. **Encourage Outdoor Activities and Pedestrian Uses**
   Integrate uses such as bikeways, outdoor eating, seating, gathering spots, and other park elements that encourage pedestrian use. Provide entrances to these areas between buildings along a pathway from the parking.

g. **Link Building Interiors to the Outdoors**
   Promote views into buildings to attract customers, and to provide a connection between the indoor and outdoor environments.

**Redevelopment Process (Railroad Corridor)**

a. **Redevelopment Plans**
   Develop detailed redevelopment plans for properties and groups of properties based on the expectation that uses in surrounding buildings will change in response to shifting markets. The selection of properties to be included should be based on the business plans of existing property owners.
b. Ensure Effective Maintenance Procedures
Ensure long-term maintenance by either the landowners or the Village with assessment to the landowners. Consider the use of landscape easements to assign and specify land ownership and control.

c. Reduce Maintenance Costs
Reduce the need for major maintenance in this area by selecting appropriate landscaping and screening elements. Select materials that can be replaced and repaired cost-effectively in case of vandalism or graffiti.

Physical Characteristics (Railroad Corridor)

a. New Retail Buildings
New buildings along Railroad Corridors should reinforce the continuity of the street. Encourage large windows at ground level to allow people to see activities and goods inside. Integrate the design of signs, awnings, lighting, and facade treatments with the architectural character and facades of surrounding buildings. Plans for retail spaces should be sufficiently flexible to reasonably accommodate different retail activities as changes occur in consumer behavior and retail market needs.

b. Areas Between Lots
Along side lot lines and between lots, establish strong, integrated, visual edges with continuous landscaping and ornamental fencing. Create clearly marked gateways and linkages along these edges for shared movement of pedestrians and vehicles. Where feasible, use areas between lots and along side lot lines to create significant landscapes (such as groves and gardens between buildings).

c. Parking Surfaces
Design parking areas as hard-surfaced public spaces with shared, visually integrated parking and pedestrian areas. Design parking patterns to match and reinforce the geometry of the buildings and site conditions.

d. Landscape Elements
Incorporate existing trees into the development wherever possible. Design roadside entries as visually prominent gateways with have adjacent, but distinct, vehicular and pedestrian entrances. These entrances should be marked with decorative fence lines, lighting, or similar features that are visually more prominent than other features surrounding the site or road. The construction materials shall be similar to those used for the building and other site amenities. Lighting poles and fixtures should be well designed, and should provide adequate lighting of the pedestrian realm. Landscaping should be used along pedestrian paths, which direct residents to the shopping areas. Landscaping should be used to screen the cement factory and to provide a sound barrier for adjacent uses.

As feasible a consistent pattern of landscaping should be encouraged along the railroad right R.O.W.

e. Court Yards and Public Places
Use buildings to form courtyards and public places by emphasizing the shape of spaces between buildings, and creating continuous pedestrian-friendly edges along the perimeter of such courtyards and public places.

f. Signage
Encourage uniform, attractive roadside signage that has a distinct base, middle, and top, with the content displayed in the middle portion.

Traffic and Circulation (Railroad Corridor)

a. Make Vehicular Entrances Appealing to Motorists
Create an easily identifiable entry place for motorists with a distinctive gate-like feature. Signs should be used to highlight the entrance and attract motorists. Such gateways and entrances shall be designed to create sufficient sight lines for traffic movement.

b. Encourage Vehicular Linkages Between Sites
Along side yard edges, the plan shall be designed to include options for vehicular linkages between off-street parking lots that are open to the public for general business purposes. Such options shall be created when an off-street parking lot, or a driveway servicing such a lot, is located adjacent to the edge of the site. Such options shall consist of driveway alignments and parking alignments designed to facilitate vehicular movement by the general public from one off-street parking lot to another, across the edge separating the lot from the adjacent lot. This should provide for a safer entrance area onto the street.

c. Make Service Areas Attractive

Service areas can be visible, but should be designed as visually attractive components of public areas, or visually separated from such areas. Acceptable dividing elements for service areas can be any combinations of fences or hedges that provide visual screening at least 60" high.

7.10 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LEHIGH/CHESTNUT/JOHNS DRIVE AREA (SUB AREA C)

This area contains older industries and businesses that predate the Glen, and reflect older patterns of land use and circulation. It is highly likely that these areas will experience development pressure over the next decade. Given the critical location of these areas at a major traffic node (near the new Metra Station), careful redevelopment planning is essential.

As issues and opportunities within these areas were analyzed, a number of recurring themes arose; these themes form the basis from which the recommendations for the districts have been made:

- The land values have shifted in the last decade.
- The newly-created Lake Glenview, and the Park District building have made the area attractive for other uses.
- Long-term goals of landowners may not match those of tenants.
- The visual quality of the areas along the tracks is poor.
- Are there other areas in Glenview that existing businesses could move to?
- Glenview residents currently use the many businesses located in this area.
- Business owners would like to keep existing uses.
- Business owners are concerned about the cost of upgrading their businesses.
- Architectural quality of some businesses is discordant with some of the newer uses.

Commercial, mixed-use development (other than residential), and light industry should be focused in areas where the infrastructure and utilities can support the development. This includes the railroad corridor, major arterials, and areas close to neighborhood centers. By focusing development in these areas, the character of the Village will be better preserved. To ensure safety, limited access points should be allowed off the roads. Internal circulation should be required for all plans.

Activities and Uses (Lehigh/Chestnut/Johns Drive Area)

a. Industrial
   Allow existing industrial and business uses to remain.

b. Retail and Commercial
   Allow new retail/commercial and/or light industrial development along Lehigh Avenue and John's Drive.

c. Parks and Open Space
   As new development occurs, create effective public access to the east edge of Lake Glenview.

d. Residential
   While residential uses are not allowed at this time, in the future, (in approximately five years) the option for low density residential (i.e. town homes) in this area should be
b. New Buildings
The character of new streets should follow traditional neighborhood design principles used in the Glen. For retail structures, encourage large windows at ground level to allow people to see activities and goods inside. Integrate the design of signs, awnings, and facade treatments with the architectural character and facades of surrounding buildings. Ensure that plans for retail spaces are sufficiently flexible to accommodate different retail activities as changes occur in consumer behavior and retail market needs.

New buildings should front Lehigh Avenue and away from Lake Glenview.

Use buildings to form courtyards and public places by emphasizing the shape of spaces between buildings, and creating continuous pedestrian-friendly edges along the perimeter of such courtyards and public places.

Redevelopment Process (Lehigh/Chestnut/Johns Drive Area)

a. Redevelopment Plan
Develop a long-term redevelopment plan for the district, including view shed restrictions, and roadside mixed use (retail, office, and industrial uses along Lehigh and Johns Drive). This should include several options to reflect different patterns of land assembly.

b. Zoning
Allow zoning to change to reflect future mixed-use districts with industrial and commercial uses.

c. New Road Easements
As property ownership and use changes, implement the new redevelopment plan, including new public access and easements along property lines for a new roadway system (as identified in the redevelopment plan).

d. Public Services
As property ownership and use changes, update public services such as water, sewer, and drainage to meet Village standards.

Physical Characteristics (Lehigh/Chestnut/Johns Drive Area)

a. View Shed Restrictions
Ensure that view shed restrictions retain the existing visual character of Lake Glenview Park (regardless of land use).

b. New Buildings
The character of new streets should follow traditional neighborhood design principles used in the Glen. For retail structures, encourage large windows at ground level to allow people to see activities and goods inside. Integrate the design of signs, awnings, and facade treatments with the architectural character and facades of surrounding buildings. Ensure that plans for retail spaces are sufficiently flexible to accommodate different retail activities as changes occur in consumer behavior and retail market needs.

New buildings should front Lehigh Avenue and away from Lake Glenview.

Use buildings to form courtyards and public places by emphasizing the shape of spaces between buildings, and creating continuous pedestrian-friendly edges along the perimeter of such courtyards and public places.

c. Existing Industrial and Businesses
Along side lot lines and between lots, establish strong, integrated visual edges with continuous landscaping and ornamental fencing. Create clearly marked entrances and linkages along these edges for shared movement of pedestrians and vehicles. Where feasible, use areas between lots and along side lot lines to create significant landscapes such as groves and gardens.

d. Landscape Elements
Along the edge of Lehigh, create strong edges using landscape elements. Encourage landscape continuity by limiting the variety of tree and shrub species. Incorporate existing trees into the development wherever possible. Design roadside entries as visually prominent gateways that have adjacent, but distinct, vehicular and pedestrian entrances. These entrances should be marked with fence lines or similar features that are visually more prominent relative to the other features surrounding the site or road. The construction materials should be similar to those used for the building and other site amenities.

Traffic, Parking, and Circulation (Lehigh/Chestnut/Johns Drive Area)

a. Public Access Easements
Provide a public access easement perpendicular to the existing path along the eastern edge of Lake Glenview for bicycles and pedestrians.

b. Bicycle and Pedestrian Movement
Encourage the creation of transportation connections that facilitate bicycle and pedestrian movement. Design paving of parking surfaces with strong visual patterns to facilitate the flow of pedestrians and vehicles through the parking areas.
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7.11 RECOMMENDATIONS OLD WILLOW TRIANGLE (SUB AREA A)

The Old Willow Triangle subarea historically developed as an industrial corridor alongside the railway tracks and the Naval Air Base. Recent developments, including the Willow Creek Shopping Center (Target, Kohl's Department Store, etc.), the North Shore Corporate Park, newer residential developments along Willow Road, and in the Glen, have incrementally changed the character of the area. It is an area in transition; the cement plant alongside the athletic facilities, the "Carrot Top," and the newer developments, create a diverse and mixed-use service district. Old Willow Road is not currently a pedestrian-friendly neighborhood; the realignment of Lehigh Avenue, the new Metra Station, and the above-mentioned new developments create an environment in which a pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use district with pedestrian and bicycle links to the surrounding neighborhoods may be created.

The diverse and changing land use conditions have also created issues with utility service and drainage. As the district changes, these concerns should be addressed. Older facilities should be encouraged to update their infrastructure and landscaping in order to enhance the service district experience. The existing concrete plant is a blighting influence and is an inappropriate land use for this changing land use district.

Activities and Uses (Old Willow Triangle)

a. Existing Businesses
   Encourage existing businesses to remain as redevelopment occurs. Do not allow expansion of such uses unless they are compatible with, and supportive of, the other recommendations for this subarea.

b. New Retail Activity
   Locate retail activities in clear, cohesive groups of adjacent buildings. Encourage non-retail activities (including business, industrial, recreational, and institutional uses) to be grouped nearby, or to be interspersed occasionally within retail areas. Locate retail activity (retail goods, specialty shops, services, or restaurants) on the ground floor, and locate additional businesses and offices, on upper floors (2 to 3 story buildings).

c. Office, Industrial, and Other Commercial Uses
   Allow office, industrial, and other commercial uses on side streets.

d. Outdoor Activities
   Encourage outdoor activities and events, including retail activities in parking areas, seasonal events, temporary structures, outdoor eating, and gathering spots. Integrate uses such as bikeways, outdoor eating, seating, gathering spots, and other park elements, to encourage pedestrian use. Provide entrances to these areas between buildings along a...
pathway from the parking. Link these activities to residential neighborhoods in the area via pedestrian paths.

c. Green Spaces and Parks
Encourage the creation of small green spaces and parks that are integrated with, and open to, surrounding activities.

d. Encourage Outdoor Activities and Pedestrian Uses
Integrate uses such as bikeways, outdoor eating, seating, gathering spots, and other park elements that encourage pedestrian use. Provide entrances to these areas between buildings along a pathway from the parking.

e. Link Building Interiors to the Outdoors
Promote views into buildings to attract customers and to provide a connection between the indoor and outdoor environments.

Redevelopment Process (Old Willow Triangle)

a. Use of TIF Funds
This subarea, within the T.I.F. district for the Glen, should allocate funds to improve public infrastructure and amenities as part of the redevelopment process.

b. Improve Community Amenities
Retain and enhance existing community amenities; work with business owners to improve the quality of infrastructure, parking, buildings, and other facilities

c. Incentives
Provide incentives for property owners to update their facilities

Physical Characteristics (Old Willow Triangle)

a. New Retail Buildings
New buildings along Old Willow Road should reinforce the continuity of the street.

b. Parking Surfaces
Design parking areas as hard-surfaced public spaces with shared, visually integrated parking and pedestrian areas. Design parking patterns to match and reinforce the geometry of the buildings and site conditions.

c. Shared Access
As new uses are developed, and as existing uses are modified, use easements to require shared parking for all non-residential uses. Shared parking should include cross-easements between adjacent uses within a block, the use of

Traffic and Circulation (Old Willow Triangle)

a. Pedestrian Activity
Encourage street-level pedestrian activity. Require front entries for the general public, but allow additional side or rear entry conditions for the public. Maintain sidewalks on all streets. Develop paths along Old Willow Road. These should link to adjacent paths and sidewalks connecting the Metra Station, business parks, neighborhoods, and environmental features.

b. Parking
Design the paving of parking surfaces with strong visual distinctions to illustrate the flow of pedestrians and vehicles through the parking areas. When additional parking is needed, place parking in the back of buildings, in mid-block courtyards (with main street entry), underground, or in parking structures. Integrate these areas with the other architectural features and public space elements of the street.

c. Shared Access
As new uses are developed, and as existing uses are modified, use easements to require shared parking for all non-residential uses. Shared parking should include cross-easements between adjacent uses within a block, the use of
retail parking for non-retail uses during off-peak periods, and the use of non-retail parking for retail uses during off-peak periods. When additional parking is needed, place parking lots in the rear of buildings or in mid-block courtyards. Integrate these areas with other architectural features and public space elements of the street.

d. Bicycle and Pedestrian Movement

Trails should be provided from Old Willow Road to the Techny Basin. Encourage the creation of transportation connections that facilitate bicycle and pedestrian movement. This can take the form of bikeways linked to surrounding residential streets along the back (rear of lot) easements. Design the paving of parking surfaces with strong visual patterns to facilitate the flow of pedestrians and vehicles through the parking areas.

e. Signage

Create a pattern of signage that encourages the use of rear cross-easements and entries from cross streets rather than Old Willow Road. Such signage should be directly along the street edge. It should be well lit, visually prominent, allow for display of logos and names in a flexible and diverse manner, and still provide some overall consistency in the form and composition of the signage system. For example, a series of low, monument signs, with different interior graphics, but similar materials and tops, could provide such a signage system.

f. Service Areas

Where possible, allow a mixture of vehicles, both service and customer (except frequent semi-truck deliveries). Locate service access in the rear and design it with landscape, screening, and features that match the surrounding architectural features and site conditions. Make service areas attractive as components of public areas, or visually separate from such areas through the use of fences and hedges. Locate service access in the rear and design it with landscape, screening, and features that match the surrounding architectural features and site conditions.

7.12 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CORRIDORS

Natural features of environmental corridors and conservancy lands contribute to the overall beauty of the Village. Development should not be allowed in these areas; rather, these areas should be utilized as amenities for existing and future residents. Environmental conservancy areas include primary and secondary environmental corridors, the rivers, streams, wetlands, woodlands, wildlife habitats, isolated natural resource areas, poorly drained soils, and severe slopes. Development within these areas may lead to environmental and development problems.

Activities and Uses (Environmental Corridor)

a. Provide Paths Through the Corridors

Allow access to and through the corridors and conservancy areas, but minimize the impact by having only a few, simple paths.

b. Utilize the Natural Features as an Amenity for Development

Plan the surrounding development so many residents see each feature. Do not block the view of the corridor or conservancy from public roads.

c. Allow Only Passive Activities

Allow only passive activities such as walking, hiking and biking along trails. Paths should be made of natural materials.

d. Connect Areas Together

Connect areas to provide a greater impact and create a more significant green space.

e. Allow Limited Public Uses

Allow limited public and private uses, which expand the opportunities of the general public to experience the natural environment.

Maintenance (Environmental Corridor)

a. Use Preservation Techniques to Protect the Land

Require deed restrictions, covenants, and easements that guarantee land control and management of natural areas. Create restrictions that are difficult to change without broad public approval (such as referenda, unanimous agreements, and so forth). Surrounding development should neither affect the growth of the landscape in the environmental...
Map 7.13: Environmental resources and open space in Glenview.
corridor, nor increase the erosion of surrounding soils.

b. **Design to Preserve Open Space**
   Encourage the design and preservation of common areas to minimize their future utility as developable parcels.

c. **Conform to Water Quality Regulations**
   Conform to the rules for watershed and water quality and water control regulations.

**Visual Character (Environmental Corridor)**

a. **Protect All Identified Environmental Corridors and Conservancy Areas**
   Development should not occur in any of the identified areas, and surrounding development should not negatively affect the visual connection to natural features.

b. **Preserve and Integrate Landscape Elements**
   Link proposed landscapes to environmental features, enhancing their value and providing a connection between built and natural environments.

c. **Connect the Landscapes**
   Extend and connect the existing natural areas and environmental corridors with new plantings and landscaping that match the existing plantings and landscape. Create continuous landscape edges along public roads and between surrounding development by using mixtures of species, which creates a varied image as the seasons change, and which maintains the rural character.

d. **Use Similar Plant Species**
   Utilize the character of the existing environmental corridor as a basis for selecting new plantings.

**Traffic and Circulation (Environmental Corridor)**

a. **Create Walking and Hiking Trails**
   Create walking and hiking trails adjacent to public roads to act as buffers for development. Integrate walking and hiking trails with the geometry and pattern of roads.
LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT RECOMMENDATIONS
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8.1 TYPES OF PLACES

SIGNIFICANT GREEN/OPEN SPACE
Many natural resources, such as soils, streams, vegetation, and wildlife, remain from the Village's pre-settlement history. Glenview residents enjoy the benefits of these natural resources, which are habitat to hundreds of other living things, generally thought of as "nature." Natural areas and natural resources contribute to the quality of life in the Village, and are a part of a valuable living heritage that should be preserved and restored for the education and enjoyment of residents. These resources also provide local and regional benefits as passive open space, and by absorbing and purifying storm water.

Natural resources are concentrated in publicly owned natural areas such as forest preserves, the Grove, the rivers, wetlands, the Air Station Prairie, the Woodworth Prairie, the Techny Basin, and Lake Glenview. Natural resources are also located on private lands ranging from corporate campuses to individual residential yards, and include riverbanks, trees, shrubs, and naturalized gardens.

The Village has taken important initial steps to preserve and protect nature by preserving the Air Station Prairie, acquiring the Techny Basin, Lot 16 and the adjacent river, creating Lake Glenview and its surrounding natural areas, and hiring a natural resources manager. See Appendix E.6.1. for a chart of park and recreational resources in the Village and their amenities from the Park District. In addition there are other resources like Gallery Park.

Ecological Resources in the Village of Glenview – Summary

- Air Station Prairie
- Lake Glenview and Gallery Park
- West Fork Corridor
- Techny Basin
- Lot 16
- River, Willow to Valley Lo
- North Navy Ditch
- River, Valley Lo to Chestnut
- River, Chestnut to Grove
- River grove to Waukegan Road (Downtown)
- River, Waukegan Road to Corporate Limits
- North Branch, Harms Woods and Blue Star Memorial Woods
- Wagner Farm and Various Parks
- Woodworth Prairie
- The Grove and Community Park West
- Des Plaines River and Forest Preserve
- Parkways and other Public Places - (street trees and other habitat)
- Private Land: Residential and Corporate - (Trees and other habitat aspects including natural landscaping)

Air Station Prairie
The Air Station Prairie includes 32 acres of upland and wetland habitat in various stages of restoration and mitigation. It is protected as an environmentally significant area under the provisions of the Village of Glenview zoning ordinance, and is being managed by the Village under the terms of a detailed management plan, in cooperation with the North Branch Restoration Project.

The heart of the prairie is a high-quality 14-acre prairie remnant containing more than 160 native plant species. A mix of prairie and agricultural vegetation being restored to prairie, surrounds it. In the northeast corner, a new wetland area is being created; along the eastern edge, the perimeter road and associated fill are being removed. The southern end of the prairie consists of approximately eight acres of wetlands, which are being restored primarily through biological means, specifically by controlling purple loosestrife through the introduction of beetles.

An interpretative center will be built on an area of existing fill in the southeast corner to provide orientation and shelter for visiting groups. With respect to educational programs, the prairie and interpretive center are expected to support and complement programs of the schools and Park District, which have primary responsibility for that function.

Lake Glenview and Gallery Park
Lake Glenview and its wetlands cover approximately 45 acres, surrounded by 149.49 acres of land populated with native species, to be maintained as natural landscape. Use of these areas is for low-intensity recreation, and emphasizes natural fish and wildlife habitats.
The remainder of Gallery Park provides for more intensive recreation, including sports fields for a new middle school. The school and the Park District's community center are located at the southern edge of the park.

The park is owned and managed by the Village with athletic fields leased to School District 34 and the Park District.

The lake serves to control storm runoff from a larger area and is connected to the Techny detention basin and the West Fork of the Chicago River. Habitat, especially for birds, within the park is also connected to the naturalized areas on the Glen Club golf course and other natural areas, such as the prairie and the river corridor.

Woodworth Prairie

Owned by the University of Illinois at Chicago, the Woodworth Prairie is managed as a nature preserve of exceptionally high biological quality. Although it has a small interpretive center, and has in the past years operated interpretive programs for schools and the general public, it has terminated those programs and is focusing on scientific aspects.

The Grove and Community Park West

The Grove Historic Landmark, with its prairie grove and wetland habitat, is a major focal point for natural resources in the Village. The outstanding quality of the nature center and of the educational programs Grove staff conduct there, to Village residents, of vital importance in understanding natural resources and the biology of the area. Ongoing ecological restoration within the Grove is improving habitat and serving as an important example. The Grove is owned and operated by the Glenview Park District. Support by the Village is primarily through the zoning code, which provides protection through environmentally-sensitive area provisions, and by controlling land uses in the adjacent area.

The West Park wetlands are federally protected wetlands owned by the Park District in conjunction with active sports fields. They are being restored to ecological good health.

Other Public Parks

The Wagner Farm contains pasture grasses and a wetland area that has substantial potential for restoration as a natural habitat.

Flick Park contains trees, shrubs, a mini arboretum, and a pond which provides an aquatic habitat.

Roosevelt Park, Johns Park, and others, provide trees, shrubs, and the potential for at least some limited natural landscaping.

The three riverside parks provide limited riparian habitat and are addressed within Section 7.1-Environmental Cooridors.

Golf courses can provide important habitat, especially through the use of natural landscaping. While the two Park District courses provide little habitat at present, there is significant potential. The Glen Club course includes extensive natural habitat and is a participant in the International Audubon Program.

Parkways and Other Public Places (Street Trees and Other Habitats)

Although seldom recognized as ecologically important, street trees provide an important habitat for nesting birds, and provide both food and shelter to birds during migration. Native tree species - especially oaks, elms, and hickories - serve as hosts for insects eaten by spring migrants (such as warblers) after crossing agricultural areas that do not provide enough food. Trees around public places such as Village Hall, the Library, and golf courses, can also provide important habitat for birds, animals, and insects such as butterflies.

Private Land, Residential and Corporate

The living natural resources within Glenview rely to a large extent on habitat existing on privately owned land, both residential and corporate. Even lands with only turf grass, trees, and shrubs, support nature to some extent; lands that include natural landscaping can provide substantial wildlife habitat.

The use of perennial native plants in un-mowed conditions can provide both attractive landscaping and valuable habitat for native plants, insects, birds, and animals. The use of natural landscaping is gaining popularity, and can contribute substantially as a natural habitat.
Map 8.1: Significant open space in and around Glenview.
Map 8.2: School districts in Glenview.
resource within the Village. Natural landscaping not only provides useful habitat, it also conserves water by absorbing rainwater, and reduces the need for irrigation. In addition, it reduces energy consumption and air pollution from mowers. The Village can play an important role in encouraging the use of natural landscaping by providing demonstrations and information.

**CIVIC/INSTITUTIONAL BUILDINGS**

Civic and Institutional buildings within the Village include the village hall, police and fire stations, parks facilities, library, post offices, community centers, and other state and federal buildings. Though the Village may not have direct control over the physical characteristics of these facilities, the following guidelines describe the communities vision for civic/public buildings in Glenview.

**Public Schools**

Six School Districts serve the Village of Glenview. The Village has two high school districts, New Trier #225 and Glenbrook #203. Glenbrook South High School is located on Pfingsten Road north of Lake Avenue.

Elementary schools from four school districts are located in Glenview: School District #34 (Glen Grove, Henking, Hoffman, Lyon, Pleasant Ridge and Westbrook Elementary School), School District #37 (Avoca Elementary School), School District # 30 (Willow Brook Elementary School), and District # 31 (Winkelman Elementary School).

Springman Middle School is located at the intersection of Washington Road and Central Road and Attea Middle School is located on Chestnut in the Glen; both middle schools are part of district #34. Another school in Maine East serves the unincorporated areas.

**Private Schools**

The Village is also home to five private and parochial schools: Emmanuel Lutheran (1850 Chestnut Avenue), Our Lady of Perpetual Help (1125 Church Street), Emmanuel Church School of the New Jerusalem (74 Park Drive), and St. Catherine Laboure (3425 Thornwood Avenue).

**NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL NODES**

Neighborhood commercial nodes are small commercial areas located along neighborhood corridors that serve the commercial needs of the surrounding neighborhood. By focusing development in these areas, the residential character of the adjoining neighborhoods will be better preserved. To ensure safety, limited access points should be allowed off the roads. Internal circulation should be required for all plans. The neighborhood commercial nodes should act as a gateway to the residential neighborhoods that support it.

### 8.2 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SIGNIFICANT GREEN/OPEN SPACE

**Intent:** Green/open space shall serve as a primary social connection between all neighborhoods, and as an amenity for surrounding home sites through the protection and enhancement of the existing natural environment. These include neighborhood parks, preserves, and other open land (The Grove and Wagner Farm).

**Activities and Uses (Significant Green/Open Space)**

a. **Recreational Areas**
   Include combinations of active recreational and passive areas. Use the active recreational areas for league games that are managed by sports associations or public agencies. Also encourage the use of active recreational areas for spontaneous games among neighborhood residents. Additionally the ‘Navy 19 acres’ should be preserved for open space/playfields.

b. **Community Based Activities**
   Encourage community-based social and cultural events, including meetings and celebrations, and especially events associated with adjacent community, business, or residential uses.

c. **Educational Activities**
   Encourage educational walking tours to illustrate the beauty and importance of these natural areas. Animals, birds, and plantings should be protected.

d. **Access**
   Consider controlling access to the interior of the park if it is essential to protecting and supporting the activities.

**Maintenance and Management (Significant Green/Open Space)**

a. **Maintenance**
   Assign maintenance and management of parks to public agencies or, in special cases, to large neighborhood or homeowner associations that have the organizational capacity to sustain maintenance and management services.

b. **Coordinated Efforts**
   Encourage the various agencies responsible for maintenance and management to coordinate their efforts to reinforce the social and economic activities of the park and its relationship to the neighborhood.

c. **Special Features**
   Encourage the maintenance and management of special features, such as a community garden, park structures, or play areas, by local property owners, a neighborhood association, business group, or homeowner association. Establish specific agreements that clearly define such arrangements.

**Physical Characteristics (Significant Green/Open Space)**

a. **Boundaries**
   Create boundaries that follow the alignments of topography and existing patterns of land ownership, development, or environmental features. Design the edges of parks distinctively with rows of tree plantings to reinforce the street edge and allow for clear visual access into the park interior. Use existing landscaping, when possible, to form the edge.

b. **Natural Features**
   Preserve significant land areas containing natural features.

   Design the interior of parks with a variety of landscapes, ornamental elements, open fields, gardens, paving patterns, topographical features, and lighting. Divide parks into a clear hierarchy of major and minor spaces including both formal geometric shapes (suitable for the layout of play fields) and less formal, more picturesque shapes suitable for passive recreation.

c. **Context**
   Use parks as edges to development and/or as visual amenities for housing. Design formal pedestrian and vehicular entries corresponding to the geometry of the surrounding street system.

d. **Landscape**
   Include large grass areas combined with numerous tree plantings and ornamental features such as fountains, flower gardens and similar elements.

e. **Berms and Fencing**
   Minimize the use of berms to screen views into the park preserve and between sub areas. Instead, encourage the use of shade trees that allow views between sub areas while still providing a sense of separation. Minimize the use of fences,
which will detract from the natural beauty of the existing landscape, in protected areas.

f. Plannings and Wildlife
Use planting to moderate the seasonal climate. Protect animals, birds, and plantings native to the preserve.

Traffic and Circulation (Significant Green/Open Space)

8.3 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CIVIC/INSTITUTIONAL BUILDINGS

This district includes existing institutional sites and their surrounding land, as well as, future civic uses. Though the Village has no control over many civic/institutional facilities, the following recommendations outline the community’s vision for them.

Existing facilities and land should be maintained to accommodate expansion in the future. These areas create an identity within surrounding neighborhoods and the community overall, and can serve as a place for social events and gatherings.

Activities and Uses (Civic/Institutional Buildings)

a. Use the Site for Community Activities
Encourage community interaction in the form of significant cultural, institutional, and other public activities.

b. Provide Space for Related Activities Inside the Building(s)
Provide space within the buildings for public activities and public use such as meeting rooms for neighborhood groups, classrooms, or exhibit areas.

c. Provide for Future Expansion
Develop plans that provide for contiguous expansion of governmental or institutional buildings so these uses will continue into the future.

Development and Management (Civic/Institutional Buildings)

a. Ensure Effective Maintenance Procedures
Ensure long-term maintenance by designating it as the responsibility of a specific agency or group.

b. Reduce Maintenance Costs
Reduce the need for major maintenance in this area by selecting appropriate landscaping and screening elements. Select materials that can be replaced and repaired cost-effectively, in case of vandalism or graffiti.

c. Preserve Natural Amenities
Preserve natural amenities, where possible, to protect the natural character of the Village. Link these features together, or to an overall trail system that links natural features throughout the area.

d. Create Public Spaces
Create landscape elements that enhance the geometry and pattern of the building and integrate it with the surrounding public places. For new buildings in particular, a site should be selected which has an adjacent public space for events.

e. Use Landscape Elements to Form Vistas
Use landscape elements to form vistas of natural areas around the site.

Traffic and Circulation (Civic/Institutional Buildings)

a. Encourage Pedestrian and Vehicular Movement
Encourage pedestrian and vehicular movement around the site and/or along edges of the building. Use fences, landscaping, or gates to limit access to the natural areas of the site, and link any trails to an overall trail system when applicable.

b. Reduce the Prominence of Parking Lots
Place parking lots or entrances to parking along the sides of buildings, or locate lots behind the building. Screen these
areas with landscape, fences, or similar elements that match
the other architectural features and public space elements.

c. **Locate Service Areas in the Rear**
Locate service access in the rear and design it with
landscape, screening, and vegetation that match the other
architectural features and public space elements surrounding
the building.

d. **Consider Controlled Access**
Consider controlled access to the interior of the site as a
technique for protecting and enhancing the activities.

### 8.4 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL NODES

Neighborhood commercial nodes should be located at neighborhood
corridor intersections. Development should occur along roadside
dges.

Roadside edges occupy an area about 40’ to 100’ deep, immediately
adjacent to the public right-of-way, along the edge of the property.
They are intended to create visually appealing landscapes that visually
define the public right-of-way and create a unified appearance to the
road.

Roadside courts are located immediately behind the roadside edge,
and create more visually appealing commercial areas, and greater
visual compatibility between commercial sites and the residential
environment.

### Activities and Uses (Neighborhood Commercial Node)

a. **Commercial Uses**
Commercial buildings ground floors must contain business
activity (retail goods and services or office uses).

### Development and Management (Neighborhood Commercial Node)

a. **Ensure Effective Maintenance Procedures**
Ensure long-term maintenance by either the landowner/
business owner or the Village (with an assessment to the
owner).

### Physical Characteristics (Neighborhood Commercial Node)

a. **Building Fronts**
Locate building fronts on property lines with either no space
or else very little space between each building.

b. **Continuity**
Reinforce the continuity of the neighborhood street with
streetlights, paving patterns, other structures (bus shelters,
phone booths and public signage), and landscaping.

c. **Windows**
Encourage large windows at ground level that allow people
to see activities and goods inside.

d. **Awnings**
Integrate the design of signs, awnings, and facade treatments
with the architectural character and style of the street.

e. **Landscaping**
Allow trees to be used to moderate weather or beautify the
street.

### Traffic and Circulation (Neighborhood Commercial Node)

a. **Pedestrian Activity**
Encourage street-level pedestrian activity.

b. **Front Entry**
Require front entries for the general public, but allow
additional side or rear entry conditions for the public.

c. **Parking**
Use on-street parking with additional parking located on the
side or in the rear.
The transportation component of the Village of Glenview Comprehensive Plan is divided into three main sections: 1) Existing Transportation Conditions, which assesses the existing status of the Village's transportation system, 2) Future Transportation Conditions, which identifies the future transportation conditions, and 3) Recommended Transportation Plan, which recommends a transportation improvement plan to accommodate the future traffic needs of the Village. The transportation system under study includes automobile travel, pedestrian and bicycle linkages, transit bus and rail options, and Amtrak.

The Village of Glenview is located approximately 20 miles north of the City of Chicago in Cook County, Illinois. The communities surrounding the Village of Glenview include: the Villages of Northbrook and Northfield to the north; the Village of Wilmette to the east; the Villages of Skokie, Golf, Morton Grove, and Niles to the south; and the City of DesPlaines to the west. Glenview is loosely bordered by the Tri-State Tollway (I-294) to the west, the Edens Expressway (I-94) to the east, Willow Road to the north, and Golf Road (IL 58) to the south.

The location of the community in relation to the adjacent communities and the regional transportation system has a significant impact on the transportation conditions within the Village. The transportation improvements recommended as part of the Comprehensive Plan can be effective at enhancing safety and efficiency at select intersections, neighborhoods, and short corridors within the Village. However, the Village has limited control over the traffic passing through the Village, or the transportation improvements required to complete a regionally efficient transportation system. The Village’s comprehensive transportation plan identifies improvements aimed at enhancing traffic flow within the Village limits. The plan also addresses the limiting factors associated with the regional roadways that pass through the Village of Glenview.

Existing Transportation Conditions
The existing transportation system studied as part of this comprehensive evaluation includes the roadway network, commuter railroad system, bus routes, pedestrian linkages, and bicycle routes. The primary focus of this section is to document the status of the existing system.

Future Transportation Conditions
The future transportation conditions section identifies potential traffic growth on the Village’s roadway network, including traffic generated by adjacent communities. The future traffic volumes are analyzed on the existing roadway network, and anticipated deficiencies are identified. This section also identifies transportation improvements that have already been planned in an upcoming budget, but have not yet been constructed.

Recommended Transportation Plan
Based on the findings of the existing and future transportation conditions, a recommended transportation plan was developed for the Village of Glenview, including intersection and roadway improvements, right-of-way requirements, neighborhood traffic calming measures, access management strategies along major roadways, pedestrian and bicycle linkages, and anticipated transit improvements.

9.1 EXISTING TRANSPORTATION CONDITIONS
The Village of Glenview transportation system evaluated as part of the comprehensive plan is comprised of a roadway network, bicycle and pedestrian linkages, and the transit system.

Roadway Network
The roadway network system is classified into three types of facilities: arterials, collectors, and local roadways. The arterials are the main corridors that carry the high traffic volumes, typically at higher speeds. Arterials should be designed to move through vehicles with limited access to adjacent developments and minor roadways. The Illinois Department of Transportation classifies arterials as Strategic Regional Arterial (SRA) routes. SRA routes are arterial roadways designed to handle long distance traffic and supplement the area’s expressway system. When arterials are not designed to accommodate their intended function of a through street, congestion occurs and additional traffic uses the collector and local street system. Collector roadways collect traffic from the local roadways and transport them to the arterials. Collectors should be designed to accommodate...
a balance of through traffic and access to adjacent developments. The local roadway system provides access to the collector roadways. Local roadways should be designed to discourage through traffic and provide access to adjacent developments and roadways.

The arterial and collector roadways are shown in Exhibit 1 and described below.

### Arterial Roadways

- **Golf Road** is a major east/west arterial roadway and is a designated SRA (IL 58). The cross section of Golf Road varies from a six-lane divided roadway to a four-lane divided roadway between Milwaukee Avenue and Waukegan Road. Golf Road originates at Central Park Avenue in Evanston, IL, and continues to the west to Barrington Road in Hoffman Estates, IL, for a length of approximately 32 miles. Golf Road has a posted speed limit of 40 mph. Golf Road has an interchange with the Tri-State Tollway, I-294, which runs along the west border of Glenview.
- **Milwaukee Avenue** is a northwest/southeast diagonal four-lane divided arterial roadway and is a designated SRA route (IL 21). Milwaukee Avenue originates at Skokie Highway (USH 41) in Gurnee, IL, and continues to the south to the intersection of Canal Street with West Lake Street in Chicago, IL, for a length of approximately 40 miles. At different locations in Glenview, the posted speed limit along Milwaukee Avenue is 35 mph or 40 mph.
- **Waukegan Road** is a four-lane divided north/south arterial roadway and is a designated SRA (IL 43) route. Waukegan Road originates at Belvidere Road (IL 120) in Park City, IL, and continues to the south to Lincoln Highway (USH 50) in Frankfurt, IL. Waukegan Road has a posted speed limit of 35 miles per hour (mph) in the Village of Glenview.
- **Willow Road** is a four-lane divided east/west arterial roadway within the Village of Glenview. Willow Road originates at Green Bay Road in Winnetka, IL, and continues to the west to IL 62 in Barrington Hills, IL, for a length of approximately 24 miles. The posted speed limit along Willow Road in the Village of Glenview is 40 mph to 45 mph. Willow Road has an interchange with the Edens Expressway, I-94, which runs along the east border of Glenview. Willow Road also has an interchange with the Tri-State Tollway, I-294, which runs along the west border of Glenview. West of the I-294 interchange, Willow Road is designated as Palatine Road.
- **Lake Avenue** is an east/west four-lane arterial roadway that originates at Michigan Avenue in Wilmette, IL, and continues to the west to Waukegan Road in Prospect Heights, IL. At different locations in Glenview, the speed limit along Lake Avenue is posted at 35 mph, 40 mph, or 45 mph.

### Collector Roadways

- **Central Road** is an east/west two-lane undivided collector roadway that widens at the intersections with Shermer Road, Greenwood Road, and Milwaukee Avenue. Central Road originates at Lehigh Avenue and continues to the west to I-290. The posted speed limit along Central Road is 35 mph in Glenview.
- **Sanders Road** is a north/south four-lane divided collector roadway between Milwaukee Avenue and Willow Road. Sanders Road originates at Milwaukee Avenue in Glenview and continues to the north to Duffy Lane in Lincolnshire, IL. The posted speed limit along Sanders Road is 40 mph.
- **Glenview Road** is an east/west two-lane undivided collector roadway that widens at the intersections with Milwaukee Avenue and Waukegan Road. Glenview Road originates at intersection with Dearlove Road and Milwaukee Avenue in Glenview and continues to the east to Wilmette Avenue in Wilmette, IL. The posted speed limit along Glenview Road is 35 mph.
- **Greenwood Road** is a north/south two-lane collector roadway that widens at the intersections with Central Road and East Lake Avenue. Greenwood Road originates at West Lake Avenue in Glenview and continues to the south to Peterson Avenue in Park Ridge, IL. The posted speed limit along Greenwood Avenue is 35 mph.
- **Pfingsten Road** is a north/south two-lane collector roadway that originates at Lake Cook Road in Northbrook, IL, and continues to the south to East Lake Avenue in Glenview. North of East Lake Avenue, the posted speed limit along Pfingsten Road is 35 mph within Glenview. South of East Lake Avenue, Pfingsten Road becomes a local street providing access to a residential neighborhood.
- **Harms Road** is a north/south two-lane undivided collector roadway with a posted speed limit of 35 mph in Glenview. Harms Road originates at Lake Avenue in Glenview and continues to the south to Dempster Street. South of Golf Road, Harms Road is known as Central Avenue.

- **Landwehr Road** is a north/south two-lane undivided collector roadway. Landwehr Road widens at the intersections with Willow Road and West Lake Avenue. Landwehr Road originates at West Lake Avenue in Glenview and continues to the south to IL 68 in Northbrook, IL. The posted speed limit along Landwehr Road is 40 mph.
- **Chester Avenue** is an east/west two-lane collector roadway that originates at Waukegan Road in Glenview and continues to the west to Patriot Boulevard in Glenview. Between Waukegan Road and Lehigh Avenue, Chester Avenue is an undivided roadway with a posted speed limit of 35 mph. West of Lehigh Avenue, Chester Avenue transitions to a divided roadway section with a posted speed limit of 25 mph.
- **Dearlove Road** is a northeast/southwest two-lane undivided collector roadway that originates at the intersection of Glenview Road and Milwaukee Avenue in Glenview and continues to the southwest to Central Road in Glenview. The posted speed limit along Dearlove Road is 40 mph.
- **Lehigh Avenue** is a northwest/southeast two-lane undivided collector roadway that originates at Willow Road in Glenview and continues to the south to Harlem Avenue in Glenview. The speed limit along Lehigh Avenue is posted at 30 mph, 40 mph, and 45 mph at different locations within the Village of Glenview.
- **Harlem Avenue** is a north/south two-lane undivided collector roadway with a posted speed limit of 30 mph in Glenview. Harlem Avenue originates at Lehigh Avenue in Glenview and continues to the south to Eagle Lake Road in Peotone, IL.
- **Shermer Road** is a north/south two-lane undivided collector roadway with two separate roadway sections north and south of the Glen that do not connect. North of the Glen, Shermer Road originates at Dundee Road (IL 68) in Northbrook, IL, and continues to the south to West Lake Avenue in Glenview. South of the Glen, Shermer Road originates north of Fowler Drive in Glenview and continues to the south to Waukegan Road (IL 43) in Niles, IL. Shermer Road widens at the intersection with Central Road. In Glenview, the posted speed limit along Shermer Road is 30 mph.
EXHIBIT 1
ROADWAY CLASSIFICATION AND DAILY TRAFFIC VOLUMES
VILLAGE OF GLENVIEW TRANSPORTATION STUDY
Winnetka Road is an east/west two-lane undivided collector roadway with a posted speed limit of 35 mph in Glenview. Winnetka Road originates at Waukegan Road (IL 43) in Glenview and continues to the east to Church Road in Wilmette, IL. East of Hillbard Road, Winnetka Road is known as Hill Avenue and Hill Road.

Wagner Road is a north/south two-lane undivided collector roadway. Wagner Road originates at Old Willow Road in Northfield, IL and continues to the south to Central Road in Glenview. At different locations along Wagner Road, the speed limit is posted at 35 mph and 40 mph.

Sunset Ridge Road is a north/south two-lane undivided collector roadway with a posted speed limit of 35 mph in Glenview. Sunset Ridge Road originates at East Lake Avenue in Glenview and continues to the north to Skokie Road in Northbrook, IL.

### Daily Traffic Volumes and Analysis

The existing daily traffic volumes for the major roadways in the Village of Glenview are listed below and are shown on Exhibit 1. Table 1 also shows the annual growth in traffic along each roadway between 1990 and 1998 and between 1994 and 1998.

As shown in Table 1, the daily traffic along I-94 and I-294, south of Willow Road, is 168,500 and 113,400 vehicles per day (vpd), respectively. On a typical day, the arterial roadways currently carry 22,800 to 44,700 vpd. The historical traffic growth from 1990 to 1998 along the arterials ranges from –2.9% per year on East Lake Avenue to 4.8% per year on Willow Road. The AADTs for the collector roadways range from 4,500 vpd on Sunset Ridge Road to 17,300 vpd on Sanders Road. For the collector roadways, the historical traffic growth from 1990 to 1998 ranges from –4.5% per year on Sunset Ridge Road to 2.0% per year on Central Road.

The capacity of a roadway is defined as the maximum amount of daily traffic that a roadway facility can accommodate under prevailing conditions. Roadway geometrics, such as exclusive turn lanes and parking can have an effect on the capacity of roadways. The spacing and frequency of traffic signals also affects the capacity of a roadway. Level of service (LOS) is a measurement of how a roadway is operating at a given time. LOS service ranges from LOS A, which is primarily free-flow operations to LOS F, which indicates low speeds, long queues, and high delays. The following are descriptions of LOS for arterial roadways as defined by the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 2000:

**LOS A** describes primarily free-flow operations at average travel speeds, usually about 70 percent of the free-flow speed for the given street class. Vehicles are completely unimpeded in their ability to maneuver within the traffic stream. Control delay at signalized intersections is minimal.

**LOS B** describes reasonably unimpeded operations at average travel speeds, usually about 70 percent of the free-flow speed for the street class. The ability to maneuver within the traffic stream is only slightly restricted, and control delays at signalized intersections are not significant.

**LOS C** describes stable operations; however, ability to maneuver and change lanes in midblock locations may be more restricted than at LOS B, and longer queues, adverse signal coordination, or both may contribute to lower average travel speeds of about 50 percent of the free-flow speed for that class.

**LOS D** borders on a range in which small increases in flow may cause substantial increases in delay and decreases in travel speed. LOS D may be due to adverse signal progression, inappropriate signal timing, high volumes, or a combination of these factors. Average travel speeds are about 40 percent of free-flow speed.

**LOS E** is characterized by significant delays and average travel speeds of 33 percent or less of the free-flow speed. Such operations are caused by a combination of adverse progression, high signal density, high volumes, extensive delays at critical intersections, and inappropriate signal timing.

**LOS F** is characterized by urban street flow at extremely low speeds, typically one-third to one-fourth of the free-flow speed. Intersection congestion is likely at critical signalized locations, with high delays, high volumes, and extensive queuing.

Typically, LOS D or better represents acceptable operating conditions. For LOS E conditions, the driver will experience longer delays along the roadway. LOS F represents severe traffic congestion conditions. Table 2 shows the AADT range for Level of Service C, D, E, and F for several roadway cross-sections.

As shown in Table 2, the capacity of a roadway increases with additional lanes, exclusive turn lanes, and less access. The capacity of the existing arterial and collector roadway system in Glenview was

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freeways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Lake Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>44,500</td>
<td>-4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,700</td>
<td>32,800</td>
<td>-900</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>28,800</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>-800</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>23,200</td>
<td>-300</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lake Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,800</td>
<td>17,900</td>
<td>16,400</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenview Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>101,100</td>
<td>107,200</td>
<td>113,400</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>20,900</td>
<td>15,900</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnetka Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>28,800</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>-800</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>26,100</td>
<td>31,100</td>
<td>37,200</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lake Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dearlove Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landwehr Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12,300</td>
<td>12,100</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>-26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lake Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td>22,800</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>25,300</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>25,300</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Rd.</td>
<td>North Shore.</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dearlove Rd.</td>
<td>North Shore.</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landwehr Rd.</td>
<td>North Shore.</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood Rd.</td>
<td>North Shore.</td>
<td>4,900*</td>
<td>4,900*</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lake Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan Rd.</td>
<td>North Shore.</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Rd.</td>
<td>North Shore.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dearlove Rd.</td>
<td>North Shore.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landwehr Rd.</td>
<td>North Shore.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood Rd.</td>
<td>North Shore.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lake Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The AADT volume collected by HNTB. All other data from the Illinois Department of Transportation SRA: Strategic Regional Arterial.

***: 2001 AADT volume collected by HNTB. All other data from the Illinois Department of Transportation.**

**NA:** The AADT was not available.
Chapter 9 - Transportation Study

As part of the Comprehensive Plan process, intersection turning movement counts were conducted in August and September of 2001 and March of 2002. The traffic counts were conducted during the weekday morning (7:00 to 9:00 a.m.) and evening (4:00 to 6:00 pm) peak traffic hours at the following eleven intersections:

1. Waukegan Road & Willow Road
2. Waukegan Road & East Lake Avenue
3. Waukegan Road & Glenview Road
4. East Lake Avenue & Greenwood Road
5. East Lake Avenue & Shermer Road
6. East Lake Avenue & Sunset Ridge Road
7. East Lake Avenue & Wagner Road
8. Milwaukee Avenue & Deerfoot/Glenview Road
9. Milwaukee Avenue & Sanders Road
10. Glenview Road & Shermer Road
11. Glenview Road & Greenwood Road

In addition, peak hour traffic volumes have been obtained for the following intersections based on prior studies:

1. Willow Road and Old Willow Road
2. Waukegan Road & Chestnut Avenue
3. Waukegan Road & Dewes Street
4. Waukegan Road & Henley Street
5. Waukegan Road & Linneman Street
6. Milwaukee Avenue & Central Road
7. Milwaukee Avenue & Lake Avenue
8. Milwaukee Avenue & Zenith Parkway
9. West Lake Avenue & Patriot Boulevard
10. Central Road & East River Road
11. Central Road & Zenith Parkway
12. Central Road & Deerfoot Road
13. Glenview Road & Church Street
14. Glenview Road & Pine Street
15. Patriot Boulevard & Chestnut Avenue
16. Patriot Boulevard & Navy Park Street
17. Chestnut Avenue & Johns Drive
18. Dewes Street & Railroad Avenue
19. Dewes Street & Church Street

The traffic volumes at the above intersections were compiled from a previous review of approved village traffic impact studies for the following developments:

- D-1 District Build-out
- The Mixed Use Regional Center (MURC) in The Glen
- Glenview Business Park
- Residential Development (Southwest quadrant of Milwaukee Ave & Lilac Ave)

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-Section</th>
<th>Speed (mph)</th>
<th>Turn Lanes</th>
<th>LOS C</th>
<th>LOS D</th>
<th>LOS E</th>
<th>LOS F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-Lane Undivided</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>&gt;16,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Lane Undivided</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>&gt;19,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Lane TWLTL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>&gt;20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Lane Undivided</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>&gt;21,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Lane Undivided</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>&gt;26,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Lane Undivided (Limited Access)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>&gt;35,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Lane TWLTL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>&gt;28,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Lane Divided</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>&gt;30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Lane Divided (Limited Access)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>&gt;35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Lane Divided</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>40,500</td>
<td>&gt;40,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Lane Divided (Limited Access)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>&gt;46,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Typical Cross-Section</th>
<th>Right-of-Way (Feet)</th>
<th>Existing (AADT)</th>
<th>AADT</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Golf Rd</td>
<td>East of Waukegan Ave</td>
<td>2-Lane (U)</td>
<td>64 – 103</td>
<td>32,800</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Ave</td>
<td>West of Greenleaf Rd</td>
<td>4-Lane (D)</td>
<td>85 – 110</td>
<td>32,800</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan Rd</td>
<td>South of Milly Ave</td>
<td>5-Lane (TWLTL)</td>
<td>99 – 101</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Ave</td>
<td>West of Glenview Rd</td>
<td>5-Lane (TWLTL)</td>
<td>99 – 101</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Rd</td>
<td>East of Waukegan Rd</td>
<td>2-Lane (U)</td>
<td>64 – 103</td>
<td>32,800</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Lake Ave</td>
<td>West of Milwaukee Ave</td>
<td>4-Lane (D)</td>
<td>85 – 101</td>
<td>32,800</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *: 2001 AADT volume that was collected by HNTB. All other AADT data from the Illinois Department of Transportation.
• Town & Country Business Center
• Willow Creek Retail Center
• Belmont Village
• OPTIMA Glenview East and West developments

A detailed listing of the traffic studies that were obtained for review is included in Table A in the Appendix. For those developments not yet constructed or fully occupied, the anticipated peak hour traffic volumes documented in each of the above traffic impact studies were compiled and added to the existing traffic counts.

The existing weekday morning and evening peak hour traffic volumes for all 30 of the intersections listed above are illustrated on Exhibit A in the Appendix.

The study area intersections were analyzed based on the procedures set forth in the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). Level of Service is a quantitative measure that refers to the overall quality of flow at an intersection ranging from very good, represented by LOS 'A', to very poor, represented by LOS 'F'. For analysis and design purposes, Level of Service (LOS) 'D' was used to define acceptable peak hour operating conditions. Descriptions of the various levels of service are presented below:

LOS A is the highest level of service that can be achieved. Under this condition, intersection approaches appear quite open, turning movements are easily made, and nearly all drivers find freedom of operation.

LOS B represents stable operation.

LOS C still represents stable operation, but periodic backups of a few vehicles may develop behind turning vehicles. Most drivers begin to feel restricted, but not objectionably so.

LOS D represents increasing traffic restrictions as the intersection approaches instability. Delays to approaching vehicles may be substantial during short peaks within the peak period, but periodic clearance of long lines occurs, thus preventing excessive backups.

LOS E represents the capacity of the intersection.

LOS F represents jammed conditions where the intersection is over capacity and acceptable gaps for unsignalized intersections in the mainline traffic flow are minimal.

The existing traffic operations at the study area intersections were analyzed for the weekday morning and evening peak traffic hours.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>Level of Service (LOS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan Road &amp; Willow Road</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan Road &amp; Chestnut Avenue</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan Road &amp; E. Lake Avenue*</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan Road &amp; Glenview Road*</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan Road &amp; DuPage Street</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan Road &amp; Holway Street</td>
<td>Step Sign</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan Road &amp; Lutensmore Street</td>
<td>Step Sign</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Road &amp; Mid Willow Road</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Avenue &amp; Sanders Road*</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Avenue &amp; W. Lake Avenue</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Avenue &amp; North Parkway</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Avenue &amp; Deerfield/Glenview Road</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Avenue &amp; Central Road</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Road &amp; DeKalb Road</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Road &amp; East River Road</td>
<td>Step Sign</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkside Boulevard &amp; Chestnut Avenue</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkside Boulevard &amp; Navy Park Street</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkside Boulevard &amp; West Lake Avenue</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lake Avenue &amp; Greenwood Road*</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lake Avenue &amp; Shermer Road*</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lake Avenue &amp; Summit Ridge Road*</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lake Avenue &amp; Wagner Road*</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenview Road &amp; Greenwood Road*</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenview Road &amp; Shermer Road*</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenview Road &amp; Church Street</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenview Road &amp; Pine Street</td>
<td>Step Sign</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Avenue &amp; John Drive</td>
<td>Step Sign</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerfield Street &amp; Railway Avenue</td>
<td>Step Sign</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerfield Street &amp; Church Street</td>
<td>Step Sign</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Travel time/delay studies were conducted along Waukegan Road, Milwaukee Avenue, Golf Road, and Willow Road to calibrate the operational analysis of the intersections along these corridors. The LOS values reflect the calibration of the intersection operations analysis. It should be noted that the LOS shown in Table 4 reflects the overall intersection operations, and select movements will operate below the overall intersection LOS.

As shown in Table 4, the overall operation of the study area intersections range from LOS A to LOS E during the weekday peak traffic hours. The Milwaukee Avenue intersections with West Lake Avenue and Central Road currently operate below the acceptable LOS D criteria. The East Lake Avenue intersection with Shermer Road currently operates below the acceptable LOS D criteria. However, several of the intersections operating at LOS D or better conditions, have select movements which are failing (LOS E or LOS F).

The ten intersections with the worst operating conditions were also analyzed with the Year 2015 traffic conditions. The results of this analysis are provided in the Future Transportation Conditions section of this report.

Crash Summary

The Glenview Police Department summarized the crash statistics from September 1, 1999 through September 1, 2000. The number and type of crashes that occurred in Glenview during that year are shown in Table 5.

Non reported crashes include crashes on private property, crashes settled without Police involvement, and crashes reported to the Police Station.

Based on the crash statistics from September 1, 1999 through September of 2000, the Glenview Police Department ranked the most hazardous intersections. The number of crashes that occurred at each intersection were converted to a rate for comparison purposes. The intersection crash rate represents the number of crashes per million entering vehicles (MEV) and is calculated by the following equation:

\[
\text{Crashes Per MEV} = \frac{\text{Number of Crashes} \times 1,000,000}{\text{Intersection Daily Entering Volume} \times 365}
\]

The number of crashes and the corresponding rate per MEV for the fourteen most hazardous intersections are included in Table 6 and illustrated on Exhibit 3.

As shown in Table 6, the intersection of Waukegan Road with
Chestnut Avenue has the highest rate of 5.0 crashes per MEV. The West Lake Avenue intersection with Milwaukee Avenue and the I-294 interchange with Willow Road had the next highest crash rates, with rates of 4.34 and 4.19 crashes per MEV, respectively. An intersection with a high crash rate is often the result of longer vehicle delays.

### Neighborhood Traffic Conditions

A common concern in residential neighborhoods is cut through traffic and high speed traffic. Cut through traffic is generally considered to be through traffic that travels on a local street as a way to avoid congestion on a nearby primary route such as an arterial, or because the local street provides a shorter route to a desired destination. In response to residents' concerns regarding cut through and high speed traffic, several studies have been conducted in recent years to identify the amount of cut through traffic in particular neighborhoods.

The following section summarizes four of these studies, which demonstrate all of the neighborhoods in the studies experience the same problems, cut through traffic and high speeds. The main cause of the cut through traffic in each neighborhood was the poor operation of nearby collector and arterial roadways and the ease of access through neighborhoods.

**Springdale Avenue Neighborhood:** In October of 2000, a license plate survey was conducted during the weekday evening peak period (4:00 to 6:00 p.m.) for westbound vehicles entering Springdale Avenue at Greenwood Road and southbound vehicles exiting Highland Lane and Longmeadow Drive at Glenview Road. The survey indicated that 52% of the westbound traffic on Springdale Avenue is cut-through. In addition, 69% of the southbound traffic on Highland Lane and 24% of the southbound traffic on Longmeadow Drive were identified as cut-through traffic.

Figure 1 displays the location of these cut throughs and their respective percentages. Table 7 summarizes the results of the study.

The study concluded the most effective approach to significantly reducing cut-through traffic in the Springdale Avenue neighborhood is to improve the traffic carrying capacity of Greenwood Road and the intersection of Greenwood Road with Glenview Road. Therefore, it was recommended that the Village consider extending the existing four-lane section of Greenwood Road from Crestwood Lane to south of Glenview Road.

**Pleasant Drive Neighborhood:** In December of 2000, a study was conducted to estimate the amount of cut-through traffic in the Pleasant Drive neighborhood. The percent of cut-through traffic in the neighborhood was estimated and is shown in Table 8.

From the estimates above, it appears vehicles may be using Pleasant Drive as a cut through. Although this road primarily serves residences, due to the layout of the street network in the area, it also serves as a minor collector. Therefore it is a reasonable route for destinations within the area. The study recommended that a thorough cut through traffic count be performed in order to evaluate if Pleasant Drive is being used as a cut through for vehicles that do not have destinations within the area.

**Washington Street & Lehigh Avenue:** A resident along Washington Street, just south of Lehigh Avenue, had expressed concern for the volume and speed of traffic on the street. A license plate survey was conducted during the weekday evening peak period (4:00 to 6:00 p.m.) for westbound vehicles entering Springdale Avenue at Greenwood Road and southbound vehicles exiting Highland Lane and Longmeadow Drive at Glenview Road. The survey indicated that 69% of the westbound traffic on Springdale Avenue is cut-through. In addition, 69% of the southbound traffic on Highland Lane and 24% of the southbound traffic on Longmeadow Drive were identified as cut-through traffic.

Figure 1 displays the location of these cut throughs and their respective percentages. Table 7 summarizes the results of the study.

The study concluded the most effective approach to significantly reducing cut-through traffic in the Springdale Avenue neighborhood is to improve the traffic carrying capacity of Greenwood Road and the intersection of Greenwood Road with Glenview Road. Therefore, it was recommended that the Village consider extending the existing four-lane section of Greenwood Road from Crestwood Lane to south of Glenview Road.

**Pleasant Drive Neighborhood:** In December of 2000, a study was conducted to estimate the amount of cut-through traffic in the Pleasant Drive neighborhood. The percent of cut-through traffic in the neighborhood was estimated and is shown in Table 8.

From the estimates above, it appears vehicles may be using Pleasant Drive as a cut through. Although this road primarily serves residences, due to the layout of the street network in the area, it also serves as a minor collector. Therefore it is a reasonable route for destinations within the area. The study recommended that a thorough cut through traffic count be performed in order to evaluate if Pleasant Drive is being used as a cut through for vehicles that do not have destinations within the area.

**Washington Street & Lehigh Avenue:** A resident along Washington Street, just south of Lehigh Avenue, had expressed concern for the volume and speed of traffic on the street.
Crash data collected from September 1999 to September 2000

Note: Rate is number of accidents per million entering vehicles (MEV)
Washington Street. It was indicated that drivers may use Washington Street to avoid the signalized intersection of Glenview Road and Harlem Avenue. In April of 1999, a cut-through traffic study was conducted for the intersection of Washington Street with Lehigh Avenue. The findings of the study show very little change in traffic volumes at the Washington Street intersection with Lehigh Avenue in the past six years. During the peak hours, the total volume on Washington Street has only increased by 2 to 3 vehicles per year while the overall volume has decreased. The negligible increase in traffic during peak hours indicates that Washington Street may not serve as a cut through route.

The three alternatives suggested by the resident were (1) cul-de-sac Washington Street at Lehigh Avenue, (2) prohibit southbound right-turns, and (3) prohibit northbound left-turns. The study results showed that these alternatives may reduce some cut through traffic on Washington Street, but will have adverse effects on the surrounding streets. Thus, none of the traffic alternatives were recommended.

Woodland Avenue: A study was conducted at nine locations that were identified with potential cut through problems. A license plate survey was performed during the weekday evening peak period (4:00 to 6:00 p.m.) for all eastbound and westbound vehicles and the cut through traffic was tabulated from this survey. Table 9 summarizes the locations the study was conducted as well as the percentage of cut through traffic at the respective locations.

The percentages of cut-through trips in five of the locations above warrants further analysis (the first five locations listed in Table 9). Several alternatives to control cut through traffic were considered. The study recommended the following alternatives. Alternative 1 includes the addition of dual left-turn lanes and appropriate right-turn lanes at the intersection of Lake and Waukegan to increase capacity and reduce delays at the intersection. Alternative 2 is the installation of a “full diverter” or cul-de-sac near Waukegan Road where the land use changes from commercial to residential. The last alternative would change the streets to one-way operation which would eliminate the eastbound cut-through movements but would be restrictive to local residents. A sub-alternative would make a section of the street one-way while the rest of the street would remain two-way. This would eliminate eastbound cut-through traffic, but would allow residents greater access.

The above studies reflect problems that occur in many other neighborhoods within the Village. Solving the problems associated with cut-through and high speed traffic on neighborhood streets

### Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total Traffic Volume</th>
<th>Cut-Through Volume</th>
<th>Percent Cut-Through</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Drive*</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewes Street*</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove/Raleigh/Sanford/Hawthorne*</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlawn Avenue*</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood/Topp*</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacLean/Hutchings</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springdale/Highland</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale/Delph Place</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside/Revere</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Warrants further study to prevent cut-through traffic.
requires a evaluation of the entire adjacent transportation system. The recommendations section of the report will identify improvements that will enhance neighborhood traffic safety, including improving the adjacent collector and arterial roadways and implementing traffic calming techniques within the neighborhoods.

9.2 PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

Public transportation in Glenview consists of Metra commuter rail, Amtrak passenger rail, and Pace suburban bus. Exhibit 4 depicts rail lines and bus routes.

Metra Commuter Rail

The Metra Milwaukee District Line connects downtown Chicago to Fox Lake, Illinois, with 19 intermediate stops. Glenview is home to two Metra stations, one located downtown, and the recently opened Glen of North Glenview station, which is located south of Willow Road. The weekday schedule includes 25 inbound trains and 28 outbound trains for the downtown Glenview station, and 24 inbound and 25 outbound trains for the Glen of North Glenview station. The stations are also served on the weekends with 10 trains in each direction on Saturdays and 9 trains in each direction on Sundays. The stations are located in fare zone D. A one-way fare from either station to downtown Chicago is $3.15.

Statistics from Metra indicate that ridership at the downtown Glenview station has increased over the years. In 1999, there were 1,519 weekday inbound boardings (to Chicago), and 127 weekday outbound boardings. In an average week, there are 8,456 boardings and 8,100 alightings. The downtown Glenview station is the busiest station on this line in terms of passenger boardings. In an average week, there are 8,456 boardings and 8,100 alightings (Metra Milwaukee North Line Fall 1999 Station Ridership Survey). It is the busiest station on this line in terms of passenger boardings and alightings, and it is the 18th busiest station of all 235 Metra stations. By comparison, Glenview’s average weekday passenger load is 1,046, while the average Metra passenger load is 667.

The majority of commuters (51%) drove alone to access the Glenview station. 27% walked, 18% were dropped off, and less than 8% were carpoolers, bicyclists, or transit users (Metra 1999 On-Board Passenger Survey).

Metra does not have any ridership or mode of access information for the recently opened Glen of North Glenview station. There are currently 681 existing parking spaces at the downtown Glenview station, which are 100% utilized. Parking spaces are located along the railroad right-of-way, as well as on various lots near the station. There is one large lot containing 112 spaces near the station on the west side of Lehigh Avenue, as well as a number of smaller lots in the downtown area. Parking fees are $2.00 per day for daily spaces, or $180.00 per year for permit spaces (for residents). The Glen of North Glenview station was opened in 2001, and currently has 500 parking spaces located east of the railroad tracks.

Amtrak Intercity Rail

The downtown Glenview station provides service for Amtrak intercity passenger rail as well as Metra. The Empire Builder train servicing Chicago, St. Paul, Minnesota, and Seattle, stops in Glenview twice daily. The Hiawatha Service between Chicago and Milwaukee, Wisconsin has six daily trips in each direction, including one during the morning rush and one during the evening rush.

Pace Suburban Bus

There are eight Pace bus routes that serve the Glenview area. Many of these routes serve the Metra stations, shopping centers, high schools, and employment centers.

Route 210: This route begins in downtown Chicago, with stops at the Western Avenue CTA rapid transit station, various Lincolnwood shopping centers and the Morton Grove Metra station. It then travels north along Waukegan Road to the Glenview Metra station, and then onto Glenbrook South High School and Glenbrook Hospital.

Route 212: This route begins in Evanston at the Davis Street Metra and CTA stations, with stops at Rush North-Shore Hospital, Old Orchard Shopping Center, the Glenview Metra station, Kraft, United Parcel Service, Glenbrook North High School, the Northbrook Metra station, and the Northbrook Court Shopping Center.

Route 220: This route begins at O’Hare International Airport. It travels through Rosemont and Des Plaines to the Des Plaines Metra station.

Route 221: This route begins at the Glenview Metra station.

Route 222: Beginning at the Harlem Blue Line CTA station in Chicago, this route travels straight up Harlem Avenue, terminating at the Glenview Metra station. It serves Kraft, as well as three private high schools: Notre Dame High School, Loyola Academy, and Regina Dominican High School.

Route 421: Route 421 begins at the Linden Purple Line CTA station in Evanston. It serves the Wilmette Metra station, Regina Dominican High School, Edison Plaza, Loyola Academy, Northfield, downtown Glenview, and Kraft headquarters.

Route 623: This route is dubbed the “Allstate Shuttle Bug,” and connects the Glen of North Glenview station with the Allstate complex on Sanders Road. It primarily serves the work commute. This route is subsidized in part by Allstate.

Route 624: The “Willow-Sanders Shuttle Bug” also begins at the Glen of North Glenview station, bringing workers to Household Finance, Caremark and Accenture, all located along Sanders Road, west of I-294. Like Route 623, this route is subsidized by the businesses it serves.

Route 648: This route connects the Glenview Metra station with AON, located just east of I-294. It is subsidized in part by AON.

9.3 PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE CONDITIONS

The Village of Glenview has identified three main north/south corridors for bicycle travel:

- Des Plaines River Trail along the Des Plaines River
- North Branch Trail along the North Branch of the Chicago River

The three corridors generally have a north/south orientation and are located in the west, center, and east sections of the Village. These locations form the foundation for a dispersed network that provides bicycling opportunities for Glenview residents. The Village has identified a primary need for an east/west bicycle route(s) to provide interconnections among the three north/south trails, which would jointly form a more complete bicycle route network. As part of the Village Comprehensive Plan, the Village seeks to identify necessary improvements to accommodate additional bicycle routes within the Village. Another goal of the Comprehensive Planning process is to identify improvements that enhance the pedestrian environment within the Village.

Existing Pedestrian and Bicycle Conditions

Typical Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel

Several sources were reviewed to determine the current propensity for bicycling and walking. The Chicago Area Transportation Study’s 1990 Household Travel Survey indicates that walking accounts for 13% of all trips in northeastern Illinois. A 1996 Regional Transportation Authority study revealed that walking constitutes 24% of trips to Metra stations in northeastern Illinois, with less than 1% by bicycle. Information from the Census 2000 Supplementary Survey indicated that 6.1% of respondents...
in the Chicago metropolitan area walked or biked to work (American Community Survey’s Census 2000 Supplementary Survey (C2SS) sampled 700,000 households across the country).

More recently, the 2002 Household Survey conducted as part of the comprehensive planning exercise inquired about Glenview residents’ commuting patterns. 2.6% of respondents indicated that they walk to their place of employment. No information was given for bicycling, although “other” was listed at 1.8%.

The survey also inquired about the tendency for walking trips when destinations were within walking distance. The survey did not inquire about bicycling. Table 10 summarizes the results.

While the majority of respondents indicated that they do not walk to these “walkable” destinations, the survey also revealed that more than 75% were supportive of spending Village funds on trail and walkway development, river walks, and linking the regional bicycle paths. More than half of respondents agreed that more bicycle and pedestrian facilities were needed.

There can be various reasons why walking and bicycling are not chosen, even in areas where destinations are close by. Such reasons can include a lack of through, direct routes; real or perceived safety issues; lack of bicycle parking at the destination; or other impediments, such as pedestrian obstacles along a route.

**Existing Sidewalk Conditions**

Sidewalks are provided along most of the roadways in the Village. However, certain sidewalks were found to be discontinuous during the field investigation. These included Willow Road, Milwaukee Avenue, East Lake Avenue, Landwehr Road, and Golf Road. Areas without sidewalks or with discontinuous sidewalks require pedestrians to travel on parkways or on roadways. Pedestrian travel on parkways or roadways leads to unattractive dirt trails and walking on roadways creates a dangerous condition for pedestrians.

**Existing Bicycle/Pedestrian Paths**

**Regional Trails**

- Des Plaines River Trail: This unpaved regional trail runs through the Cook County and Lake County Forest Preserves which line the Des Plaines River. The trail begins in Maywood and extends north to the Ryerson Conservation Area in Riverwoods. The Des Plaines River Trail can be accessed at Milwaukee Avenue, Willow Road, and Techny Road.

**Other Trails**

- The Glen Bike Path: This path winds around Lake Glenview and Gallery Park, located in The Glen.
- Reservoir Path: This circular path surrounds the Techny Basin which was recently developed south of Willow Road, near Rayne Way. Peninsula Park is located at the southeastern end of the Basin. The path will eventually connect to the proposed Techny Trail and the new North Glenview Metra station.
- Glenview Trail: A portion of the Glenview Trail is currently in place on the east side of the tracks. It begins at the downtown train station and ends in the vicinity of Spruce Drive.

**Existing Roadway Conditions for Bicycle Travel**

Using AASHTO and IDOT guidelines, a field investigation of the existing roadway conditions was performed on March 20, 2002 to assess the compatibility of the existing infrastructure in accommodating bicycle facilities. The conditions that were observed include outer lane width, shoulder surface and width, drainage grates, crossings conflicts, AADT, and posted speed limits. Table 11 summarizes the AADT and speed limit data.

**Roadway Lane Width**

- Outer lane widths of 14-15 feet are recommended to accommodate shared roadway use between motor vehicles and bicycles (Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, AASHTO, 1999). The outer lane widths on the major roads within the Village are generally 12 feet at most, which is inadequate for safely accommodating a shared use with a bicycle. However, roadways with low motor vehicle volumes and low speeds may be considered for shared use with a 12-foot outer lane width.

**Table 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination Points</th>
<th>Which of the Destination Points are within walking distance from your home?</th>
<th>If yes, which of these do you walk to?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shopping centers</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation centers</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park or open space</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of employment</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus stop</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train station</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** 2002 Household Survey

**Table 11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Posted Speed Limit (miles per hour)</th>
<th>Daily Traffic Volume (AADT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willow Road</td>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>35,000-17,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lake Road</td>
<td>35-45</td>
<td>25,000-11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenview Road</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13,900-17,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Road</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13,600-15,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Road</td>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>31,100-44,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison Street</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Avenue</td>
<td>35-45</td>
<td>31,000-16,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landwehr Road</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfingsten Road</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood Road</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriot Boulevard</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shermer Road</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5,700-9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh Avenue</td>
<td>30-45</td>
<td>10,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Ridge Road</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner Road</td>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>4,900-5,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** 2002 Household Survey
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Shoulder Surface and Width
Most of the roadways that were observed during the field visit had concrete curb and gutter. Paved shoulders were also present on certain roadways, which can be used for bicycle travel. Paved shoulders can provide adequate space for bicyclists. They should be at least 4 feet wide to accommodate bicycle travel. However, where 4-foot widths cannot be achieved, any additional shoulder width is better than none at all. Pfingsten Road has a 2-foot paved shoulder that is identified by pavement markings along with a 12-inch gutter and barrier curb (see Figures 2 and 3). Although the width is less than ideal, it is a good example of the general type of accommodation that is needed for safe bicycle travel adjacent to a motor vehicle lane. Sections of Lehigh Avenue have corrugated paved shoulders (i.e., rumble strips), which are designed to improve safety by alerting motorists when their vehicle strays off the travel lane (see Figure 4). However, they can be both hazardous and uncomfortable to bicyclists.

Drainage Grates
The grate types for drainage inlets along roadways within the Village of Glenview includes some that are safe and some that are hazardous for bicyclists (see Figure 5 through 7). Bicycle wheels can get caught in drainage grate designs that include longitudinal openings, thereby creating a serious hazard for cyclists. Hazardous grates are present on sections of various roads including East Lake Avenue, Chestnut Avenue, and Willow Road. Bicycle-safe grates were observed along Glenview Road, Shermer Road, and Patriot Boulevard.

Crossings
Road bridges over rivers and streams typically maintain the same widths as the approaches in Village. Due to the absence of exclusive bicycle lanes adjacent to motor vehicle lanes, pavement markings at the intersections in the Village do not provide delineation for bicycle lane travel. At roadway intersections, travel guidance is provided only by pedestrian crosswalk markings. The ideal intersecting angle of road approaches to at-grade railroad crossings is 90 degrees. The at-grade crossings with the Union Pacific railroad (Village eastern edge) and the Metra line along Lehigh Avenue are acceptable. The railway at the western part of the Village is grade separated.

Posted Speed Limits and Traffic Volumes
Speeds and traffic volumes along the major arterial and collector roadways are generally too high for the average person to feel comfortable riding a bicycle in an adjacent lane. Table 11 lists a number of the main roadways in the Village and their speed limit and traffic volumes (for which data was available):

Based on the field investigation of existing roadway conditions, it is apparent that the roadways would require improvements to be able to accommodate bicycle travel. The level of improvement for each roadway is discussed in Section 4, Recommended Improvements.

9.4 PROVISION OF BICYCLE PARKING
Most of the destinations in the Village that were observed during the field investigation do not have bicycle racks. These included fast food restaurants, schools, and various small businesses and commercial areas. Bicycle racks were present at several large grocery stores and at Metra train stations, as well as Flick and Roosevelt parks. The overall absence of bicycle racks at destination points creates a deterrent for bicycle travel.

Destination Points
Exhibit 5 shows a map of bicycle and pedestrian destination points within the Village of Glenview.
Downtown Glenview
Within downtown Glenview, there are many destination points, including the Glenview Metra/Amtrak station, the Glenview Public Library, the Post Office, Shopping districts along Glenview and Waukegan Roads, Our Lady of Perpetual Help school and the Playdium roller rink and swimming pool, and Jackman Park.

Public Transportation
The Village is served by two Metra stations, and a third station is nearby in the Village of Golf. The downtown Glenview Metra/Amtrak station is located on Depot St. The Glen of North Glenview Metra station is located at Johns Drive/Old Willow Road and Ravine Way. The Golf Metra station is located on Overlook Drive, just east of Waukegan Road. Many Pace bus routes also terminate at the downtown Glenview Metra/Amtrak station. All Pace buses are equipped with bicycle racks.

Shopping Areas
Numerous major retail areas are located within the Village, including: Downtown Glenview area; Carillon Square, located at East Lake Avenue and Waukegan Road; Plaza Del Prado, located at William Road and Prigentst Road; and Willow Creek Retail Center, located south of Willow Road at Old Willow Road. In addition, three regional malls are located near Glenview. Golf Mill Mall is located at Golf and Milwaukee Avenue in Niles, just south of the Village limits. Old Orchard Shopping Center is located at Old Orchard Road and Skokie Boulevard, east of I-94, just south east of the Village limits in Skokie. Northbrook Court is located in Northbrook on Lake Cook Road.
There are also numerous retail shops along Waukegan Road, Golf Road, and Milwaukee Avenue.

Recreation Areas
In addition to several neighborhood parks, Glenview has a number of recreation areas, community centers, and other points of interest including: Flick Park, which is located between Glenview Road and East Lake Avenue, south of Prigentst Road and north of Greenwood Road; Roosevelt Park, which is north of Glenview Road between Grove Street and Fir Street; the Grove National Historic Landmark and nature preserve, located on Milwaukee Avenue, just east of I-294; Wagner Farm, located at Lake Street and Wagner Road; Gallery Park and Lake Glenview, located in The Glen, at Lehig Avenue and West Lake Avenue; MWRD Reservoir Area, located near the Willow Creek Retail Center, south of Willow Road, east of Lehig Avenue; Glenview Ice Center, located at Landwehr Road and East Lake Avenue; Athletic fields east of I-294, near Zenith. The Cook County Forest Preserve, the Des Plaines River, and the River Trails Nature Center is just to the east of the Village, with entrances at Milwaukee Avenue, Willow Road, and Techny Road.

Schools
Two public and two private high schools serve the Glenview area. Glenbrook South High School is located at West Lake Avenue and Prigentst Road in Glenview; Glenbrook North High School is located on Shermer Road, north of Willow Road in Northbrook. Christian Academy High School is located on Waukegan Road, south of Willow Road in Northfield. Loyola Academy is located north of Lake Avenue, just west of I-94 in Wilmette; various elementary and middle schools located throughout the Village.

9.5 FUTURE TRANSPORTATION CONDITIONS
Based on the Draft comprehensive plan for the Village of Glenview, the projected growth in traffic is primarily expected to result from new development within the Village. The traffic growth from within the Village will result from the development of currently vacant sites, of which there are relatively few, and the redevelopment of existing sites. Although both elements are expected to generate new traffic, the overall increase in the total Village traffic resulting from (re)developments are not expected to be significant, and the traffic impacts are expected to be localized around the site. Therefore, the primary contributory to the traffic on the Village’s roadway network will come from the growth of the adjacent communities and the general growth in automobile usage.

Year 2015 and 2025 traffic volumes were projected based on historic growth trends, anticipated travel patterns, and potential development and redevelopment plans. The Year 2015 projections were used to evaluate peak hour operations at ten select intersections. The Year 2025 projections were used to evaluate roadway cross-sections and right-of-way needs on the collector and arterial roadway network.

Year 2015 Intersection Operations Analysis
Exhibit 6 shows the Year 2015 peak hour traffic volumes at the ten intersections with the worst operating conditions, as identified from the existing conditions analysis. An annual increase of 0.1% was used to project the weekday peak hour traffic volumes. The relatively low increase of 0.1% per year reflects the existing congestion and the inability of the roadways to accommodate more traffic during the peak hours.

Table 12 shows the expected Year 2015 operating conditions at the study area intersections during the weekday morning and evening peak traffic hours with the existing intersection geometries.

As shown in Table 12, Milwaukee Avenue intersection with West Lake Avenue is expected to experience overall intersection LOS of E during the peak traffic hours. During the weekday evening peak traffic hours, the Milwaukee Avenue intersection with Central Road and the East Lake Avenue intersection with Shermer Road are expected to experience LOS E intersection operating conditions. Select movements at all of these intersections are expected to operate at LOS E or F conditions during the peak traffic hours. Improvements recommended for these intersections are listed in Section 4.1.

Future (Year 2025) Daily Traffic
The Year 2025 daily traffic volumes were developed based on the historical AADT values obtained from IDOT. An annual increase of 0.25% was used to project the Year 2025 daily traffic volumes. Table 13 shows the existing and future (Year 2025) AADT values for the arterial and collector roadways in Glenview. The expected future level of service is also included in Table 13.

As shown in Table 13, the daily traffic in 2025 on the arterial roadways is expected to be in the range of 47,800 vpd on Golf Road to 23,600 vpd on Waukegan Road. The projected Year 2025 AADTs for the collector roadways range from 18,500 vpd on Sanders Road to 4,800 vpd on Sunset Ridge Road.

Future Planned Roadway Improvements
IDOT and Cook County provided information regarding roadway improvement projects. The Chicago Area Transportation Study (CATS) committee is designated by the state and local officials as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the northeastern Illinois region. CATS serves the Cook, DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry, Will Counties and a portion of Kendall County. The CATS committee prepares the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), which lists federally funded and regionally significant, non-federally funded surface transportation projects planned for implementation in the upcoming years. The following projects in Glenview are included in the 2002-2006 TIP.

West Lake Avenue & Milwaukee Avenue
In 2005, dual left-turn lanes are planned to be constructed at the intersection of West Lake Avenue with Milwaukee Avenue.

Willow Road
In 2005, IDOT plans to resurface a section of Willow Road from Milwaukee Avenue to Landwehr Road. The project includes bridge widening, interchange and intersection improvements, and noise barrier.
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PM
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Sunset Ridge Rd. North of E. Lake Ave. 4,500 4,800 A
Winnetka Rd. East of Waukegan Rd. 8,900 9,500 C
Shermer Rd. South of E. Lake Ave. 9,500 10,200 C
Harlem Ave. South of Golf Rd. 10,100* 10,700 C
Dearlove Rd. South of Milwaukee Ave. 11,200 12,000 C
Chestnut Ave. West of Waukegan Rd. 11,500* 12,200 C
Landwehr Rd. South of Willow Rd. 12,100 12,900 C
Harms Rd. South of Glenview Rd. 12,800* 13,600 D
Greenwood Rd. South of E. Lake Ave. 16,400 17,500 D
Sanders Rd. South of Willow Rd. 17,300 18,500 C

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing (1998) AADT</th>
<th>Future (2025) AADT</th>
<th>Future (2025) Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arterial SRA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Rd.</td>
<td>East of Milwaukee Ave.</td>
<td>44,700</td>
<td>47,600</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Ave.</td>
<td>South of W. Lake Ave.</td>
<td>38,700</td>
<td>39,700</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan Rd.</td>
<td>South of Willow Rd.</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>35,400</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South of Greenview Rd.</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South of South Ave.</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>35,400</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Rd.</td>
<td>East of Waukegan Rd.</td>
<td>37,200</td>
<td>39,200</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Lake Ave.</td>
<td>South of Shermer Rd.</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>37,700</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West of Waukegan Rd.</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>30,500</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East of Wagner Rd.</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>26,700</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Lake Ave.</td>
<td>East of Milwaukee Ave.</td>
<td>22,600</td>
<td>27,600</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East of Milwaukee Ave.</td>
<td>22,300</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Rd.</td>
<td>East of Milwaukee Ave.</td>
<td>17,900</td>
<td>17,900</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East of Greenwood Rd.</td>
<td>17,600</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linden Rd.</td>
<td>South of Willow Rd.</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>18,300</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shervices Rd.</td>
<td>South of Waukegan Rd.</td>
<td>17,285</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East of Shermer Rd.</td>
<td>17,900</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenwood Rd.</td>
<td>South of E. Lake Ave.</td>
<td>16,400</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl saga Rd.</td>
<td>South of Willow Rd.</td>
<td>15,750</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Rd.</td>
<td>South of Glenview Rd.</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>13,300</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lander Rd.</td>
<td>South of Willow Rd.</td>
<td>12,100</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ave.</td>
<td>North of Chicago Rd.</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>12,200</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dearlove Rd.</td>
<td>South of Milwaukee Ave.</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. High Ave.</td>
<td>South of Willow Rd.</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>10,900</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orleans Ave.</td>
<td>South of Golf Rd.</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>10,700</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shermer Rd.</td>
<td>South of E. Lake Ave.</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchuta Rd.</td>
<td>East of Waukegan Rd.</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whipple Rd.</td>
<td>South of E. Lake Ave.</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bower Road</td>
<td>South of E. Lake Ave.</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Year 2015 Traffic Peak Hour Intersection Operations With Recommended Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service (LOS)</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan Road &amp; Willow Road</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan Road &amp; Chestnut Avenue</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan Road &amp; East Lake Ave</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan Road &amp; Glenview Road</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Avenue &amp; West Lake Avenue</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Avenue &amp; Dearlove/Glenview Road</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Avenue &amp; Central Road</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lake Avenue &amp; Greenwood Road</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lake Avenue &amp; Shermer Road</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenview Road &amp; Greenwood Road</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shermer Road

There are plans to reconstruct Shermer Road from East Lake Avenue to Golf Road in 2005.

Lake Avenue

There are plans to reconstruct a section of Lake Avenue from Waukegan Avenue to the Edens Expressway. The traffic signals along Lake Avenue are expected to be interconnected during the reconstruction.

9.7 RECOMMENDED INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS

As shown in Table 12, with the projected Year 2015 traffic volumes, select intersections are expected to experience overall intersection operations of LOS E conditions during the peak traffic hours. Select movements at the ten intersections are expected to operate at LOS E or F conditions in the Year 2015 with the existing intersection geometries. The following intersection improvements are recommended to accommodate the Year 2015 traffic volumes at these intersections:

Waukegan Road intersection with Willow Road

It is recommended to provide an additional northbound left-turn lane, resulting in dual left-turn lanes. The additional left-turn lane will increase capacity for northbound left-turning vehicles and thus provide more green time for other movements at the intersection. It is anticipated that this additional left-turn lane can be constructed within the existing right-of-way.

Waukegan Road intersection with Chestnut Avenue

It is recommended to provide exclusive southbound right-turn and left-turn lanes. The exclusive southbound turn lanes will remove the turning vehicles from the through lane, thus increasing the capacity of the southbound approach. No additional right-of-way is anticipated to construct the southbound right-turn and left-turn lanes.

Waukegan Road intersection with East Lake Avenue

It is recommended to provide an additional southbound left-turn lane, resulting in dual left-turn lanes. The southbound dual left-turn lanes will increase capacity for southbound left-turning vehicles. In addition, with this improvement, more green time is expected to be available to other movements at this intersection. Additional right-of-way is expected to be required to construct an additional southbound left-turn lane. Exclusive right-turn lanes on each approach should be evaluated during preliminary engineering. It is anticipated that providing exclusive right-turn lanes will require additional right-of-way.

Waukegan Road intersection with Glenview Road

It is recommended to provide an additional westbound left-turn lane, resulting in dual left-turn lanes. Dual left-turn lanes for the westbound approach will increase capacity for the westbound left-turning vehicles and thus provide more green time to other movements at the intersection. The provision of westbound dual left-turn lanes is expected to require acquisition of additional right-of-way on the east approach.

Milwaukee Avenue intersection with W. Lake Avenue

As identified in the TIP, additional left-turn lanes on all approaches are recommended, resulting in dual left-turn lanes. An additional northbound and southbound through lane on Milwaukee Avenue is recommended, resulting in a six-lane facility. In addition, exclusive right-turn lanes for the northbound and southbound approaches on Milwaukee Avenue are recommended. These improvements will increase capacity of the intersection to accommodate the peak hour traffic volumes. Additional right-of-way is expected to be required to construct these improvements.
Chapter 9 - Transportation Study

Exhibit 7 summarizes the anticipated right-of-way impacts of the Village of Glenview Comprehensive Plan. It is recommended to provide an exclusive right-turn lane for the southbound and westbound approaches. An exclusive right-turn lane will remove the right-turning vehicles from the through lane, thus increasing the capacity of the through and right-turn lanes. Additional right-of-way is expected to be required to construct right-turn lanes for the southbound and westbound approaches.

Milwaukee Avenue intersection with Dearlove/Glenview Road

It is recommended to provide an exclusive right-turn lane for the southbound and westbound approaches. An exclusive right-turn lane will remove the right-turning vehicles from the through lane, thus increasing the capacity of the through and right-turn lanes. Additional right-of-way is expected to be required to construct right-turn lanes for the southbound and westbound approaches.

Milwaukee Avenue intersection with Central Road

It is recommended to provide an additional left-turn lane on the northbound approach, resulting in dual left-turn lanes. An additional northbound and southbound through lane on Milwaukee Avenue is recommended, resulting in a six-lane facility. An exclusive eastbound right-turn lane is recommended. These recommended improvements will increase the intersection capacity to accommodate the peak hour traffic volumes. Additional right-of-way is expected to be required to provide these improvements.

East Lake Avenue intersection with Greenwood Road

It is recommended to provide an exclusive right-turn lane for the eastbound and westbound approaches. An exclusive right-turn lane will remove the right-turning vehicles from the through lane, thus increasing the capacity of the through and right-turn lanes. Additional right-of-way is expected to be required to provide these exclusive right-turn lanes.

East Lake Avenue intersection with Shermer Road

It is recommended to provide an exclusive northbound left-turn lane to remove the left-turning vehicles from the through lane and thus increase the capacity for the northbound approach. It is anticipated that this improvement can be constructed within the existing right-of-way.

Glenview Road intersection with Greenwood Road

It is recommended to provide an additional eastbound left-turn lane, resulting in dual left-turn lanes. The eastbound dual left-turn lanes will increase capacity for eastbound left-turning vehicles and thus more green time is expected to be available to other movements at this intersection. In addition, Greenwood Road, is recommended to be a four-lane facility north of Glenview Road and a three-lane roadway with a two-way left-turn lanes south of Glenview Road. It is anticipated that these improvements can be constructed within the existing right-of-way.

Exhibit 7 summarizes the anticipated right-of-way impacts of the intersection improvements. The right-of-way impacts are based on a planning level analysis, and are only defined in terms of their general location. The preliminary engineering phase of the project will provide more specific right-of-way information when design details such as lane widths and roadway alignments (shifting of roadway to avoid sensitive areas) are further defined.

Table 14 shows the expected Year 2015 operating conditions at the study area intersections during the weekday morning and evening peak traffic hours with the recommended intersection improvements. During the evening peak hour, the East Lake Avenue intersection with Shermer Road is expected to experience LOS F conditions with the recommended improvement of a northbound exclusive left-turn lane. A potential improvement would be to also provide dual westbound left-turn lanes at this intersection to achieve LOS D conditions. However, there is a concern that additional capacity for the westbound left-turn movement would encourage more traffic to use Shermer Road. It is recommended to monitor the operations at this intersection in the future. With the recommended improvements, all of the other intersections are expected to operate acceptably at LOS D or better conditions during the peak traffic hours. It should be noted again that only the ten intersections with the highest existing delays were analyzed for Year 2015 conditions. It is anticipated that other intersections will require geometric and/or signal timing changes to maintain acceptable operating conditions in the future.

9.8 RECOMMENDED ROADWAY CROSS-SECTIONS

As shown in Table 13, Golf Road, Waukegan Road, Milwaukee Avenue, Willow Road, East Lake Avenue, and Central Road are expected to experience LOS F operations by the Year 2025. The following widenings are recommended to accommodate the future traffic conditions.

Arterial Roadways

Waukegan Road

It is recommended to provide a raised landscaped median along Waukegan Road corridor to provide a uniform four-lane divided cross-section. Exhibit 8 illustrates the proposed typical section for the Waukegan Road corridor. No additional right-of-way is anticipated along the majority of the corridor to provide a raised median. However, additional right-of-way is expected to be required at select intersections including East Lake Avenue and Glenview Road.

Milwaukee Avenue

Based on the existing traffic conditions and the expected traffic growth along this corridor, it is recommended to reconstruct Milwaukee Avenue to a six-lane divided roadway. The proposed six-lane divided cross-section for Milwaukee Avenue is illustrated on Exhibit 9. The minimum right-of-way required is 100 feet, while the existing right-of-way varies from 85 to 110 feet. Approximately 15 feet of right-of-way is expected to be needed for a section of Milwaukee Avenue north of Sanders Road as well as a section south of Central Road. With the recommended intersection improvements, right-of-way is anticipated to be needed at the Milwaukee Avenue intersections with West Lake Avenue, Glenview Road, and Central Road.

Willow Road

Willow Road, east of Waukegan Road (outside of Village limits), is currently a two-lane facility. West of Waukegan Road, the roadway is a four-lane divided roadway. To minimize impacts to Waukegan Road, Willow Road should be reconstructed east of Waukegan Road to provide a four-lane facility. Right-of-way needs were not evaluated for Willow Road east of Waukegan Road.

Collector Roadways

Central Road

With the existing traffic conditions and the expected future traffic growth, it is recommended to reconstruct Central Road to a three-lane roadway with a two-way left-turn lane (TWLTL). A minimum of 61 feet of right-of-way is needed to provide the three-lane roadway section. Since the existing right-of-way along Central Road ranges from 83 feet to 104 feet, no additional right-of-way is anticipated to be required.

Sanders Road

There is an existing narrow transversable median along Sanders Road. In the future when Sanders Road is reconstructed it is recommended to provide a wider median to allow storage for left-turning vehicles.

Glenview Road

Glenview Road, east of Waukegan Road, should be reconstructed to provide a three-lane roadway with a two-way left-turn lane for selected segments or exclusive left-turn lane.
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lanes provided as selected intersections. The existing right-of-way along Glenview Road ranges from 58 feet to 105 feet. Additional right-of-way is anticipated to be required for a section of Glenview Road east of Waukegan Road to provide the 61 feet minimum of right-of-way needed for the three-lane road.

Greenwood Road
It is recommended to provide a four-lane facility along Greenwood Road between East Lake Avenue and Glenview Road. No right-of-way is anticipated to be required to provide the four-lane section. South of Glenview Road, it is recommended to provide a three-lane roadway with a two-way left-turn lane. Since the existing right-of-way along Greenwood Road ranges from 98 feet to 108 feet, no additional right-of-way is anticipated to be required to provide a three-lane roadway section.

A typical cross-section for the proposed three-lane roadway with a two-way left-turn lane (TWLTL) is illustrated on Exhibit 10.

### 9.9 RECOMMENDED ACCESS MANAGEMENT PLAN

Most streets in Glenview provide through movement of traffic and access to landowners adjacent to the roadway. Unfortunately these two movements conflict each other. A roadway that carries a significant capacity attracts businesses that want access to the roadway. These access points in turn produce more turbulence and reduce the capacity of the roadway, which made the site attractive in the first place. A compromise must be made between the roadway users and the owners of land abutting the roadway. This can be accomplished through the application of a comprehensive policy based on the principles of access management.

This section provides an overview of access management principles and techniques, and then it provides general guidelines for implementing access management strategies along the Waukegan Road corridor.

Access management preserves traffic safety, capacity, and speed on the roadway system while allowing traffic flow into and out of a site with minimal hindrance to through traffic. It achieves the necessary balance between traffic flow and land use access by careful control of the location, type, and geometric design of driveways and public intersections. Access management requires the coordination of land use planning with transportation planning and recognizes the primary purpose of the roadway. The goal of access management is to maintain a desired level of service along a corridor or network of streets while providing access to local businesses and landowners.
adjacent to the roadway.

The first step in implementing an access management policy is to classify the roadways that will be affected by the policy. Three major classifications are typically identified in most communities as arterials, collectors, and local streets. The difference between these classifications is the trade off between mobility and access. An arterial roadway gives priority to through movements and thus the access management policies are more stringent on these types of roadways. A local street gives priority to land access of adjacent properties and thus the through movement is impeded. A collector roadway gives equal priority to the through movements and access to landowners abutting the roadway. Figure 8 graphically illustrates the trade off between these classifications.

Arterial roadways such as Waukegan Road, Lake Avenue, and Willow Road should promote through movement, while still providing well designed access at select locations. Waukegan Road is a good example of a roadway that no longer functions safely and efficiently due to its lack of access management.

### Access Management Principles

The principal advantages of controlling access are the preservation and improvement of service and safety for both the public roadway and the private developments abutting the roadway. Access management principles focus on maintaining the functional integrity of the roadway while still providing reasonable access. Arterial and collector roadways should be designed to include the following access management principles:

- Limit the number of access points
- Limit the number of conflict points
- Separate conflict points
- Remove turning vehicles from through-travel lanes
- Provide adequate intersection geometries at access locations

### Limit the Number of Access Points

**Limit the Number of Access Points Per Property**

This technique limits the number of access driveways per property, relative to the length of available frontage. For parcels with frontage along two streets, it is desirable to provide access only to the secondary street. Along arterials, access should be limited to a single driveway unless the frontage exceeds 1/4 mile.

**Spacing of Unsignalized Access Points**

Sufficient spacing between unsignalized roadways (private driveways or public roadways) is imperative for a roadway to function properly and is an important principle in access management. Standards for spacing must account for safety, sight distance, operational impacts on the traffic stream, operating speeds, acceleration and deceleration requirements, entering and exiting volumes and the potential for overlapping influence areas. Sufficient spacing allows drivers adequate time to make decisions and identify locations where they may expect another vehicle or pedestrian to make an opposing movement. Insufficient spacing reduces the level of service (LOS) of the roadway and increases delays. For example, there are numerous closely spaced driveways along Waukegan Road which lowers its LOS even though it carries significantly less traffic than other arterials, such as Lake Avenue which has fewer driveways and comparable volumes. Adequate spacing minimizes the potential for accidents and delay to through vehicles.

The IDOT “Access to State Highways” manual does not require a minimum distance between driveways but does require a minimum of 440 feet between local street access and a desirable value of 660 feet. Desired driveway spacing on designated SRA routes is 500 feet with median openings spaced a minimum of one-quarter mile apart. Table 15 provides the range of access spacing required for access points based on speeds and roadway classification.

### Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Classification</th>
<th>Speed Limit Range (mph)</th>
<th>Access Spacing Range (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collectors</td>
<td>30 - 40</td>
<td>180 - 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterials</td>
<td>35 – 50</td>
<td>210 - 375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The IDOT “Access to State Highways” manual does not require a minimum distance between driveways but does require a minimum of 440 feet between local street access and a desirable value of 660 feet. Desired driveway spacing on designated SRA routes is 500 feet with median openings spaced a minimum of one-quarter mile apart. Table 15 provides the range of access spacing required for access points based on speeds and roadway classification.

### Spacing of Signalized Intersections
Signalized intersections should be spaced to allow continuous progressive movement of through traffic. This should incorporate relatively uniform spacing of traffic signals and adequate distances between signals to allow vehicles to travel at reasonable speeds. Closely and/or irregularly spaced traffic signals can reduce travel speeds below reasonable limits and can result in excessive stopping, delays, and diversion to neighborhood streets. Figure 9 demonstrates the speed of traffic progression as a function of cycle length and signal spacing.

The NCHRP Report for Access Management Guidelines recommends a minimum signal spacing of 1/3 to 1/2 miles for major arterial streets and 1/4 mile for minor arterial streets. The existing spacing of signalized intersections along Waukegan Road ranges from 1/8 mile to over 3/4 mile. Signalized intersections along Milwaukee Avenue are located as close as 1/4 mile to close to a mile apart. In Glenview, signalized intersections along Golf Road are spaced as close as 1/8 mile to over a 1/2 mile. For the interchange with I-294, signalized intersections along Willow Road are spaced at over a 1/3 mile tol1/2 mile.

### Table 16 Minimum Corner Clearance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Classification</th>
<th>Speed Limit Range (mph)</th>
<th>Minimum Corner Clearance (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collectors</td>
<td>30 – 40</td>
<td>80 – 330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterials</td>
<td>35 – 50</td>
<td>115 – 460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Along Waukegan Road, access driveways should be evaluated for closure or consolidation as existing sites are redeveloped.

**Corner Clearance**

Corner clearance is the distance between a driveway and a public street. This distance should be sufficient enough to allow drivers adequate perception-reaction time to access potential downstream conflicts and is aimed at preventing the location of driveways within the functional area of an intersection. It also minimizes driveway/intersection conflicts by preventing blockage of driveways upstream of an intersection due to standing traffic queues. The IDOT “Access to State Highways” manual requires a minimum of 30-foot clearance between a driveway and an adjacent public street. The Institute of Transportation Engineers recommends distances based on the speed of the major route and the amount of traffic generated by the driveway, as shown in Table 16.

**Limit the Number of Conflict Points**

Limiting conflict points can reduce the potential for crashes and enhance traffic flow on the roadway. A typical four-leg intersection has a total of 32 conflict points consisting of 16 crossing points, 8 diverging points, and 8 merging points. Similarly, a three-leg intersection has 9 total conflict points consisting of 3 crossing points, 3 diverging points, and 3 merging points. There are several methods used to reduce the number of conflict points at an intersection, which are explained below:

- A non-traversable median eliminates all crossing and left-turn conflict maneuvers except at the median openings. The provision of adequate storage for left-turning vehicles at median openings must be considered. A non-traversable median eliminates most conflicts at that location, but redistributes the turning volumes to adjacent intersections.
- A directional median opening allows only designated movements and prohibits all other movements. The crossing movement is prohibited in all cases.
- Providing oneway inbound or outbound driveways.

The provision of a raised median along Waukegan Road will greatly reduce the number of conflict points along the corridor.

**Separate Conflict Points**

The separation of conflict points simplifies the driving task by giving drivers a longer time to respond to successive access related events. The higher the speed, the longer the distance a vehicle will travel during a given perception-reaction time. Minimum separation distances are a function of both the speed of traffic on a section of roadway and the complexity of the decision with which the driver may be presented. The complexity of the problem increases with the volumes of traffic and with both the number and type of conflict. Methods that can be used to separate conflict points include access spacing, eliminating the number of access points per property, and consolidation of existing drives, as previously defined.

**Remove Turning Vehicles from Through Travel Lanes**

Access points along a corridor impede traffic flow as vehicles slow down to turn into these driveways and streets. In addition, if the speed differential between vehicles on a roadway is greater than 10mph, the chances for a rear end collision are considerably greater. In order to improve safety and operations, designated turn lanes are recommended at all intersections along arterial roadways.

As identified in the previous section, turn lanes have been recommended at several intersections throughout the Village. As other intersections are reconstructed, the Village should continue to pursue right and left-turn lanes within the design.

**Provide Adequate Intersection Geometrics at Access Locations**

Intersection geometrics can have a great effect on the safety and operations of a roadway. Intersections, both public roadways and private driveways, should incorporate adequate turning widths with acceleration and deceleration lanes, adequate storage lengths for turn lanes and channelization where it is appropriate.

Many of the existing driveways along Waukegan Road were constructed with an apron and pan design. As existing sites are consolidated and redeveloped, the driveways to major developments should be reconstructed as a public street, with corner radii. The provision of corner radii will allow the driveway to operate safer and more efficient with less impact to Waukegan Road.

### 9.10 RECOMMENDED NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

The primary cause of most neighborhood traffic problems, namely cut-through traffic and high speeds, is the result of poor operations on the adjacent collector and arterial roadways. The recommendations to resolve these issues must start with the improvements on these adjacent roadways. The next step is to implement traffic calming measures within the neighborhoods.
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Table 17
Potential Traffic Calming Measures for Glenview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device</th>
<th>Speed Reduction</th>
<th>Traffic Calming</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed Bumps</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Low Cost</td>
<td>Increases drivers awareness of speed bump</td>
<td>Likely to damage vehicles if speed is too high or exceeds the speed table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter Box</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Low Cost</td>
<td>Reduces litter and enhances aesthetics</td>
<td>Likely to damage vehicles if speed is too high or exceeds the speed table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Cushion</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Low Cost</td>
<td>Cushions speed bump impact on vehicles</td>
<td>Likely to damage vehicles if speed is too high or exceeds the speed table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Bump</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Low Cost</td>
<td>Reduces speed on arterial road</td>
<td>Likely to damage vehicles if speed is too high or exceeds the speed table</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table above provides an overview of potential traffic calming measures for the Glenview area. Each measure has its own advantages and disadvantages, and the likelihood of their implementation depends on various factors such as the specific needs of the area, the types of vehicles present, and the overall transportation infrastructure. It is important to consider these factors when deciding which measures to implement.

A diagram illustrates the proposed Milwaukee Avenue Minimum Typical Section, highlighting the proposed right-of-way, minimum typical section, and existing right-of-way. The diagram also shows the proposed minimum right-of-way width and the minimum typical section width.

The Village of Glenview Comprehensive Plan is referenced as a source of more detailed information regarding transportation study and traffic calming measures.
As defined by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, traffic calming is “the combination of mainly physical measures that reduce the negative effects of motor vehicle use, alter driver behavior, and improve conditions for non-motorized street users”. The primary purpose of traffic calming in a neighborhood is to reduce traffic speeds and volumes. This provides greater safety, improved environmental conditions, greater use of cycling and walking, improved streetscape, and an enhanced identity of neighborhood.

Implementing a pilot traffic calming plan requires neighborhood consensus. The residents of the neighborhood need to fully understand the purpose and impacts of traffic calming in order for the plan to work effectively. It is especially important to get the residents input so the pilot program will meet their needs and interests as well as involve them in the decision making process. They will be more willing to support projects they understand and have had an active role in making decisions.

Traffic Calming Applications

There are different types of traffic calming applications, which have been proven to minimize cut-through traffic, reduce vehicle speed, and improve aesthetics. Table 17 describes the different types of traffic calming devices typically used and their impacts on speed and traffic reduction, as well as their advantages and disadvantages. Figure 10 illustrates examples of these devices which have been used throughout the country.

Pilot Traffic Calming Plan for Springdale Avenue Neighborhood

It is recommended to incorporate a pilot traffic calming plan in the Springdale Avenue neighborhood. The original study conducted for the Springdale neighborhood recommended improving the capacity of Greenwood Road to a four lane section from Crestwood Lane to south of Glenview Road. In addition, improvements to the intersection of Glenview Road and Greenwood Avenue were recommended. These improvements may significantly reduce cut through traffic. After these improvements are implemented, it is recommended to conduct another cut through study in the neighborhood to determine if the intersection improvements reduced the cut through traffic. If cut through traffic is still found to be a problem, a traffic calming pilot program should be considered. Involvement of the neighborhood is the first step in a traffic calming program. Prior to recommending solutions or implementing measures, the neighborhood residents need to be fully aware of the impacts. If Springdale Avenue Neighborhood decides to pursue a traffic calming program, the following traffic calming devices are one set of recommendations that should be considered:

- A neck down treatment should be constructed on Springdale
The treatments recommended above will reduce traffic speeds through the neighborhood and may reduce cut through traffic. However, to completely eliminate cut through traffic, a full closure of Springdale Avenue may be needed. This could include a cul-de-sac of Springdale Avenue at Greenwood Road or a mid-block full closure along Springdale Avenue. Implementing a full closure would have
significant impacts on the neighborhood residents, and the trade-off between less cut-through traffic and personal inconvenience may not be worthwhile.

**Neighborhood Traffic Summary**

Based on previous studies and field observations, it is apparent that many drivers are utilizing local neighborhood streets as cut through routes in order to avoid congested intersections on primary streets. The residents of these neighborhoods have raised concerns regarding the volume and speed of traffic through their streets. In order to eliminate cut through traffic in neighborhoods, the primary routes need to be improved to reduce delays. Because these types of improvements are costly and may not be constructed for years to come, an alternative is to implement a traffic calming plan through neighborhoods to discourage cut through traffic and reduce the overall speed of traffic. For traffic calming to be effective, it is imperative that an overall neighborhood plan is developed to address the neighborhood with a system of traffic calming measures. Traffic calming does not work if implemented as isolated measures. It is also imperative to gain consensus from the residents of the neighborhoods where the plan is being implemented so it will meet their interests and needs.

**9.11 RECOMMENDED BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PLAN**

Proposed on-road and off-road bicycle improvements have been identified based on their ability to serve destination points; the connections they provide to the regional trail system; the ability of the roadway to accommodate bicycle travel; and the level of effort needed to implement the improvement.

In addition to the Village’s Comprehensive planning effort, the Village of Glenview has participated in a subregional bicycle planning process lead by the Northwest Municipal Conference. This planning process gathered input from northwest Cook County communities and compiled data on community bicycle planning efforts into one database. Proposed improvements for the Village of Glenview are shown in Exhibit 11.

**Objectives of Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning**

Provide an alternative mode of travel within the Village: The ability to make short trips by means other than the automobile will improve traffic circulation, reduce congestion, alleviate (to some extent) automobile parking demand, and improve air quality. Destination-based trips are conducive to bicycling when they are within three miles of the point of origin, and when walking-based trips are within ½ mile.

Provide connections to popular destination points:

Destination points within the Village that are attractive to bicyclists and pedestrians include the downtown area, shopping areas, recreational areas, and schools. A list of these areas is included in Section 3, and they are mapped in Exhibit 11. Providing bicycle and pedestrian linkages to these points from residential areas via signed on-road facilities or separated, off-road paths will encourage more bicycling and walking. Bicycle parking at key destination points also fosters a more favorable environment for bicycling.

Provide recreational opportunities and connections to regional trails:

As discussed earlier, two regional trails are currently in place near the Village. To the east, the North Branch Trail runs along the North Branch of the Chicago River, which begins in the City of Chicago and connects all the way to the Chicago Botanic Garden at Lake Cook Road. To the west, the Des Plaines River Trail begins in Maywood and extends north to the Ryerson Conservation Area in Riverwoods. A third, sub-regional trail, the Techny Trail, is proposed along the Metra Milwaukee District tracks. The recreational bicycling experience is enhanced when local connections to these trail systems are provided.

**Identify missing bicycle and pedestrian links**

The Village, along with the Northwest Municipal Conference, has identified proposed bicycle routes for consideration. These routes provide connections from residential areas to destination points as well as to the regional trail system. Other issues to examine are where critical links are needed to ensure safe and efficient bicycle and pedestrian travel. While the Village is relatively well connected in the north-south direction, east-west connections should be pursued along both off-road and on-road systems, where feasible.

**Bicycle Paths (off-road)**

A bicycle path is a bikeway that is physically separated from motorized vehicular traffic by an open space or barrier and either within the roadway right-of-way or within an independent right-of-way. Bi-directional paths should be designed to be at least 10 feet wide with 2 feet of graded area on each side.

**Techny Trail**

The proposed Techny Trail would follow the Milwaukee District Metra tracks and Lehigh Avenue and connect Glenview with Northbrook and Morton Grove. It would serve five Metra stations (downtown Glenview, North Glenview, Northbrook, Golf, and Morton Grove). It would also serve the downtown Glenview area, as well as provide a connection to the existing Reservoir Path and the path within the Great Park, around Lake Glenview. An easement from Metra would be necessary.

A portion of the Techny Trail between Chestnut Avenue and Johns Court is scheduled to be built in 2002. In addition, a bicycle bridge over Golf Road east of the Metra tracks is scheduled to be built in 2002 or 2003.

**Glenview Trail**

This portion of the Techny Trail runs between East Lake Avenue and Chestnut Avenue, on the east side of the Metra right-of-way. Design engineering of this trail is currently underway. The Village has been meeting with Metra to secure an easement for this project.

**Union Pacific Railroad Right-of-Way (Winnetka Road to Old Orchard Drive)**

The Villages of Wilmette and Skokie have been working with Glenview to develop a trail that would run along the Union Pacific tracks at the eastern edge of the Village.

**Centennial Trail**

This east-west trail is proposed to connect the Des Plaines River Trail and the North Branch Trail. It runs along West Lake Avenue between the Des Plaines River Trail to Pfingsten Road, where it turns southeast onto East Lake Avenue. It follows East Lake Avenue all the way to the eastern boundary of Glenview at the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way. In addition to connecting two regional trails, it would also provide access to Flick Park and Roosevelt Park, and a proposed subregional trail along the Union Pacific right-of-way. It can also serve the Glenview Ice Center, Glenbrook South High School, and Glenbrook Hospital via an on street connection along Landwehr Road.

A separated path is the preferred alignment for Centennial Trail. Traffic volumes and speeds on West and East Lake Avenues are currently high, and there is a high volume of truck traffic as well. Design engineering is currently underway for improvements to East Lake Avenue. The accommodation of bicyclists and pedestrians should be addressed during the design.
Bicycle Lanes (on-road)
A bicycle lane is described as a portion of the roadway that has been designated by signing and pavement markings for the preferential or exclusive use of bicyclists. Bicycle lanes should be one-way facilities and carry bike traffic in the same direction as adjacent motor vehicle traffic. For roadways with no curb and gutter, the minimum width of a bike lane should be 4 feet. If parking is permitted, the bike lane should be placed between the parking area and the travel lane and have a minimum width of 5 feet. For roadways with curb or guardrail, the recommended width of a bike lane is 5 feet from the face of the curb or guardrail to the bike lane stripe.

The Glen Bike Path
This path is proposed along West Lake Avenue from Monterey Drive to the existing path that encircles Lake Glenview located in the Glen Redevelopment Project. The proposed path would connect with the Techny Trail. It could also extend further to the east to connect to the proposed Centennial Trail.

Willow Road, Landwehr Road to Patriot Boulevard
This would provide connections from numerous residential areas in Glenview and Northbrook to the Plaza Del Prado and the proposed Techny Trail.

Glenview Road, Milwaukee Avenue to the Union Pacific Railroad
This would connect numerous residential areas with Flick Road, Roosevelt Park, downtown Glenview, the Glenview Metra station, the North Branch Trail, and the proposed subregional trail along the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way. The Village of Wilmette is also planning a signed route along Glenview Road to extend east to Gilsen Park on Lake Michigan.

Central Road, Cook County Forest Preserve entrance to John’s Park and Hoffman School
This would connect residential neighborhoods with the Cook County Forest Preserve entrance just west of I-294; new athletic fields east of I-294; Springman Junior High School, John’s Park, and Hoffman School.

Golf Road, Milwaukee Avenue to Harms Road
Golf Mill Shopping Center is among numerous commercial shopping centers located along Golf Road. In addition, Kraft and Avon are located at Waukegan and Golf Roads. The North Branch Trail can also be accessed from Golf Road.

Milwaukee Avenue, Winkelmann Road to Golf Road
Milwaukee Avenue provides connections to a number of recreational, cultural, employment, and commercial areas. The Des Plaines River Trail can be accessed via the River Trails Nature Center entrance. The Grove National Landmark and nature preserve can be accessed off of Kennicott Lane; several commercial shopping areas and large employers are also located along Milwaukee Avenue.

Signed, Shared Roadways
Signed, shared roadways are those that have been identified by signing as preferred bike routes. The routes do not have separate lanes or striping to designate their on-street location. For the route signs to be more functional, supplemental destination plates can be placed beneath them when located along routes leading to high demand destinations. The following collectors and minor arterials would be conduits to bicycling via an on-road route signage system:

- Landwehr Road, Willow Road to West Lake Avenue
- Pingsten Road, Willow Road to Rugen Road
- Greenwood Road, Willow Road to Glenlake Drive, Glenlake Drive to Pingsten Road
- Patriot Boulevard, Willow Road to Independence Avenue to Sherrmer Road to East Lake Avenue
- Chestnut Avenue, Patriot Boulevard to Lehigh Avenue
- Sherrmer Road, East Lake Avenue to Golf Road
- Lehigh Avenue, Chestnut Avenue to Golf Road
- Sunset Ridge, Wniekta Road to East Lake Avenue
- Wagner Road, Wniekta Road to Glenview Road
- Harrison Street, Greenwood Avenue to Waukegan Road

Sidewalk Improvements
As a general rule, gaps in pedestrian pathways (sidewalks) need to be filled in order to provide continuous, safe travel for pedestrians. Sidewalks between residential areas and nearby destinations (within ½ mile) should be provided along major streets. The field investigation noted that gaps were present in sections of Willow Road, Milwaukee Avenue, East Lake Avenue, Landwehr Road, and Golf Road.

Continuous sidewalks should be provided in the major destination areas, including downtown Glenview, public transportation facilities, shopping areas, recreation areas, and schools, as well as within residential areas or in the vicinity of schools where gaps currently exist.

Other Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements
There are other improvements that should be undertaken to encourage bicycling and walking. Bicycle parking should be provided at major destination points. All drain grates along designated bicycle routes should be safe for bicyclists. A smooth surface, free of potholes and debris, should be provided on all designated bikeways. Pavement edges should be uniform and should not have abrupt drop-offs. Signs and pavement markings should be inspected regularly and kept in good condition.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Policies
The following policies can help implement the plans and improvements described in this report:

- Bicycle and pedestrian access, including bicycle parking, will be considered by the Village as part of any local development review processes.
- Missing bicycle and pedestrian links, including gaps in sidewalks to major destinations, will be identified and addressed by the Village.
- The Village will ensure that roadway projects currently under design, or those to be designed in the future, consider bicycle and pedestrian access.
- The Village will ensure that AASHTO and IDOT standards are followed in the design of any bicycle facilities.
- The Village will place an emphasis on improving bicycle and pedestrian access to transit and the regional trail system.
- The Village will consult with neighboring jurisdictions regarding proposed bicycle and pedestrian improvements that cross Village boundaries.
- The Village will actively use existing infrastructure to provide connections throughout the Village. A comprehensive bike and pedestrian path signage system should be developed.

9.12 RECOMMENDED TRANSIT PLAN

Metra Commuter Rail
Metra does not have any station or parking improvements scheduled for the downtown Glenview station. At the Glen of North Glenview, Metra will be constructing over 400 new parking spaces west of the right-of-way, in conjunction with the relocation of Lehigh Avenue. A new depot will be constructed as well.

The Future Agenda for Suburban Transportation (FAST) was produced by Metra and Pace in 1992. It describes improvements to Metra’s Milwaukee District North Line that will allow for faster, more flexible service. Improvements in travel time may be achieved by upgrading signal systems that will increase allowable train speeds from...
70 to 79 mph, as well as providing for bi-directional capability. Major crossovers may also be upgraded, which will also reduce travel times.

Metra’s 2002-2006 capital program includes funding for passing sidings and new signals between Round Lake and Fox Lake, Illinois, which is north of the Glenview. Both the track sidings and the upgraded signal system will have the potential for increasing speed and reliability along this rail line.

**Amtrak**

There are currently no plans to expand Amtrak service on this rail line. The Midwest Regional Rail Initiative has proposed high speed rail service between Chicago Union Station and St. Paul, Minnesota. It is likely that existing stations that currently serve Amtrak, like downtown Glenview, will also serve high speed rail passenger.

**Pace Suburban Bus**

Pace has recently developed a regional plan entitled Vision 2020. This plan describes improvements to the suburban bus system throughout the northeastern Illinois region, including express routes on major roadways; smaller, community-based services at regional and community transportation centers; and a network of service that will provide transportation for people to their specific destinations. The Vision 2020 plan also concentrates on community infrastructure improvements, including sidewalks, curb cuts and bike racks to more effectively deliver public transportation. A community transportation center is proposed at the downtown Glenview Metra station, where bus and rail access is available. From this hub, people can use Pace’s community base service to travel not only to the Metra station but also to other bus routes that serve Glenview. Additionally, a regional transportation center is proposed at nearby Old Orchard Shopping Center. Routes that travel longer distances will stop at the regional centers, allowing for transfers between the community-based service and the regional express routes.
The formal adoption of the Village of Glenview Comprehensive Plan is the first step in implementation of the long-term vision for the Village. The appropriate implementation tools will assist the Village in realizing the plans and potentials outlined in the Plan. The tools will include:

**Public Policy and Administrative Actions**
- Use the Comprehensive Plan in the review of improvements, development projects, and proposals
- Ensure that all local codes and ordinances conform to and support the Comprehensive Plan
- Develop intergovernmental relationships and agreements to address regional issues, such as watershed management, transportation, and crime
- Continued evaluation of the annexation policy for the Village
- Conduct a market study for the Downtown District
- Continue to work closely with the Glenview Library Board to identify location and scope of project

**Regulatory Actions**
- Review and revise zoning ordinance to support the Comprehensive Plan policies
- Establish illustrated architectural design guidelines for the Village
- Develop downtown revitalization plan and guidelines
- Establish corridor development guidelines
- Establish landscape improvement plan

**Funding Sources and Implementation Techniques**
- Target area improvement and redevelopment (TIF)
- Special Service Areas
- Business Improvement Districts
- Illinois Main Street Program
- Illinois First

**10.1 REGULATORY TOOLS**

The Comprehensive Plan provides guidance for making zoning and other regulatory decisions in the communities. The standards and development goals established in this Comprehensive Plan should direct the revision of the any ordinances and its contents, as well as, guide the development of detail designs and guidelines.

**Zoning**

While many of the proposed land uses are permitted in their respective districts, and are allowed to occur, there are occasional restrictions placed on uses and their specific location within the zoning district. A careful analysis of the Comprehensive Plan recommendations and the zoning ordinance should be conducted and any necessary revisions incorporated.

**Illustrated Architectural Design Guidelines**

Illustrated architectural guidelines will replace the current appearance guide used by the Village and the Architectural Review Board. These guidelines should establish such elements as design details and standards for building form and fenestration, materials, signage, lighting, site furniture, and details.

**Downtown Revitalization Plan & Guidelines**

The Downtown Revitalization Guidelines will have a block-by-block plan for redevelopment. The plan should include land use, build-to guidelines, building heights, materials and style, fenestration, parking, and circulation details.

**Corridor Development Guidelines**

These guidelines will be applicable to commercial, industrial, and public land uses along community corridors. The guidelines will establish standards for shared parking, access management, signage, architectural standards, and landscaping. Development along these corridors will be evaluated for compliance with the corridor development guidelines along with other applicable standards.

**Village Landscape Standards**

Landscaping is an important factor in creating a desirable environment. The landscape improvement plan for the Village should develop standards for landscape for all arterials and public places in the Village.
The standards will also address issues of operation, maintenance and management.

10.2 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TOOLS

Successful implementation of the comprehensive plan recommendations will be dependant to a large extent upon the Village's ability to regulate new development and implement proposed public improvements. This can be done through administrative and policy decisions or can be funded through municipal programs. Yet some projects will require special technical and financial assistance or incentives. While there are many funding sources and mechanisms described below, there are some applicable ones for the Village.

Target Area Improvement and Redevelopment (TIF)

TIF is a mechanism used to carry out revitalization and redevelopment activities on a local basis. TIF allows a community to capture the increase in local property taxes, which results from a redevelopment project in order to pay for the public costs involved in the project. TIF funds can be used for:

- Acquisition, clearance, and other land assembly and site preparation activities
- Rehabilitation of older, deteriorating, or obsolete buildings
- Area-wide infrastructure improvements such as road repairs and utility upgrades
- Correction and mitigation of environmental problems
- Job training, workforce readiness, and other related educational programs
- Incentives to attract or retain private development
- Professional fees related to the project, such as legal, planning, marketing, and architectural services

Special Service Areas (SSA)

The Special Service Area (SSA) program is a mechanism for contiguous industrial, commercial, and residential areas to fund expanded services and programs through a localized property tax levy. These enhanced services and programs are in addition to services and programs currently provided through the Village. Typically only commercial and industrial parcels are subject to SSA tax. Residential, religious, not-for-profit, and public facilities are generally excluded for the tax.

Examples of SSA services and improvements include:

- Commercial area beautification and maintenance
- Sidewalk and roadway improvements
- Promotional activities such as parades and festivals
- Landscaping and other streetscaping improvements
- Security services
- Parking lot improvements
- Business area marketing and advertising assistance

When proposing a SSA, impacted taxpayers must be convinced of the merits of the proposed services and/or improvements and the additional taxes. Illinois State Law requires that a public meeting must be convened before the community can approve an SSA. It can be formally defeated with the signature of 51% of property owners and residents on a petition opposing the creation of the SSA.

Business Improvement Districts

Division 74.3 of the Municipal Code of the State of Illinois authorizes Business District development and redevelopment. The Village may designate, after public hearings, an area of the municipality as a Business District. In implementing a business district development or redevelopment plan, the Village may:

- Approve all development and redevelopment proposals
- Exercising the use of eminent domain for the acquisition of real and personal property for the purpose of a development or redevelopment project
- Acquire, manage, convey, or otherwise dispose of real and personal property acquired pursuant to the provisions of a development or redevelopment plan
- Apply for and accept capital grants and loans from the United States and the State of Illinois, or any instrumentality of the United States or the State, for business district development and redevelopment
- Borrow funds as it may be deemed necessary for the purpose of business district development and redevelopment, and in connection with the obligations or revenue bonds, as it shall be deemed necessary, subject to applicable statutory limitations
- Enter into contracts with any public and private agency or person
- Sell, lease, trade, or improve such real property as may be acquired in connection with business district development or redevelopment plans
- Expend such public funds as may be necessary for the planning, execution, and implementation of the business district plans
- Establish by ordinance or resolution, procedures for the planning, execution, and implementation of business district plans
- Create a Business District Development and Redevelopment Commission to act as agent for the municipality for the purposes of business district development and redevelopment

Illinois Main Street Program

The Main Street Program is a four-point historic preservation based program on downtown revitalization. It provides training and technical support to participating communities as they move toward revitalizing their historic downtown business districts.

Four Points Approach™

1. Build an effective volunteer based downtown management organization. A collaborative approach that includes a broad range of public and private sector groups, organizations, and constituents works best.

2. Enhance the design and appearance of the downtown through the preservation of historic architecture and streetscapes. This means everything from renovating buildings, constructing compatible new structures, improving signage and merchandising displays, to creating attractive and usable public spaces, and ensuring that planning and zoning regulations support the downtown revitalization effort.

3. Create a unified, refined image and develop promotion strategies that bring people back downtown. You'll find that by marketing the district's assets to residents, visitors, investors, and others through special events, retail promotions, and image building activities, you'll improve the way your downtown is perceived.

4. Retain and strengthen existing downtown businesses, attract appropriate new businesses, and develop economic restructuring strategies for sustaining the economic vitality of the downtown area. The goal here is to simultaneously strengthen the district's existing economic base while finding ways to expand its economy and introduce compatible new uses (source: www.commerce.state.il.us/com/mainstreet/text/mainstreet.html).
Annexation Policy

Methods of Annexation

1. Voluntary Annexation
   Only those property owners who are willing to accept the responsibility of becoming a Village of Glenview resident will be annexed.
   Allows an Illinois Municipality to annex an area of 60 acres or less, provided it is completely surrounded by one or more municipalities, or is bounded by them on three sides with a natural boundary (navigable river, lake, or forest preserve) on the fourth side (it is current Village policy to annex these areas).

2. Combination Voluntary & Involuntary Annexation
   Sometimes annexation is the result of a combination of voluntary and involuntary procedures, as when a referendum is held to decide whether an area should be annexed. All qualified voters of the area may then vote on the proposition and a simple majority prevails.

Benefits to Property Owners
- Police services
- Emergency medical services
- Maintenance services
- Water & sewer services
- Community development department
- Library services
- Free commuter parking
- Paid commuter parking
- Village newsletter
- Liquor control
- Public health
- Senior citizen housing

Financial Impact of Annexation
- General revenue
- Property tax revenue
- Water revenue
- Utility tax revenue
- Vehicle sticker revenue
- 9-1-1 revenue
- Regular income tax
- Income tax surcharge
- Motor fuel tax
- Photo processing sales tax
- State use tax (xx per capita)

The Official Map should be updated to reflect future land uses.

Impact on Operating Departments
- Fire Department
- Police Department
- Public Works Department

Existing Agreements
- Milwaukee Road and Sanders Road Corridor Agreement – April 1997
- Willow Road Corridor Agreement – March 1990
- Interdepartmental Memorandum: Annexation Study – March 1993
- Glenview Annexation – 1987

Types of Areas Available for Annexation
- Residential Islands within the Village
- Commercial Islands within the Village
- Open Space/Parkland and/or Forest Preserves
- Commercial Industrial lands at the fringe of the Community
- Residential development at the fringe of the community

Village of Glenview Annexation Policy

a) If the annexation of the land is not financially viable and the land to be annexed provides no development challenges (i.e. the land is fully developed and not likely to change in the near future), then do nothing.

b) Try to annex based on the following criteria:
   1. Positive cost-revenue basis
   2. In order to avoid negative development patterns
   3. To facilitate future annexations that may be desirable
   4. To facilitate the effective provision of Village services
   5. If there is a need to respond to a pattern of growth in surrounding incorporated areas
   6. Some combination of the above

Annexation reports should include the following:
Future Land use should be determined. If there is more than one land use they should be balanced and the proposed land use should be consistent with and complimentary to surrounding land uses.

A description of the current land use status should be included in annexation report.
### Village of Glenview Comprehensive Plan

#### Plan Documents

**Appendix A.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Copies</th>
<th>Description of Document</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cook County Comprehensive Land Use &amp; Policies Plan</td>
<td>Board of Appeals</td>
<td>May 1, 1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Village of Urbana: Preparing to Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>December 1, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Village of Mount Prospect: Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>March 1, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City of Des Plaines: Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>Camiros, Ltd</td>
<td>August 1, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northfield Vision Plan</td>
<td>Trika, Pettigrew, Allen &amp; Payne, Inc.</td>
<td>November 1, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glenview Naval Air Station: Volume 1: Executive Summary</td>
<td>Camiros, Ltd</td>
<td>June 1, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Village of Glenview: Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>Stanton and Rockwell</td>
<td>August 1, 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Village of Glenview: Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>August 1, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Village of Glenview: Capital Improvement Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>1999-2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Downtown Architectural Study</td>
<td>Anne McGuire &amp; Associates</td>
<td>July 1, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Downtown: A Vision for the Future</td>
<td>Planning Resources</td>
<td>June 1, 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Village of Glenview: Capital Improvement Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Village of Glenview: Downtown Architectural Study</td>
<td>Anne McGuire &amp; Associates</td>
<td>July 1, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Village of Glenview: Downtown Architectural Study</td>
<td>Mary Bak</td>
<td>December 1, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Village of Glenview: Plan Review &amp; Inspection Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Village of Glenview: Development Department Application Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Zoning, Ordinance, and Architectural Documents

**Appendix A.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Copies</th>
<th>Description of Document</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TIF Information</td>
<td>The Village Report</td>
<td>November 1, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Resolution No. 00-37 (LeHigh Triangle)</td>
<td>The Village of Glenview</td>
<td>June 1, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ordinance No. 4196 (Chestnut Ave. &amp; LeHigh Triangle)</td>
<td>The Village of Glenview</td>
<td>August 1, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Downtown Glenview Zoning Study: Maximum Build-Out within the D-1 District</td>
<td>Planning Resources</td>
<td>June 1, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Appearance</td>
<td>Burke, Bosselman, &amp; Weaver</td>
<td>March 1, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Willow Road Corridor Agreement</td>
<td>Randall, Gayle, &amp; Patt</td>
<td>November 1, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Village of Glenview: Downtown Architectural Study</td>
<td>Anne McGuire &amp; Associates</td>
<td>July 1, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Village of Glenview: Interdepartmental Memorandum (Cut-Through Sutdies)</td>
<td>Mary Bak</td>
<td>December 1, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Village of Glenview: Plan Review &amp; Inspection Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Village of Glenview: Development Department Application Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Village of Glenview: Subdivision &amp; Engineering Guide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Traffic Documents

### Appendix A.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Copies</th>
<th>Description of Document</th>
<th>Consultants</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Development Guidelines</td>
<td>Pace Suburban Bus Service</td>
<td>June 1, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Village of Glenview: Interdepartmental Memorandum</td>
<td>Sergeant Perlini</td>
<td>November 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Glenview's Most Hazardous Intersections)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Traffic Impact Study; Maximum Build-Out within the D-1 District</td>
<td>James J. Benes &amp; Associates</td>
<td>June 1, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Your Region's Railroad</td>
<td>Metra</td>
<td>October 1, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Traffic Impact &amp; parking Demand Analyses the Metra</td>
<td>Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.</td>
<td>May 1, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Roadway Paving</td>
<td></td>
<td>1970-1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Village of Glenview Comprehensive Plan

#### Project Schedule

**May 23th, 2002**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
<th>SYNTHESIS</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASK 1</td>
<td>Schedule Meetings, Refine Scope</td>
<td>Traffic Development, Area Identity Workshop</td>
<td>Key Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 2</td>
<td>Data Analysis, Information Analysis</td>
<td>Neighborhood Plans and Zoning Changes Workshop</td>
<td>Traffic Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 3</td>
<td>Issue Identification Workshop</td>
<td>Final Neighborhood Plans and Zoning Changes Workshop</td>
<td>Special Study Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Project Schedule

- **2001**: May, June, July, August, September, October
- **2002**: May, June, July, August, September, October

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>PROJECT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>DATA COMPILATION AND ANALYSIS</th>
<th>COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</th>
<th>LAND USE MASTER PLAN</th>
<th>FISCAL ANALYSIS</th>
<th>ELDERLY HOUSING COMPONENT</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASK 1</td>
<td>PROJECT ORIENTATION</td>
<td>DATA COMPILATION AND ANALYSIS</td>
<td>COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</td>
<td>LAND USE MASTER PLAN</td>
<td>FISCAL ANALYSIS</td>
<td>ELDERLY HOUSING COMPONENT</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 2</td>
<td>PROJECT ORIENTATION</td>
<td>DATA COMPILATION AND ANALYSIS</td>
<td>COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</td>
<td>LAND USE MASTER PLAN</td>
<td>FISCAL ANALYSIS</td>
<td>ELDERLY HOUSING COMPONENT</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **May 23th, 2002**

- **2001**: May, June, July, August, September, October
- **2002**: May, June, July, August, September, October

#### Key Activities

- Community-Wide Public meetings
- Comprehensive Plan Committee Meetings
- Special Study Area / Stakeholder Meetings
- Traffic Study
- Planning
- Key Activities
### Village of Glenview Comprehensive Plan

**Appendix**

#### Review Draft Comprehensive Plans and Zoning Changes and Traffic Study Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **7-May**
- **9-Jan**
- **AP**
- **22-May**
- **9-Oct**
- **24-Feb**
- **9-Mar**
- **13-Apr**

- **34-Nov**
- **8-Mar**
- **10-Apr**
- **31-Jan**
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE #1

May 24, 2001

Attendees:

Present:
Larry Carlson (Chairman)  Susan Isenberg   Donna Pappo
Jeff Lerner    Rita Planey   John Hedrick
Ty Lautie    Gail Anderson   Laura Bierman
Joe Di Mattina    Kent Fuller   Doug Kaiser
Mark Steger    John Patton   Anastasia Usher
Mary Beth Denefe    Michael Guinane   Mark Steger
Rita Planey    Gail Anderson   Andy Olson
Chris Krueger (came in late)

Absent:
Steven Wulfsohn
John Crawford
Rachael Cook

Comprehensive Plan Committee Staff Present:
Dave Sliktas (Village Planner)
Kristy Lawson (Planning Intern)

Consultants Present:
Larry Witzling (Principal)
Gaurie Rodman (Project Manager)
Ingrid Herzog (Associate)
Jamie Rybarczyk (Associate)

The meeting was called to order at 7:07 p.m. by Chairman Larry Carlson and roll call was taken.

Introduction and General Overview:
Chairman Carlson asked if there were any corrections to the January 20, 2001 minutes.
Susan Isenberg stated that her last name should be spelled with an “I” not an “E”, and John Hedrick stated that there is not a “N” in his last name.

With no further corrections to be made, Doug Kaiser made a motion to approve the minutes as corrected.
Seconded by Donna Pappo. Upon voice vote, the minutes of January 20, 2001 were approved as corrected.

Chairman Larry Carlson introduced Andy Olson as the new representative for School District 225.

Village Planner Dave Sliktas asked that members of the Committee to update the mailing list by the end of the meeting.

Dave Sliktas introduced PDI, the consultant firm, chosen in January out of the four presentations heard at the January 20, 2001 meeting.

Larry Witzling, President of PDI, introduced the team working on the Comprehensive Plan. He gave the floor to Gaurie Rodman who discussed the scope of services, preliminary schedule, and the 8 sub-areas of the plan identified in the Village RFP.

She then introduced the 8 sub-areas to the Committee and requested that the Committee identify and discuss their main concerns for each area. Larry Witzling stated that problems that are usually thought of include: traffic, noise, security, property values, suitability, the idea of change, tax base, political fairness, infrastructure, etc.

Gaurie suggested that the Committee look at each site individually. The following is a summary of the comments made by the committee for each of the eight sub-areas.

Summary of Public Comments:
How do you prioritize which sub-area to start with?

It was decided to cluster the sub-areas by geographical location for the purpose of discussion.

Sub-area A (Old Willow Triangle):

a. Lot of small buildings, retail, food store, and small light industrial users
b. Two new tennis courts
c. Issues of drainage
d. Public infrastructure
e. Safety and security
f. East of LeHigh Road is deserted
g. Increased traffic with a lot of new development
h. Mixed-use area
i. Bus station, cemetery, tennis courts, and cement delivery
j. Traffic will lessen on Willow Road once the Glen opens
k. Consider deserted part of Village
l. Future development will affect the Community
m. Driving pattern and access pattern is in-flux
n. Substantial redevelopment on either side of triangle
o. Need to be careful in using the word ‘redevelopment’ with property owners
p. Talk about future plans and possibilities of future plans

Actions:
a. Identify stakeholders- Comprehensive Plan Committee
b. Prepare base map/site photographs- PDI

Sub-area B (Jefferson/Monroe Area):

a. Controversial area
b. Older single-family homes transition to town homes/multi-family

Appendix
c. Zoning was put into place years ago to introduce town homes

d. The multi-family development differs greatly from each other in quality; last 3-4 years have gotten worse

e. What should the older-family homes be replaced with

f. Maybe improved by mixed-residential

g. Replace with something of quality

h. Streetscaping and lighting should be unified within each neighborhood

i. Is there something the Village could do to encourage redevelopment

j. Possible appearance code

k. Density may not be the issue

Actions:

a. Identify stakeholders- Comprehensive Plan Committee

b. Prepare base map/site photographs- PDI

Sub-area C (LeHigh/Chestnut/John’s Drive Area):

a. Changing land use patterns

b. Process of transition

c. Controversial issue with business owners to keep it light industrial

d. Lot of tenants such as: automotive, concern about how vocal they may get about redevelopment

e. Businesses are concerned about being pushed out, they feel they can’t do their business elsewhere

f. Market forces

g. Next to park, use is too close to green space

h. Concern from business owners that they have to upgrade their stores

i. Transition of economical land values

j. Both sides of tracks is very unattractive

k. The Glen is separated by the tracks, will never be part of the Glen

l. Does the Village want this area to change? What should go next to the Glen?

m. Identify areas where existing businesses could relocate too

Actions:

a. Identify stakeholders- Comprehensive Plan Committee

b. Prepare base map/site photographs- PDI

Sub-area D (Chestnut Avenue south side from LeHigh Road east to Cemetery):

a. Chestnut used to end by green space, now that the Glen is open, there is thru traffic

b. Traffic problems currently on Chestnut going north

Actions:

a. Identify stakeholders- Comprehensive Plan Committee

b. Prepare base map/site photographs- PDI

Sub-area E (Waukegan Road north of Harrison to Willow Avenue):

a. Waukegan Road was a boulevard 25-30 years ago with trees in middle

b. Helped with traffic calming

c. Ask Pat about bringing the medians back

d. Changed the whole character of Waukegan Road when the boulevard was taken out

e. Are there redevelopment opportunities on Waukegan Road

f. Focus on ways to strengthen businesses on Waukegan Road

g. Lighting is inconsistent, example: Walgreen’s

h. There is a need for consistency

i. Vacant property on Waukegan Road and Lake Road owned by Village

j. Look at regulations from Lake Forest

k. Aesthetics of ROW

l. Traffic

m. Part of the emotional response is that there is a lot of vacancy

n. Fragmented

Actions:

a. Identify stakeholders- Comprehensive Plan Committee

b. Prepare base map/site photographs- PDI

Sub-area F (Greenwood & West Lake Avenue area):

a. Annexation

b. Corner piece of property on Lake and Greenwood

c. Preventive annexation from county, concern with multi-family development if it stays in county

d. Village can offer water and fire protection

e. State statutes regarding annexations

f. Borders the Glen

g. Current state of roads and current plans for road improvements

h. Traffic

i. Two of the worst traffic corners in the Village occur here

Actions:

a. Identify stakeholders- Comprehensive Plan Committee

b. Prepare base map/site photographs- PDI

Sub-area G (D-1 district and surrounding R-18 District):

a. Same as E

b. Used to be more green

c. Angled parking years ago rather than parallel

d. Traffic

e. Vacancies, impression of increased vacancies, look of transitional businesses

f. Many people will come to meetings on this area

g. Emotional area, used to be the heart of the Village

h. Glenview Road and Waukegan Road used to be the heart of the Village

i. Parking problem

j. Problem with retaining businesses

k. Quality retail needed

l. 1950’s look

m. No continuity

n. Traffic is an acute problem with the train station
Discussion of using a retail consultant for Glenview Road and Waukeegan Road

Actions:
- Identify stakeholders: Comprehensive Plan Committee
- Prepare base map/site photographs: PDI
- Evaluate need for a retail consultant and make recommendation for one if needed

Sub-area H (Milwaukee Avenue Corridor from Greenwood to Willow):
- Redefine area marked on map
- Safety
- Traffic
- Appearance
- Not as hot as downtown area
- More commercial, low income looking
- Housing with low income families, lots of children attend Village schools
- Buildings on Milwaukee Avenue
- Central Road to Lake Road is new development

Actions:
- Identify stakeholders: Comprehensive Plan Committee
- Prepare base map/site photographs: PDI

After discussing the issues of the 8 sub-areas, the committee briefly addressed the format for the June 21st meeting when HNTB and Calthorpe, who will attend the first village-wide issue identification workshop.

The Committee decided that focusing on downtown revitalization and planning issues with Calthorpe and PDI is important.

A special meeting with the Committee was scheduled for 3:00 pm on the 21st of June. The consultants will also meet with representatives of the Chamber of Commerce during lunch on the 21st. The Committee also requested PDI to look into having a retail consultant.

Next Steps:
- Revise project schedule: PDI (6/14/01)
- Create committee task list: PDI (6/14/01)
- Create open house agenda: PDI (6/14/01)
- Prepare detailed base maps for downtown sub-area meeting
- Schedule June meeting on downtown with Comprehensive Plan Committee & Chamber of Commerce
- Power Point presentation of existing conditions for open house: PDI (6/21/01)

Next Meeting:
On June 21st - Lunch with chamber of commerce
Meeting with committee at 3pm
Open house at 6-9pm with a presentation at 7pm by consultants
The Committee also discussed looking at location quotient by sector for Glenview, the northern suburbs and for Metro Chicago, the State/Region and the Nation.

Larry also gave an overview of the meeting and workshops from earlier in the day; the walk-thru of the downtown area, the meeting with the Chamber of Commerce, and the downtown workshop.

The meeting ended with establishing future meetings and the time line for getting the household survey sent out. The Committee was also asked to generate a list of stakeholders for PDI to interview.

After discussing the issues of the 8 sub-areas, the Committee briefly addressed the format for the June 21st meeting when HNTB and Calthorpe, who will attend the first village-wide issue identification workshop.

The Committee decided that focusing on downtown revitalization and planning issues with Calthorpe and PDI is important.

A special meeting with the Committee was scheduled for 3:00 pm on the 21st of June. The consultants will also meet with representatives of the Chamber of Commerce during lunch on the 21st. The Committee also requested PDI to look into having a retail consultant.

Next Steps:
- a. Revise project schedule- PDI
- b. Create committee task list- PDI
- c. Create open house agenda- PDI
- d. Prepare detailed base maps for downtown sub-area meeting
- e. Schedule June meeting on downtown with Comprehensive Plan Committee & Chamber of Commerce
- f. Power Point presentation of existing conditions for open house- PDI (6/21/01)

Next Meeting:
On July 26th - Lunch with chamber of commerce
Meeting with committee at 3pm
Open house at 6:9pm with a presentation at 7pm by consultants
b. Planning Area “C” (Lehigh Triangle)
c. Planning Area “D” (South Side of Chestnut corridor)
d. Planning Area “F” (Greenwood/West Lake corridor)
4. Planning Area “H” (Milwaukee Avenue corridor)
5. Village-wide Traffic Issues
6. Annexation Strategy

Summary of Public Comments:
Larry Witzling stated that the survey would be the final topic of discussion tonight so that all the other items would be decided first. He said that based on the returned preferred sub-committee sheets, area 1 and 2 seem to have the most interest so those areas should be broken into sub-committees, while areas 3, 4, 5, and 6 could be left to the committee as a whole.

Rita Planey stated that her concern is that if the process becomes too fractionalized, the comprehensive plan will not be cohesive when all the parts are put together.

Ty Laurie concurred and stated that he was against breaking into sub-committees. He suggested that we prioritize the areas and focus on the ones that need the most attention. He added that area 3 is also of great importance and should not be overlooked. Ty Laurie stated that they do not want to bite off more than they can chew and then not give some of the areas enough attention.

John Hedrick asked what the purpose of the sub-committees were.
Larry Witzling replied that sub-committees are supposed to shorten the process and lighten the load of the committee as a whole, but now he is having doubts about the sub-committees.

Donna Pappo suggested saving area 3, 4, and 6 till the end.

Judy Beck stated that four of the sub-groups are location oriented while two are issue oriented.
Larry Witzling recommended that the most critical areas should be looked at first and once they get a handle on the process the other areas could be handled more efficiently.

Chairman Larry Carlson suggested that we should start with areas 1 and 2 and then do the others.
Larry Witzling stated that they could contact others from the west side of town to get more comments on issues regarding the Milwaukee Avenue corridor.

Donna Pappo questioned doing 1, 2, and 5 because she felt that area 3 is in far more need of help than area 2.
Gaurie Rodman stated that the downtown area could be changed to include Waukegan Road south of East Lake Road.

Chairman Larry Carlson, Donna Pappo, and Rita Planey all expressed their concern that area 3 needs attention first and the rest of the committee agreed.

Larry Witzling suggested that they start with the stakeholders list for area 3. He added that they could send out an interview letter to those on the list. Gaurie added that letters could also be sent out for the workshops.

Chairman Larry Carlson asked PDI what the average number of stakeholders is for communities that are approximately Glenview’s size.
Larry Witzling replied that it varies because there is so much political interest. The interviews could be set up in a number of ways depending on how many possible stakeholders there are. They will choose one method for area 3 and then see how it works; if it needs to be changed they can do that for the other areas. At the next meeting, the Committee can discuss broader ways to involve more people.

Andy Olson stated that tenants are not represented enough in the stakeholder list.
Rita Planey added that the list is also lacking industrial owners.
Larry Witzling stated they should create a stakeholder list for area 3 right now.

Ty Laurie asked if there is a current list of homeowner associations that could be used for area 3.
Chairman Larry Carlson replied that there are over 50 homeowner associations, and we do not know which are currently active.

Laura Bierman added that there are no Milwaukee Avenue tenants or owners listed on the stakeholder list.
Joe DiMartina added that the list is also missing church groups.
John Hedrick stated that there seem to be two extremes, public meetings or private interviews. He would like to find an option in between.

Larry Carlson responded that they have public workshops.

John Hedrick asked if there is a way to get other people that are interested more involved.
Ty Laurie questioned how they could ensure to get input from people that are interested in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mary Bak replied that they could send out a letter and pass out flyers.
Chairman Larry Carlson asked how many members are in a focus group.
Larry Witzling replied that they prefer to have 10-15 people in a focus group, if there are more they will use an open house setting. He added that they will modify the open house setting depending on the number of people.

Larry Witzling stated that the committee should look at the survey at this point. He added that they are aiming towards having the survey mailed out the week after Labor Day.
Dave Sliktas added that it will be sent out to every mailing address.

Mary Bak stated that it will be sent to about 13,000 addresses.

Dave Sliktas asked about adding the list of meeting dates for the sub-areas.

Larry Witzling replied that they need to come up with a schedule before they can list dates; they could ask if people would be willing to attend meetings for each of the sub areas.

Ty Laurie asked if postcards are being sent to business owners.

Mary Bak stated that mailing list is currently to the 13,000 addresses but as they get closer it will become more inclusive.

Steven Wulfsohn stated that the meeting schedule and willingness to come should included name and address but it should be separated from the survey so that it can remain anonymous.

Judy Becker commented that the interviews should be done after the survey because it would help them know what the real issues are.

Gaurie Rodman presented the downtown map that PDI had been working on, the map shows the footprints of the building, the next step PDI will be making is to look analytically at the downtown and find problems, assets, edges, potential, library sites, etc.

Andy Olson asked if PDI and the library will be working together for possible library sites.

Gail Anderson replied that the library would be willing to look into any suggestions that the comprehensive plan may make.

The committee discussed and amended the survey; see attached noted survey.

Kent Fuller suggested that a natural resources subcommittee be added to check the environmental concerns with all of the areas. Judy Beck and John Hedrick stated they would be willing to work with Kent on a natural resources subcommittee.

Mary Beth Denefe asked if there could be a box at the end of the survey for the people to fill out their names, addresses, and comments.

Mary Bak added that they could also include a line that could ask if they’d like to be on a mailing list to receive updates and meeting dates for the comprehensive plan.

Larry Witzling stated that PDI would rewrite the survey, and mail it back to the committee members. The committee members will then send their comments back to PDI. PDI will work with Staff to finalize the survey after all the comments are received. The survey is scheduled to be sent out in August.

Larry Witzling continued saying that for the next committee meeting PDI will have a rough table of contents and the outline of the mission statement for review.
Residents would be requested to place a stamp on the self-mailer to mail back to Village. Also, David Sliktas, Village Planner, will make available drop off box locations at the Village Police Department, Library, Village Hall, and Park District Center at the Glen.

**Planning Area Sub-Committees**
The Committee approved the Agenda for the September 20th, 2001 sub-area workshop from 6-9p.m. and Committee meeting from 9-10p.m. also on September 20th.

**Lehigh Triangle Sub-area Workshop**
The following date was presented by Gaurie Rodman for a sub-area workshop concerning the Lehigh Triangle possibly Thursday October 11th or October 25th.

**Natural Resource Sub-Committee**
Chairman Larry Carlson acknowledged the excellent work (observations and recommendations) provided by the Natural Resource Sub-committee consisting of Kent Fuller, Judy Beck and John Hedrick. The report was provided to each Committee Member.

**Adjournment**
With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 10:35 p.m.

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE # 5**

**September 20, 2001**

**Attendees:**
Cut from Village

**Introduction and General Overview:**

a. Call to order
b. Roll Call and Declaration
c. Approve Minutes
d. Organizational Issues: None
e. Old Business: None
f. New Business: PDI
g. Schedule next sub-area work session
h. Stakeholder interviews

**Summary of Public Comments:**

a. **Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Public Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Change a line to say non-residential use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b</td>
<td>Should it stay or should it go? It should say, “do you walk?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Change something with Northshore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 &amp; 23</td>
<td>You need to have zero as one of the options and drop the ‘if any’. In addition, taxes should be replaced with ‘Village funds’. Question 22 should be a general question about allocation of funds and Question 23 should be about the revenues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Verify spelling on Phingsten…first column, congested all the time, congested at rush hours, no opinion, and underutilized. Change public safety building to Police Station.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. **Establish six-month schedule**

No committee meeting on October 11th, but an open house meeting on Sub-area “C” 6-8p.m.

Sub-arc B&E: October 25th, 6-8.

Sub-area H: November 15th, 6-8, 8-10 sub-committee meeting

Sub-area G: Completed
The remainder of the schedule should be determined following the Nov 15th meeting.

c. Next Steps
Village President said to include everyone on stakeholder list and bill any additional costs.
Emphasize confidentiality with stakeholders, explain that only summary document with our quotes and names will be submitted to the city.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE # 6
November 15, 2001

Attendees:
Present:
Larry Carlson (Chairman)       Gail Anderson      John Hedrick
Anastasia Usher               Ty Laurie          Susan Isenberg
Steven Wolfsohn                Donna Poppo        Rita Planey
Jeff Lerner                    Michael Guinane    Kent Fuller

Absent:
Rachael Cook                  Chris Krueger      Laura Bierman
John Crawford                  Joe DiMartina     Nancy Firfer
Andy Olson                    Doug Kaiser        Mary Beth Defene
Mark Steger

Chairman Larry Carlson called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm

Introduction and General Overview:
Sept 6 minutes and Sept 20 minutes were approved

Summary of Public Comments:
a. Household Survey
Preliminary results will be available by December 13th.

The open-ended question on the survey will need a little bit more time to get tabulated.

Final results along with analysis will be presented to the Committee at the January Committee Meeting. Larry Witzling cautioned that statistics are easily quoted and make good stories; therefore, results should not be released without analysis.

The Committee agreed with this.

b. Stakeholder Interviews
Two-thirds of the interviews have been conducted.

The interviews with community leaders and business owners are complete. Scheduling times with the citizen leaders is challenging. Gaurie is looking at possibly conducting interviews in the evening or on a Saturday.

So far the interviews have been robust, opinionated, and confirm many of the common issues. The interview process has been very positive and appreciated by the public.
Stakeholder interviews are confidential and should not be released to the public. A summary of statements, without names will become part of the Plan.

Larry Carlson agreed that there was a certain expectation of privacy.

Was there general satisfaction of process?

Gaurie: Seemed very satisfied and became more comfortable with process—generally positive, no one said they were leaving Glenview…happy knowing there was a diverse group of people being contacted.

Larry Witzling: People feel glad that issues are being addressed and that they are being listened to…challenge is to satisfy or justify concerns in a plausible way so that if everyone’s expectations are not being met, there is at least a sense that the process was fair.

Follow-up discussion to the Open House on Milwaukee Avenue (Sub-Area H)

A resident suggested that All-State create a frontage road to All-State. Committee Member John Hedrick (employee of All-State) volunteered to be a liaison with the company to further discuss this option.

Intersection of Glenview and Milwaukee, a left turn signal in every direction was suggested, specially given the increased traffic to the new developments in the area. Currently there is only a left turn signal going south on Milwaukee and turning on to Glenview Road.

Apartment is to be opened by Christmas time.

Look at retail nodes along Milwaukee Avenue. The land uses are not necessarily compatible.

What will happen to the strip shopping centers along Milwaukee? HNTB and PDI will look at these issues in the neighborhood plans.

Reduce curb cuts.

Illinois Department of Transportation has identified Milwaukee Avenue as a regional arterial that maybe widened to six lanes. This may consume much of the parking along Milwaukee Avenue at the strip malls.

Tendencies to take commercial areas and allow residential development

State that area south of Devon Bank and Church…should be improved. Currently the development is very dense with little or no green space. This is a trouble spot due to gang activity, we would hope that this area offers a better quality of life that offers a consistency with the Village. Area needs a vision; it was developed as an unincorporated area.

Quality of life seems to rest with strong school systems, parks, safety and security….when these erode, things fall down…safety and security should be addressed.

This area has affected our school system.

What should our policy be on unincorporated areas?—what is the price of not incorporating this area? Impact on police, schools, and safety.

c. Mission Statement

Try to capture 3 basic sets of issues
1. Overall vision for the Village
2. Response to 8 sub-areas and traffic concerns
3. Public policies

These three areas generally fit into the Village goals set forth in the RFP for the Comprehensive Plan.

Would like to see statement about schools, parks, and security—put in Part A under goals and objectives

John H: looks like criteria for what final document should accomplish

Larry Witzling: not intent of Mission Statement…more broad

Kent Fuller: Where would you see environmental issues?

Larry Witzling: see it in all components

John H: don’t see this as a list of topics

PDI will continue to work on draft mission statement. Committee members please feel free to e-mail Gaurie with any suggestions.

d. 6-month schedule

Next meeting on Dec 13th, this will be an open house for the Downtown. PDI will present preliminary option for public to discuss.

There are many options to consider. The final will take a series of iterations.

This workshop will be different than the first series. PDI will present their findings to date and there preliminary options. Time will be given for audience discussion, if time allows will have break-out sessions.

Downtown District may need to have several workshops

Concern that discussion will go off on Renneckar’s, and never get to the other recommendations. Will have cards for the public to fill out so that equal time can be given to everybody to speak.
PDI will provide and background and use PowerPoint to present their options.

Anastasia: concerned that individuals will be angry if they are not allowed to speak at a public forum

Perhaps limit speakers to 3 minutes

Address issues regarding level of intervention, displaced businesses. Also address fairness and replacement values

Not last opportunity to express concerns, encourage public to offer their options

Larry W: no decision is being made on the 13th, this is first set of option, there will be future meetings, other options will be forthcoming, and these options are the first time task force is hearing options…need survey results

e. Next steps
   Jan 17th, will be a business meeting, not a workshop. Committee will discuss its opinions, and public input.

   Feb 21, 7 pm…Committee Meeting

   March and April meeting tentatively scheduled for third Thursday.

f. Meeting adjourned at 8:45p.m.

---

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE # 7

January 17, 2002

Attendees:
Larry Carlson  John Hedrick  Ty Laurie
Gail Anderson  Anastasia Usher  Susan Isenberg
Donna Pappo  Jeff Lerner  Rita Planey
Kent Fuller  Steven Wolfsohn  Joe DiMattina
Mary Beth Denefe  Chris Krueger  Laura Ladd Bierman
Mark Stuger

Absent:
Rachel Cook  John Crawford  Michael Guinane
Andrew Olson  Doug Kaiser  Judy Beck
Kerry Cummings

Chairman Larry Carlson called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm

Introduction and General Overview:
November 15, 2001 minutes were approved with some minor spelling changes

Committee Meeting Discussion:

a. Stakeholder Interviews
   Of the list of 48 persons identified for confidential stakeholder interviews, 34 have been completed to date. PDI has contacted all of the remaining 14 stakeholders yet have either not received a contact back or have had scheduling conflicts. PDI requested that the remaining interviews be done via telephone, as this may be more convenient for these individuals. Committee: approved. A general outline of the interview questions was also passed out for the committee to review.

b. Household Survey
   PDI presented the preliminary findings from the Household survey distributed in November to approximately 23,500 households. 2873 were returned. These results are preliminary, as PDI needs to verify all the figures.

   Larry Witzling proceeded to review the results question by question. Following are some of the comments;
Q14 – re number of people using personal vehicle vs. number of people taking the train. Is the percentage high considering there is a metro train station located with the community?

Q17 – Name of store rather than the square, people may not have recognized the square. Cross tabulate with where people live within the village. Shops within the square are grocery store and pharmacy; this could be the reason for the low percentage. Cross-tabulate how many people shop on the Internet vs. age

Q18 – compare the neutral answers with age and number of years in community; significance of neutral answer = ok;

Q19 – children’s museum is coming to the village;

Q20 – where did the percentage of not wanting multi-family come from, cross tabulate with residence location.

c. Discussion on downtown open-house:
As the committee did not get an opportunity to comment on the preliminary redevelopment options presented by PDI to the community at the December 13th workshop Larry Witzling asked the committee for their input on some of the ideas presented.

Scenic Illinois group evaluated the options and have made commentary. John distributed these to the committee. Please see attached.

Olympia strip has not been addressed in any of the options; it is fine right now, but what in the next 5-10 years. The strip is dependent on traffic from the library, if library moves, retail will be definitely affected. Shops could be moved to closer to downtown.

Library is on the wrong side of the tracks. It should be part of downtown

Library board hired a consultant to help with site selection

So many issues how do you decide which question should be answered first. Village should pick a few acceptable sites for the library within the village.

One consideration is that if the retail zoning is removed from the d-1 district, the village lets the library go elsewhere, and the grocery store moves from the corner of glen and Waukegan, essentially the downtown is gone. Should the committee consider the option of letting the downtown go?

Can we have a plan that is worthwhile if everything is based on the library? Focus a discussion on where the library should go.

Time frame for the library – the board would like have the site selection completed within 60 days of hiring the consultants.

The village should make a decision regarding the library, rather than saying it is up to the library board

Does not believe the library will be less used at another location, does not see the correlation between the location of the library and usage of downtown.

Does the viability of downtown dependent on “some” activity? Is this supported or is this just a myth? Is central activity necessary?

Some people like that there is not much retail around the train station. They like the more relaxed atmosphere of downtown.

Wouldn’t the train tracks become a physical barrier to the downtown in option C? Are we saying that the downtown ends at the railroad tracks?

If the library is gone, the activity generator will be the train station and it may not extend over the tracks.

Where is village hall going? It is not the determining factor for other decisions needed for the village.

Village hall does not need to be located on the main street

Can the retail strip make it across the tracks, and what happens to the library being an anchor of it is relocated to where option c suggests
Believes Dominic’s will be moving within the next 5 years, and they will not sell it to another grocery store.

Variable with library may be to reduce the footprint. Other variables are available other than acquisition.

**d. Next steps**

Gaurie Rodman distributed a revised schedule with meeting dates for the coming year. It is intended that the Comprehensive Plan will be completed for adoption by October 2002.

PDI and HNTB are now concentrating on recommendations and the outlines of the village-wide comprehensive plan. Drafts of these documents and a preliminary study on annexation policy will be presented at the next committee meeting on February 21st. It was requested that the March meeting date be moved as it coincides with spring break.

**e. Meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.**
The next steps will be to do a twenty-year projection on traffic changes. Even if the Village of Glenview does nothing and does not grow, traffic will increase in Glenview as it increases in the Region. Therefore it will be necessary to plan for these changes.

A preliminary recommendation for Waukegan Road was presented. Waukegan Road currently has less traffic than many similar traffic arterials, yet it fails in performance primarily due to the many access driveways.

A brief discussion on closing and limiting access to roads was discusses. It is possible to close an access drive if there is a related safety issue. It is possible to control left turns from drives. At this level of planning recommendations for individual properties will not be made, but a narrative statement describing a process along with a variety of option that maybe used.

The proposed median along Waukegan road will vary as it moves north and south. This will depend on existing physical conditions, traffic needs, available R.O.W. and neighborhood characteristics.

Historically some businesses, the chamber of commerce and local residents disliked the median. It was discussed that when this option is proposed, information on past applications and studies should be presented to the public.

It was noted that on the diagram it shows an additional 30' of R.O.W. this maybe needed for implementation. Pat confirmed that this maybe true in certain circumstances but in the majority of conditions there is ample R.O.W.

The recommendations will include short-term recommendations for more severe conditions and a long-term implementation plan. Those maybe implemented as properties change and develop.

As the Glen was redeveloped a series of traffic studies were conducted. The preliminary traffic study from 1993 was revised in 1998 to reflect the final plan recommendations. As parcels of land are being developed, new traffic studies are being done to accommodate any changes in traffic. HNTB has taken these studies into account in their evaluation.

Larry went on to conclude that Section 7 of the outline was critical to the implementation of the Comprehensive plan as it provides the Village with the tools; policies, practices and ordinances. Any changes or comments to the outline should be forwarded to Gaurie at PDI.

b. Mission Statement
PDI presented the latest version of the Mission Statement. Further wordsmithing and refining will be done with Glenview Village Staff and forwarded to the Committee for review. Any comments should be forwarded to Gaurie at PDI.

c. Survey
The final survey results were distributed amongst the Committee. Results of the survey will be published in the local paper. The committee had requested PDI to run additional cross tabs; the age of internet shoppers, the resident location to shopping habits and resident location to attitudes regarding residential development. These results were discussed. Nothing extraordinary but a general confirmation of the overall results.

d. Downtown Recommendation
After PDI reviewed all the comments received from the public as well as the Committee members it is clear that option C-1, was the preferred option. A discussion of the merits of this site; its central location, the opportunity to maintain retail along Glenview Road, ability to enhance the River and make it a downtown amenity and the ability to create opportunities for shared parking were discussed. Some implementation issues include business relocation, site costs ect.

The Library Board has retained the services of a consultant who will make a site recommendation in 45 days. The Comprehensive plan will have recommendations for blocks in the downtown, that will have options for both the Library included and not. A set of redevelopment principals for the downtown will be established. These may be use to evaluate proposed new developments in the downtown as well as encourage new development patterns.

e. Next Steps
PDI and HNTB are now concentrating on recommendations and the outlines of the village-wide comprehensive plan. In the next 2 months PDI will meet with Village staff to review the draft document. Drafts of these documents and a preliminary study on annexation policy will be presented at the next committee meeting on May 16th, 2002.
Appendix

Village of Glenview Comprehensive Plan

May 23, 2002

Attendees:
Larry Carlson  John Hedrick  Mark Steger
Gail Anderson  Laura Ladd Bierman  Mary Beth Denefe
Donna Pappo  Chris Krueger  Rita Planey
Kent Fuller  Kerry Cummings  Joe DiMartina

Absent:
Rachel Cook  John Crawford  Michael Guinane
Andrew Olson  Doug Kaiser  Judy Beck
Steven Wolfsohn  Jeff Lerner  Susan Isenberg

Staff Present: David Sliktas, Marta Nelson
Consultants Present: Larry Witzling, Gaurie Redman

NOTE: Two committee vacancies: Ty Laurie resigned, and Anastasia Usher resigned from school dist. 34

Chairman Larry Carlson called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm

Introduction and General Overview:
March 7, 2002 minutes were approved with no changes.

Committee Meeting Discussion:

a. Introduction to the Comprehensive Plan Document
Larry Witzling discussed the process of developing the plan document. As the recommendations are the critical aspect of the plan PDI felt it would be appropriate for the Committee to review these very carefully in order to reach consensus.

b. Downtown sub area recommendations
The committee reviewed the recommendations for the downtown. (Attached is a copy of the draft recommendations).

Committee Member comments and discussion:

• Kent Fuller distributed a memo to the Committee encouraging the creation of a Redevelopment Authority to manage the revitalization and redevelopment of the Downtown.
• John Hedrick discussed the consensus reached by the Scenic Illinois Chapter of Glenview for creating a pedestrian friendly environment along Glenview Road and Waukegan Road from Dewes Street north to Lake Avenue.
• Donna Pappo questioned how to enforce district guidelines. Larry Witzling discussed a number of different options including the creation of a regulating plan that would be adopted into the zoning regulation thereby giving it the authority needed for enforcement. Another alternative would be the formation of a redevelopment authority that would work hand in hand with property owners and developers in creating a joint vision for the redevelopment.
• Larry Carlson questioned the issue of angle parking and safety. Angled parking is more a perception of danger, especially due to the greater number of large vehicles, than it actually is. This is may be due to two reasons one, vehicles on the street are far more alert in anticipation of cars backing into the street and two, the parked vehicle drivers are far more cautious in the process of backing into the street.
• Rita Planey wanted the guidelines to address the quality of the rear facades of developments. Often times much of the resources are spent in making the front of buildings attractive while the rear, which will be mostly seen by the adjacent neighbors, is ignored.
• Kent Fuller requested that the boundaries for the sub districts within the downtown be further refined.
• The regulation of architectural styles was discussed.
• The anticipated pressure for development of land adjacent to Jackman Park will be from the residential market rather than the retail/commercial market. The appropriateness of multi-family in this location and the preservation of the character of the residential neighborhoods west of Jackman Park were discussed.
• The transportation study and its results were discussed. Larry commented that in general the change in traffic has been between a plus or minus five percent. PDI will ask HNTB to verify the results and the methodology of gathering the information.
• Donna Pappo discussed the preservation of residential neighborhoods around the downtown district. The appropriateness of the R-18 district and validity of needing higher density to revitalize the downtown was questioned.
• Kent Fuller stated that the current zoning has been in place for many years and it has taken a long time for the associated development to occur.
• Options for preserving the existing single-family homes was discussed including the transfer of development rights and historic preservation.
• Kerry Cummings asked if there was a target density, which needs to be achieved to sustain the downtown.
• The committee requested PDI to study in greater depth the yield of residential units under current zoning and evaluate the appropriateness of the D-1 District.
Chairman Larry Carlson called the meeting to order at 7:10 pm

Introduction and General Overview:
May 23, 2002 minutes were approved with no changes.

Committee Meeting Discussion:

a. Downtown Density and D-1 Zoning Analysis
Larry Witzling presented the committee with PDI’s analysis of the D-1 zoning and residential density.

Committee Member comments and discussion:
- The notion of density vs. the character of place and maintaining diversity as more important issues was discussed.
- The question of how necessary high density is to the success of downtown, and how this can and should be achieved without compromising the quality of the downtown experience was discussed.
- Discussion on how to regulate architectural diversity within the D-1 district.
- What incentives can be given to developers to jump start redevelopment in the downtown?
- Methods of codifying development incentives were discussed.
- The desire for small-scale specialty stores (third tier retail) in the downtown and how they can be encouraged into downtown spaces was discussed. The possibility of the Village, for a limited time, paying the increment in rent for downtown retail space and the financial implications of this were discussed.
- It was commented that OLPH is an asset to the community and that its presence in downtown is important.
- Long term management of the downtown district not only to bring in new business but also to manage the mix of existing businesses in the long run was discussed.

b. Waukegan Road Corridor Recommendations
The committee planned on discussing this sub area at the next meeting. The schedule distributed at the last committee meeting has been pushed back by a month.

c. Next Steps
The next committee meeting will be on July 18th, 2002.

d. Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE # 11

July 18, 2002

Call to Order:
Chairman Larry Carlson called the meeting to order at 7:10pm

Roll Call:
Larry Carlson, Chairman  Dr. Chris Krueger  Steven Wulfsohn
Donna Pappo  Jeff  Lerner  Kerry Cummings
John Crawford  Rita Planey  Kent Fuller
John Hedrick  Susan Isenberg
Gail Anderson  Andrew Olson

Absent:
Rachel Cook, Mary Beth Dentef, Joseph DiMartina, Mark Steger, Laura Ladd Bierman, Michael Guinane, Doug Kaiser, Judy Beck

Staff Present:
David Sliktas, Village Planner, Jeff  Rogers, Planning Intern

Introduction and General Overview:
June 13th, 2002 minutes approved with the following changes:
"The desire for small-scale specialty stores (third tier retail) in the downtown and how they can be encouraged into downtown spaces was discussed. The possibility of the Village, for a limited time, paying the increment in rent for downtown retail space and the financial implications of this were introduced.”

Other Business:
• Committee member Kent Fuller requested a motion regarding a food store in the downtown district be added to the agenda;

Committee Meeting Discussion:
A. Waukegan Road Recommendations.
• Larry Wittling presented the committee with PDI’s recommendations for the Waukegan Road corridor.

• The Waukegan Road corridor and some of the recommendation provided for this sub area will be relevant to other community arterials within Glenview.

• The major community arterials in Glenview are; Milwaukee Ave., Waukegan Road, Willow Road, Lake Ave and Golf Road.

• There are three sub districts for the Waukegan Road corridor;
  o Waukegan North: Willow Road – Chestnut Ave.
  o Waukegan Central: Chestnut Ave. – Dewes Street
  o Waukegan South: Dewes Street – Golf Road

Committee Member comments and discussion:
• Committee discussed the improvements at the Saturn Dealership. The Village was able to require improvements in the landscaping as the dealership requested permits for improvements. This process should be formalized and clear guidelines for improvements developed for the Waukegan Road corridor.

• The committee discussed HNTB’s street improvement recommendations. The up coming rebuilding of Lake Avenue by IDOT and the need to coordinate the proposed recommendations with this reconstruction process was discussed. Dave Sliktas will inform the Village DPW of HNTB’s recommendations and determine if they are compatible with the IDOT Improvement Plan.

• The Village property at the northwest corner of Lake and Waukegan Road was discussed. When the re-development and sub division for Carillon Court was approved a public easement to the south was maintained to provide vehicular access to this site. The shopping center between the two above sites is clearly in need of improvement. Combining these sites should increase the number of redevelopment options for this area.

• Discussion regarding the type of grocery/food store at the intersection of Waukegan and Glenview was discussed. The term ‘major’ grocery store may not be the appropriate term. The possibility of a store similar to a trader Joes’ or Whole Foods seemed more appropriate. Larry Wittling added that the intention was to have a retail establishment (preferably a food store), which encouraged pedestrian activity at this important intersection.

• As this intersection is one of the busiest, it seems more suitable for a retail activity than a civic use.

• Kent Fuller requested that the Comprehensive Plan Committee take a position as to what components are critical components of the downtown and should remain. More specifically a Library more centrally located along Glenview Road and a food/grocery store at the intersection of Glenview and Waukegan Roads.

• The redevelopment process was discussed; PDI is proposing that a special purpose development district be created along Waukegan Road. This district would take a less aggressive role in the development process than that proposed for the Downtown District. It would give the Village authority to regulate and require the meeting of landscaping, parking, and signage standards as established by the Village. The redevelopment process could also improve traffic circulation among adjacent properties via easements.

• Currently the Village zoning ordinance does not have a uniform signage ordinance. PDI will supply examples of these.
• Currently Village policy requires a tree be planted for every seven parking spaces in the Glen. This standard is now being required on other development/redevelopment projects throughout the Village. This type of requirement should be incorporated within the zoning code.

Larry Witzling discussed the notion of establishing maximum parking spaces in order to encourage shared parking.

It will be important to have a coordinated signage package to reduce signage clutter along the street.

The Committee discussed examples of good signage conditions in Elmhurst and St. Charles. PDI will photograph these.

The committee discussed policing of non-compliance of operations and maintenance standards.

PDI will provide a typical block and diagram to illustrate how shared parking and limited access will work. They will also develop a photomontage showing proposed landscape, lighting and signage.

Implementation strategies were discussed. A review of the current ordinances will be done by PDI. It may be possible to create a signage overlay district.

John Hedrick reminded the Committee that Scenic Illinois had recommended that Waukegan Road be divided into four segments: Willow to Chestnut, Chestnut to Lake, Lake to Dewes and Dewes to Golf Road. This was important as the character of Waukegan between Lake and Dewes is far more pedestrian. It was referred to as the ‘Pedestrian Parkway’. PDI agreed with this designation and will change the sub districts along Waukegan Road.

Since Waukegan Road is a State Road what are the implications to the proposed improvement? Larry Witzling stated that the median would improve traffic flow, so it is expected that IDOT will be supportive of the proposals. This will be verified with IDOT.

The committee agreed unanimously their prior commitment to retaining a food store in the traditionally defined ‘Downtown Glenview’.

August 15th, Open House
The August 15th Open House to present the recommendations for Downtown and Waukegan Road will begin at 6:00 p.m. PDI will make a formal presentation at 6:45 p.m. and public comments will follow till 9:00 p.m.

Next Steps
The Committee will meet on August 29th to discuss sub areas A, B, C & D. (7:00–9:00 p.m.) and approve for a public Open House at a date to be determined at that time.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE # 12
August 29, 2002

Call to Order:
Chairman Larry Carlson called the meeting to order at 7:45 pm

Roll Call:
Larry Carlson, Chairman Dr. Chris Krueger Mary Beth Denef
Donna Pappo Jeff Lerner Laura Ladd Bierman
John Crawford Andrew Olson
Susan Isenberg
Gail Anderson

Absent:
Rachel Cook, Joseph DiMartina, Mark Steger, Michael Guinan, Doug Kaiser, Judy Beck

Staff Present:
David Sliktas, Village Planner

Introduction and General Overview:
As there was no quorum when the meeting began (two members had called and said they would be late) the meeting began with a general discussion regarding upcoming schedule.

The schedule for completion:
1. Thursday, September 19, 2002 : Public Meeting for Sub Areas A, B, C, D
2. Thursday, October 3, 2002 : Committee Meeting for Sub Areas H & F
3. Thursday, October 10, 2002 : Public Meeting Sub Areas H & F
5. Thursday, November 7, 2002 : 1st Committee Review of Comprehensive Plan
6. Thursday, November 14, 2002 : 2nd Committee Review of Comprehensive Plan
7. Saturday, December 7, 2002 : (Tentative) Public Meeting on Comprehensive Plan

Committee Meeting Discussion:
Larry Witzling presented the committee with PDI’s recommendations for the Old Willow Triangle (Sub Area A).

Committee Member comments and discussion on Sub Area A:

- The new residential referred to in the beginning of the recommendations should be identified as the Heatherfield Subdivision.
- The question was raised as to why residential should be included into this area. Larry replied that with the new Metra station and the many community amenities available within walking distance that residential development becomes a natural land use, as current land uses choose to change. Mary Beth Denefe agreed and stated that this seemed an ideal location to include opportunities for new residential that would not negatively impact the Village.
- Donna Pappo commented that the Village does not have a zoning category that would support such a mixed-use land use.
- The question was raised as to whether single-family homes would be a viable solution for this area; Larry Witzling replied that the existing parcel form would not allow for a reasonable plotting pattern.
- Andrew Olson commented that this plan addresses the long-term incremental redevelopment of the land. So that the inclusion of residential means that in Glenview’s long-term vision this area would be suitable for some residential.
- The question was raised as to whether the Village can ‘fix-up’ buildings.
- The cement factory is not a compatible use with the newer uses surrounding it. The discussion of any environmental pollution from this site was discussed.
- It was recommended that the streetscape began at the Metra Station should be continued along Old Willow Road.
- Larry Witzling commented that the policy for shared access and pedestrian movement maybe stated in one section of the Plan and referred through out other areas of it as appropriate.
- The policies for screening the service areas of area businesses will be strengthened.

Committee Member comments and discussion on Sub Area C & D:

Larry Witzling presented the committee with PDI’s recommendations for the Lehigh Triangle and the area south of Chestnut east from Lehigh to the Cemetery (Sub Areas C & D).
- This was the old industrial corridor along the train tracks and adjacent to the naval Air station. Surrounding land uses have changed in the last decade and have placed pressure for redevelopment in this area.
- Larry Carlson stated that critical to land use in this area is the newly created Lake Glenview. The intent of the Village is to maintain this lake as a public amenity and community asset. New residential development in the Glen was not placed immediately adjacent to the lake and its environs. This policy should be followed through with any new development adjacent to the Lake and Park.
- The question was raised as to whether the land could become open space. As this is all privately owned land it would imply the Village purchasing the development rights to this land. This did not seem feasible or cost effective.
- Mike Duncan an adjacent property owner requested an opportunity to make a short statement. He was allowed to do so as long as the discussion did not include the proposed development currently under consideration before the Village. The property owner requested that land use issues regarding the properties located along Chestnut Street, west of the railway, be considered as a separate entity from the Sub Area C district. PDI’s recommendations included Sub Areas C & D along with the above-mentioned area as one district. Andy Olson questioned as to whether the boundaries should be revised.
- Property owner Sherwin Feldstein also spoke. He stated that he has owned and operated a business in the area for 30 years. Currently along the western edge of his property there is a large berm that conceals his property from Lake Glenview. He proposed that this be continued in order to screen any new development along Lehigh from the Park and Lake.
- It was also stated that this area had about 8-9 property owners and that the Village should possibly sit down with them and consider the future of this area. The shifting market demands have affected the land value in the district landowners’ desires should be balanced with community and tenants needs.
- Small scale and intimate residential neighborhood, with some small commercial and pedestrian links to the park would be a long-term acceptable land use for this area.

Committee Member comments and discussion on Sub Area B:

Larry Witzling presented the committee with PDI’s recommendations for the Jefferson/Monroe Neighborhood (Sub Areas B).
- A number of critical issues in the area included cut through traffic from Waukegan and Chestnut Streets and also the incremental change in residential development in the area. The land historically zoned R-4 has been changed in areas to R-8 and R-18 zoning, the 1990 Land Use Plan identified this neighborhood as a high-density residential district.
- Historically the neighborhoods location, adjacent to major arterial (Waukegan Road) made it a suitable location for higher density town home development.
- Andy Olson and Donna Pappo both questioned the need to create a higher density residential district. They preferred to see the current housing (as needed) be replaced with small single family housing.
a. September 19th, Open House
The September 19th Open House to present the recommendations for Sub Area A, B, C, & D will begin at 6:00 p.m. PDI will make a formal presentation at 6:45 p.m. and public comments will follow till 9:00 p.m.

b. Next Steps
The Committee will meet on October 3rd to discuss Sub Areas H & F (7:00 –9:00 p.m.) and approve for a public Open House on October 10th, 2002

c. Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE # 13
October 3, 2002

Call to Order:
Chairman Larry Carlson called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm

Attendees:
Larry Carlson
Susan Isenberg
Donna Pappo
Jeff Lerner

John Hedrick
Andrew Olson
Joe DiMattina

Judy Beck
Steven Wollsohn
Rita Planey

Absent:
Rachel Cook
Chris Knueger
Mary Beth Denefe
Gail Anderson

John Crawford
Doug Kaiser
Kent Fuller

Michael Guinane
Mark Steger
Laura Ladd Bierman

Staff Present:
David Sliktas, Village Planner

Committee Member comments and discussion on Sub Area H:
Larry Witzling presented the committee with PDI’s recommendations for Milwaukee Avenue

- Comments received from Committee member Kent Fuller were distributed to attendees. They are as follows:
  - The recommendations remind us that this area is actually one of our Villages several business districts and deserves attention as such. It may be that it is time to review the annexation policy and assertively incorporate the area into the Village in both conceptual and legal terms.
  - Page 1 - first and fourth paragraphs: Change “County Park Preserve” to “County Forest Preserve”.
  - Page 1 – third paragraph: Delete “West” from West Lake Avenue.
  - Page 3 – third paragraph strike “Park” and insert “Forest”

- It was commented that IDOT’s SRA designation has a number of levels associated with it. Could Milwaukee Avenue receive a lower rating, possibly minimizing any long-term expansions of the facility?
- Discussion on tree planting policy. Larry Witzling commented that the impact of clusters of trees on
wider medians was far more affective in the long run. (It provides healthier plant conditions). The concept of establishing number of trees based on number of parking spaces was discussed.

• It was commented that berms used along Milwaukee Avenue in many of the industrial uses worked well and were aesthetically pleasing. A discussion followed on how to encourage commercial and retail properties to do effective landscaping and maintain them in the long run.
• Garden fences work well when they have masonry peers and planting.
• Accommodating bicycles and pedestrians along Milwaukee Avenue is critical.
• Providing safe pedestrian crossing throughout Milwaukee Avenue will be very important, especially at the new athletic facilities and Skate Park near the Zenith Property.
• It was commented that a recent proposal for a two-story mixed-use facility met with opposition from local residents. The opposition was to the height of the building not necessarily the building uses.
• A discussion on how to achieve landscape continuity along Milwaukee Avenue. A number of things were proposed, requiring a 20' landscape easement beyond the street R.O.W. and establishing standards for landscaping within the easement. The second was to create a Milwaukee Avenue Overlay Zone, with regulatory authority to require established landscape guidelines to be met.
• The proposed expansion of the Milwaukee and Lake Avenue intersection and how this will affect current land uses was discussed. It was requested for PDI to do some preliminary sketches to show how this intersection may develop in the future.
• It was decided that the annexation discussion would be held off till the recommendations for Sub Area F were discussed.

Committee Member comments and discussion on Sub Area F and the Draft Annexation Policy:
Larry Witzling presented the committee with PDI’s recommendations for the Greenwood and West Lake: Sub Area F and outline for the Village Annexation Policy
• Committee Member Kent Fullers Comments:
  o Change the name of West Lake Avenue. The name is confusing. It dates back to before Lake Avenue (originally East Lake Avenue) was extended west of Waukegan Road East Lake now extends all across the Village. West Lake is now geographically north Lake Avenue. An entirely new name is needed. One possibility is to change it to Chestnut as was done with a portion of it, which was located east of the air station.
  o Page 3 F: Last word should probably be wetlands, not woodlands.
  o Page 3 III. a) “Continuous Alignment” is OK up to a point, but rigid set backs to exactly the same distance is boring and unnecessary. Some variety is desirable.
  o Page 4b) “limiting the variety of tree and shrub species” should be clarified. Substantial variety

is desirable. Uniformity is boring and invites disease.
• A discussion of the need for annexation as the Village grows was discussed. All of Sub area F and much of Milwaukee Avenue is still under County jurisdiction.
• Undesirable land uses will change with shifting land economics.
• This neighborhood is the western door way to the Glen and should be in the Village.

a. October 10, 2002
The October 10th Open House to present the recommendations for Sub Area H & F will begin at 6:00 p.m. PDI will make a formal presentation at 6:45 p.m. and public comments will follow till 9:00 p.m.

b. Next Steps
The Committee will meet on November 7th to discuss the Draft Comprehensive Plan. (7:00 –9:00 p.m.)
c. Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.
Call to Order:
Chairman Larry Carlson called the meeting to order at 7:10 pm

Roll Call:
Attendees:
Larry Carlson  John Hedrick  Joe DiMattina
Andrew Olson  Judy Beck  Susan Isenberg
Donna Pappo  Jeff Lerner  Gail Anderson
Beth Primer  Chris Krueger  Kent Fuller
Mark Steger  Doug Kaiser

Absent:
Rita Planey  Steven Wolfsohn  Michael Guinane
Laura Ladd Bierman  Mary Beth Denefe  John Crawford

Staff Present: David Sliktas, Village Planner
Mary Bak, Director of Development
Jeff Brady, Planner

Minutes from Committee Meeting No. 13 were approved.

Committee Member comments on Draft Comprehensive Plan:
Committee Member Kent Fuller speaking on behalf of the Natural Resources sub committee appreciated the integration of much of the background information provided by them into the document. He also distributed his comments regarding the draft plan. Two additional requests, one for an in depth inventory of natural resources within the Village and two for an environmental action plan for the Village were made.

This action plan may include a clear definition of “what nature is in Glenview”, programs for developing partnerships to foster environmental issues. PDI will meet with the environmental sub committee to further investigate incorporation of these concepts. The Comprehensive Plan will identify these components in its implementation section.

Committee Member Judy Beck stated that merely meeting water quality standards should not be acceptable the goal should be to aspire for higher standards. The village falls within multiple watersheds. PDI will obtain watershed mapping from Village to incorporate into plan. (This information may also be available through NIPC or the EPA homepage).

Discussion regarding SUB Area C & D began with the concern for combining the two areas. Members felt that Sub Area D the area along Chestnut should have a different set of guidelines from Sub Area C – The Lehigh Triangle. PDI will separate these two areas.

Discussion regarding the future of development along Lehigh. It was felt that the current uses served an important role within the community. Despite the added value of Lake Glenview, this area should remain industrial, at least for the foreseeable future. It was discussed that an overlay district may be created here to address issues of visual quality and landscaping.

PDI and HNTB will be providing the Village with Traffic Projections for the Downtown District.

The annexation Policy and recommendations for the Milwaukee Avenue were discussed. PDI is waiting for final information from Village departments to complete the annexation policy. A map outlining unincorporated areas and possibly identifying a scale of importance for the Village in terms of annexation will be created. Environmental criteria will also be taken into consideration in the annexation policy.

Committee Member John Hedrick distributed his general comments on the plan. They included a concept for a Vision Statement. A discussion regarding the vision statement ensued. Members will forward ideas to PDI for the generation of a clear Village Vision.

PDI Outlined the next tasks to be undertaken and completed in order to finalize the plan
1. General Edits and grammar check
2. Reduce Redundancy
3. Appendix and Graphics
4. Tool Box – including sample guidelines, annexation policy
5. Downtown Traffic Estimates

Committee members will forward there edits to Dave Sliktas to forward to PDI for incorporation.

a. Next Steps
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE # 15

January 9, 2003

Minutes from Committee Meeting No. 14 were approved.

Tool Box Draft Recommendations are reviewed:
• Public Policy
• Regulatory
• Funding

Next Steps
Next Committee meeting will be on April 7, 2003.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE # 16

April 7, 2003

Minutes from Committee Meeting No. 15 were approved.

Review of Chapters 1 - 6 of the Draft Comprehensive Plan:
• Table of contents
• Formatting and classifications
• Labelling and map layering
• Reduction of redundancy
• Staff edits and revisions
• Update census information - for the Glen, obtain special census
• What are we trying to achieve? - a statement of intent “Vision”
• In the vision statement - highlight of what is important, housing, traffic, commercial, annexation
• PDI will develop a vision and pass it to the members for review
• In 10 years - where do we want to be?
• Describe the final product
• Define sub areas
• Move 2.1 to Planning Process and then add sub areas
• 3.6 create a narrative and refer back to it

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE # 17

May 22, 2003

Minutes from Committee Meeting No. 16 were approved.

Review of Chapter 7 of the Draft Comprehensive Plan:
• 7.5 - rent full
• Landscape elements re: Lake Avenue
• Reinforce statement re: strong edges along major arterials.
• Discussion re: residential above commercial along community corridors
• Multi-family to single family percentages
• Location in proximity to amenities

Next Steps
• Annexation Policy
• Next Committee meeting will be on July 17, 2003.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE # 18

July 17, 2003

Minutes from Committee Meeting No. 17 were approved.

Comprehensive Plan Committee reviews the recommendation for Chapters 8 & 10 of the Draft Comprehensive Plan
Next Steps

- Transportation

Next Committee meeting will be on October 9, 2003.

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE # 19**

**October 9, 2003**

Minutes from Committee Meeting No. 18 were approved.

Comprehensive Plan Committee reviews the recommendation for Chapters 9 of the Draft Comprehensive Plan with HNTB.

**OPEN HOUSE**

**September 19, 2002**

**Sub-Area A, B, C, & D Meeting Notes**

**Attendees:**
General Public (approximately 35 participants)

**Introduction and General Overview:**
6:00– Public meeting started

The recommendations for the four sub Areas; A-Old Willow Triangle, B-Jefferson/Monroe, C-Lehigh Triangle and D- Chestnut south from Lehigh to the Cemetery were presented by Larry Witzling.

**Summary of Public Comments:**

Following PDI's presentation of the recommendation, the meeting was opened for the public to comment. It was reiterated that these are draft recommendation and that the final recommendations will take into account input from the general public. The recommendation text in its entirety will be on display at the Village Hall for public review.

**Question/Comment:**
The owner of North Shore Racquet Club wanted to know what the TIF moneys would be used for in her area (old Willow Triangle). She had concerns regarding the increased tax assessment and whether it would have a direct positive impact on her business.

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE**

**September 20, 2001**

**Sub-Area A, D, & F Meeting Notes**

**Attendees:**
General Public

**Introduction and General Overview:**
6:12– Public meeting started

Gaurie speaking…. who we are…what we are doing.

Why is it necessary to have a comp plan? It is what you interact in and it address changes. Traffic is a major component for this and HNTB is a sub-consultant that will work with us.

Committee has identified 8 sub-areas. Today we will cover three of them: sub-area A, D, and F. As stakeholders in these areas, we want to here what your concerns are for these areas, whether it is landscaping, parking, etc.

Larry Witzling: We are here to gather public input; a survey will be put out soon; we have 4 committee meetings now and we have done a traffic study and worked in the downtown area. What we are showing is not the end of the plan, we are here to gather you’re input and issues into the planning process. So far the committee has identified some issues and we want to verify this information as well as identify anything new that you may bring up.

We will first talk about sub-area A to allow people to move to the school board meeting.

Large show of hands for whom wants to speak about area F, a few to talk about A, few more to discuss D.

Gaurie describes the boundaries.

Larry Witzling: “Boundaries are approximations”. F wins.

**Summary of Public Comments:**

**Sub-Area F**

Gaurie: What we have heard so far, you are unincorporated and you are forced to live with these development pressures. What are your concerns?

**Question/Statement:**
George Segal: We understand that we can be incorporated at any given time. We would like to see sidewalks, maybe some sewers, but keep our small community. We would like to see square footage

**Response:**
David explains annexations issues...the village is not able to force annexation but will be able support petitions

Question/Statement:
Bill Rodman: Talking about petition near Pickwicks...not all areas have signed the petition for annexation. I would like to support Georges statement for single-family, but I do not believe that multi-family homes is appropriate for the area since our area backs up to the area. We see some value in the sewers but we have restrictions of where we can connect. What we really want is to take advantage of the police protection, and we see this as an advantage.

Question/Statement:
Lady: We support Bills statements, but the building codes are different and we don't have any fire hydrants. I see the annexation as a way to protect the neighborhoods and properties.

Question/Statement:
Guy: He is not particularly interested in annexation. My property is adjacent to...what is happening to our back yard is our first concern. We want to maintain the open space and we are concerned with multi-family bringing more traffic. Pickwick and Thornwood area, I would rather see the land redeveloped as single family not multi-family

Question/Statement:
George Segal: Who is here from west side of Pickwick...James will support annexation and wants to keep concern towards storm water storage. Currently, there is much problem with proper drainage. Finger pointing ensues and we find that the most say it is Glenview's problem. I don't know that we need to change the zoning, but multi-family will only enhance the drainage problems. Northfield Township does provide us brush removal three times a year and I would like to see Glenview follow this pattern including quality snow removal. I don't want our services decrease in quality.

Question/Statement:
Dorthy: The Northfield Township is the only place to supply the services of plowing and something with sanitation. The current service from the township is adequate.

Question/Statement:
Mark Ryan: What types and costs are pushed onto residents that become annexed?

Response:
Dave: We don't have that information here, but cost maybe in line with $2 per 1000 gallon of water and .85 per 1000 gallons of sewage.

We have talked to the Village but we are not sure if we will be required to use the water of the village. As an area we will have a say of how we should finance this.

Larry Witzling: Should we have a separate sign up sheet for those wanting annexation procedures and costs. Large shows of hands for those who want info.

Dave: I didn't think that annexation was going to be a major issues tonight so I am not prepared.

Question/Statement:
Frank Balisc: I have a field that has a ditch in it and whenever it rains I have storm water drainage problems. It backs to the county and no one made provisions as to where things were going as they continued to develop, we need to have someone to look at this.

Response:
The comprehensive plan has/will have stated goals that can and will contain statements for stormwater issues and will make recommendations for improvements.

Question/Statement:
Gene: I live in a multi-family area and would like not to annex. The streets that have been beat up but truck traffic are you going to pay for this? Why don't you reroute this traffic elsewhere? Dust everywhere...the potholes...the sewers, why are new developments sending there stuff through the our pipes that we paid for?

Response:
Larry Witzling: I cannot answer your questions regarding sewage needs and procedures, but typically, there are agreements between them that deal with such issues.

Question/Statement:
Guy in vest: It concerns me that new traffic will try to come through the residential neighborhoods, we would like to ensure that the west side of the Glen does not funnel through where kids are.

Response:
We should have this issue closely looked at.

Response:
HNTB identified some issues of cut through traffic. The last open house this very issue brought up, so our engineers will be looking at ways to minimize this impact.

Question/Statement:
Judy Rodman: I want to support area for annexation and we did bring petitions around our area (2 blocks).

Response:
Dave: Since there is a lot of interest in annexation, we will make the issues and information available to anyone that wants it.

Larry Witzling: Again, we want to identify the planning issues.

Question/Statement:
Tony Zuberus. We are zoned for multi-family, and I support Rodman's decisions for there property but some issues must be identified for other area. Perhaps it should be more closely looked at...site by site...for some multi-family instead of all of single-family.

Response:
Larry Witzling: Okay.
Question/Statement:
Women in red shirt: When are you going to fix the facilities that you have damaged.

Response:
Larry Witzling: David can answer this better, but we are here to get planning issues, so what you are saying is that we need to consider outside grievances and should be addressed in the comprehensive plan.

Question/Statement:
Dorthy: Single-family homes are multi-family…you are showing incorrect.

Response:
Larry the construction type is one thing but the use is different. No plan is every correct.

Question/Statement:
West Lake Avenue needs to be taken care of. The Village needs to be better represented, you are doing a good job, but we are not getting the answers that we want. We want good landscaping, but we need to know what the Village is going to do what is going on. We are family run businesses and have been there for 30 years, we want curbs and lights continued. Maybe this can become a major thoroughfare to keep traffic out of neighborhoods.

Response:
We understand that West Lake Avenue is important so how restricted are you, the Village of Glenview, on making these improvements. You need to make it a priority to take control of West Lake Avenue.

David and Larry Carlson: the purpose of tonight’s meeting is… the second meeting we will get some answers for you. We have some difficulties with roads continuing without annexations… he continues on with talks of Pickwick and West Lake Avenue… a little politics.

Larry Carlson: I agree and that is why we should take annexation into consideration.

Question/Statement:
Torry Semrose: Does zoning change and annexation changes need to be unanimously approved. I have land zoned with different zoning from the Village and Cook County. The county is zoned for 16 units, but the Glen is saying that only 7 units are allowed. Why is the Village blocking my building permit?

Response:
Larry: David answered this earlier, but the other part of your questions is that there are differences in zoning ordinances and master plans. There are different regulatory issues. Mary to respond to building permit: it is a very complicated planning issue. The official map of the Village suggests a very low density, because we have the authority of plat approval and we have control on areas that are potential water taxing. You need to talk to Dave at a planning meeting level.

Question/Statement:
What are the positives for commercial?

Response:
Larry: What are the cost issues of providing these services and what are the taxing revenue issues

Question/Statement:
Bill Mueller: Two concerns, storm drainage… Elmdale and Pickwick… land erosion is happening. Traffic and Pickwick is the other. Traffic and traffic is and will continue to be a problem.

Response: Okay.

Question/Statement:
Peter Erwin: Annexation… most of these uses are likely to be non-conforming, so what would happen to us if we were annexed? Would we be grandfathered in?

Response:
Larry Witzling: Your talking about ‘legal non-conforming’
GAURIE: This map does not show all current developments.

Question/Statement:
Betty Sheldon, Sub-Area D: General Concerns…aesthetic impacts and its relationship to value, the other question is the quality of what goes inside of these buildings…we need something with long-term value. Of course, traffic will be a problem with any new development. The Glenn has caused traffic problems on Chestnut and Johns Drive.

Response:
Larry Witzling: Your comments imply that you accept that something will develop, but your concern is in the quality, correct?

Question/Statement:
Jeff Claybe, Sub-Area D: I would like to see things stay the same, traffic has increased, but we would like to have an appearance committee. And we are not necessarily looking for any zoning.

Question/Statement:
Attorney for Wayne Linker, Sub-Area D: Changing the zoning to single-family would seriously make negative impacts on his land. He would not be able to sell the land for commercial development for a higher value.

Response:
These are not recommendations.

Question/Statement:
Jan Duesy, Sub-Area A: The Old Willow Swim Club is a private club. Since becoming part of Glenview nothing has changed for us. We are included in the Glenn TIF. Why has the TIF money not been used to improve our area? We want assistance in bringing in sewers.

Response:
What other activities would help improve the use of your property?

Question/Statement:
Jerry Kreo (Mechanical Shop), Sub-Area D: I’m looking for information. This is a long-range plan, when will it become effective…will it make immediate impact on the existing zoning?

Response:
We are twelve months away from completion of a plan. The plan is intended to guide the future of change.

Question/Statement:
Natalie Torskolisy: Is this going to impact any changes in what we want to make? I don’t want to make investments in to my property for fear of it being at risk. We don’t want to change our zoning from industrial to single-family. Actually, we don’t care as long as we are grand fathered.

Response:
It might. Some expansions will require conditional use permits and some will not. Let me explain grand
Appendix

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE

October 25, 2001
Sub-Area B & E Meeting Notes

Attendees:
About 55-60 attendees

Introduction and General Overview:
Subarea B—Jefferson/Monroe/Rogers Avenue
Subarea E—Waukegan Road Corridor

PDI’s Gaurie Rodman and Larry Witzling give an overview of the planning process.

They introduced themselves and stated that the purpose of the meeting was to hear from property owners and residents. Rodman and Witzling stated that some issues have been brought to their attention, including traffic; how development along Waukegan Road affects property behind it; and the aesthetics of Waukegan streetscaping.

Larry mentioned the need for guidelines to be included in overall plans.

John Hedrick is introduced—his comments are detailed in “Detailed Discussion Notes.”

An HNTB representative also makes remarks, which are included in “Detailed Discussion Notes.”

Summary of Public Comments:
1. Speakers were concerned about the uncertainty of Village plans for zoning and development in Subarea B, and due to these concerns, had questions about investing in their homes at this time. Issues raised by speakers include:
   a. Concern about the introduction of multi-family houses into the predominantly single-family neighborhood in Sub-area B (near Jefferson/Monroe/Rogers). It was stated that the single-family homes gave the neighborhood cohesiveness, and that the neighborhood had a unique country-like character that residents hoped would be preserved. A resident specifically questioned what maximum height the Village would allow for dwelling units in this area. Concern was expressed that large multi-family units would be “packed into” smaller lots or laid out like in a “single string.” It was hoped that if there was further development, there would be the incorporation of green space. A speaker said that perhaps a median was needed to accommodate turns.
   b. Concern about the introduction of multi-family houses into the predominantly single-family neighborhood in Sub-area B (near Jefferson/Monroe/Rogers). It was stated that the single-family homes gave the neighborhood cohesiveness, and that the neighborhood had a unique country-like character that residents hoped would be preserved. A resident specifically questioned what maximum height the Village would allow for dwelling units in this area. Concern was expressed that large multi-family units would be “packed into” smaller lots or laid out like in a “single string.” It was hoped that if there was further development, there would be the incorporation of green space. A speaker said that perhaps a median was needed to accommodate turns.
   c. Concern about the run-down appearance of neighborhood near the fenced property and the lack of certain amenities. A speaker who resided on Melise Drive (near the fenced-in property) said some roads in his area lack curbs and gutters, and that the drainage is bad. He also expressed a need for sidewalks, and believed certain amenities had been paid for, but not delivered.
   d. Concern about multi-family rezoning action for the area to be discussed by the Village on November 13

2. Many raised concerns about TRAFFIC in Sub-area E. It was stated that much of the traffic in Glenview simply was “passing through”—that southbound traffic on Waukegan Road was endless. Various speakers described traffic difficulties associated with negotiating Waukegan Road, and cited the following issues:
   a. Concern about getting children to school safely around the Grove Street intersection
   b. Concern about the amount of traffic around the Jefferson Street intersection
   c. Concern about the egress between the Lyon School (1335 Waukegan Road) and the bank. The speaker stated there was way too much traffic, and drivers could not easily get in and out of these locations.
   d. Concern about the inability to turn left from Waukegan between Chesnut and Lake. This has been an on-going concern for 5 to 10 years. Cars turning left are backing up traffic, and cars turning left into the Village Hall were most likely doing so illegally. A speaker suggested adding a traffic lane, and added that curb cuts were terrible and needed to be “widened out.” A speaker said that perhaps a median was needed to accommodate turns.
   e. Concern that development of The Glen would most likely increase traffic counts. It was then asked how the Village planned to accommodate anticipated increases in traffic due to the development of The Glen.
   f. Concern about the Village’s ability to change Waukegan traffic flow since it was a State Road
   g. Concern about additional traffic lights.
   h. Concern about difficulties in turning off Waukegan Road to use businesses
   i. Concern about “cut through” traffic involving Sunset Road, Wagner, Woodlawn, Glenwood, and Patriot
   j. Concern whether Glenview was coordinating traffic concerns with the rest of the region
   k. Concern about the zoning along the Waukegan Corridor (needs re-evaluation).

3. A committee has been studying the Waukegan Road Corridor and has noted that:
   a. Sub-area E corridor lacks overall context for design
   b. Sub-area E needs consistency in signage
   c. Sub-area E landscaping is inconsistent

Detailed Discussion Notes:
John Hedrick made some comments about working on beautification along Waukegan Road.

Hedricks said:
A Committee is working on ways to improve appearance of community.
Approximately 20 people on the committee meet regularly. He stated that while the committee discusses aesthetics, the committee is also concerned that there is no overall context for design.

The overall philosophy, he said, is that a good village image is good for business and property owners.
He said the committee had identified 4 separate sections:
1 - gateway from Golf;
2 - gateway area from Willow to Winnetka or Chestnut;
3 - commercial core from Winnetka to Lake Avenue;
4 - the area from Lake to Craft (could be more of a pedestrian pathway)

He said the landscaping is inconsistent—a lot of deciduous trees with no berming

More uniform planning approach to highlight some area

Consistency in signage

Street addresses are not consistent

Architectural category—very subjective—Caroline Square is high point

Northwest corner of Lake and Waukegan—not so good

Hedrick then showed a rendering from a volunteer

He has prepared an itemized list, with transitional ideas…need to move towards consensus

Some properties are curiosities—people will differ on perceiving these curiosities as gateways or detractions

In conclusion, Hedrick says he is just offering initial comments, and that he invites others to participate and join the committee.

Larry added the comment that differing landscapes along roads is typical in many communities

Larry did informal survey of crowd:
About 8 are property owners or both property/residents
Overwhelming majority were residents
About one-half thought traffic was problematic
About less than one-half thought appearance was problem
Only a handful were concerned about streets parallel to Waukegan Road

HNTB representative explained that a transportation study will study selected intersections and streets; analyze future traffic trends; and suggest possible calming strategies.

A resident then asks about an area 2 blocks west of …He is concerned about how the Glen will be developed and how any increase in traffic flow will be handled. He asked “what are village’s plans to accommodate additional traffic?” He added that traffic is not just from Glenview, that there is considerable “traffic that passes through.”

Another speaker commented on southbound traffic on Waukegan road. He stated that the flow of traffic is endless (Jefferson and Monroe), and that there was a problem with traffic is cutting through.

Larry stated that this traffic situation would be studied.

Another speaker asked, “What impact can village have on changing traffic flow on a state road? Is there an ongoing dialogue between government entities?

Larry said that it was true that the village cannot change the traffic controls without State approval, but that it is worthwhile to have a plan on record and be able to state what you want.

HNTB added that more signals is not necessarily the answer; the right spacing and timing will be looked at first.

Larry added that improvements in signalization are likely to be part of solution…. timing of lights is usually key to the solution.

A speaker stated that parents in the community know the egress on Waukegan Road near the school is problematic. The speaker described the road as the “Waukegan 500” he also added that there was a “Grove 500.”

A resident asked what was the Village’s vision for Sub-area B.

Larry explained that the purpose of the meeting was to learn what residents want so that a plan – or vision - can be drawn up.

A resident from Sub-area B stated that he liked his neighborhood’s country-like feel. He expressed concern that any increased development would ruin the character of his neighborhood. He said he didn’t like new developments where homes are set in a single string. He referred to this as “Glen Light”

Larry commented that property changes due to order of land economics.

A speaker from Sub-area B (lives on Jefferson) stated that his neighborhood was mostly single-family houses. He did not want to see housing units too tall, in order to preserve the country-like feeling.

He was concerned about new development being “really packed in there.”

A speaker from the State Financial Bank spoke about the egress between Lyon School and the bank. He said it was terrible to get in and out of school and bank. He said, “Please look at this…there is too much traffic.”

Another speaker stated that between Chestnut and Lake, there is a need to widen the road to add a lane. He stated that when a car turns left, it stops and backs up traffic. He also said the curb cuts are terrible…too sharp…need to widen out. The need for a median for turning was suggested. A speaker said it was even difficult to turn into the Village Hall…people do it illegally.

(Larry) Curb control lanes are safer, even though they don’t allow as many left turns
Larry asked the crowd, “How long have left turn movements been a problem?” The general consensus was between 5 and 10 years.

A Rogers Avenue resident, who is an architect/contractor wondered about the maximum height of new buildings. Right now, he said, the area had cohesion—it was mostly single homes. He didn’t want the neighborhood’s character destroyed. He was concerned that multi-family dwellings would create a cookie cutter effect. He also asked what issues define land economics?

Larry said that there is a natural market for changes in land development and that no agency can control this…land economics is ultimately influenced by the overall desires of community.

A speaker said he had reservations about investing in his home due to uncertainties he perceives. He stated that he has had three different plans for his home, but due to moratoriums, other restrictions, and uncertainties, he has not been able to move forward.

Larry said that ideally, a Plan would give stability to satisfy residents, but still give flexibility for change….so when house are sold, you get best price.

In response to a question, it was stated that the Plan commission wisely said, there is an issue here…plan needs to address this. The process for this Plan begins by listening, and then making recommendations. Approved recommendations will then become part of plan.

In response to questions, it was stated that traffic on John’s Drive, Leon, Patriot Blvd, and the area east of the tracks was being studied, as well as the reconfiguration of Lehigh.

A resident who lives in a town house on Jefferson complained about the fenced up area near her home.

Another speaker from Sub-area B stated that there are many single-family housing, but if multifamily housing is added, it should be done in such a way that owners of single-family homes feel comfortable in investing in their property. He said that preserving and delineating park/green areas would be helpful.

Some speakers mentioned the different stages of development:

- Residents have cited problems with cut through traffic due to Waukegan Road traffic trends
- Residents are concerned with disposition of fenced-in land in Sub-area B

Larry asked Dave Sliktas to check on the public notice for re-zoning. Dave checked and confirmed that there is a proposal for a zoning change that will be discussed Nov 13.

A resident on Jefferson said he lived near the chain fence, and stated that the fenced-in property was an eyesore. He said the fence was not keeping all people out, and that the houses are deteriorating. He reiterated that it seemed that no one seemed to own the land.

Larry named areas where there were concerns so that a Plan can address the issues. Larry summarized some of the comments he had heard including:

- Sub-area B was a unique gem of neighborhood (Jefferson/Monroe/Rogers)
- Residents liked the character of Jefferson/Monroe/Rogers area
- Residents want more certainty so they can invest in homes
- Residents have cited problems with infrastructure
- Residents have cited problems with cut through traffic due to Waukegan Road traffic trends
- Residents are concerned with disposition of fenced-in land in Sub-area B

A resident of Sub-area B again asked about the fenced in area—which he said was a large area. He wanted to know what can be done about this area. He asked, “What are you bringing to the table?” He said he wanted to come to a meeting where actual recommendations are made, so he can respond.

Gaurie explained that the community was still in the information-gathering stage and that there were still several more workshops to conduct as well as stakeholder interviews. Gaurie estimated that recommendations would probably be presented in February.

A resident who lives in Rogers Avenue said he had gotten a notice from the Village concerning multi-family re-zoning for his neighborhood. He said the meeting was for Nov 13, and questioned whether this proposed rezoning would circumvent the ongoing planning process.

Larry asked Dave Sliktas to check on the public notice for re-zoning. Dave checked and confirmed that there is a proposal for a zoning change that will be discussed Nov 13.

A resident on Jefferson said he lived near the chain fence, and stated that the fenced-in property was an eyesore. He said the fence was not keeping all people out, and that the houses are deteriorating. He reiterated that it seemed that no one seemed to own the land.

Larry stated that usually there is a process of code enforcement to take care of this.

The resident went on to say that they are not getting answers from village.

Another resident asked if the corner of Jefferson and Monroe could be considered for a 4-way stop.

Larry Carlson responded and said that there are state guidelines for stop signs (have to have certain number of cars exiting area)

On another matter, Carlson also commented that the chain link fence was keeping small children out of the site. He also commented that neighborhoods are in transition while construction is going on.

More comments were made on increased traffic on Waukegan Road. A speaker said it was like driving in a pinball machine, and that a driver had the feeling he could get wiped out by people coming or going. He said it was a completely untenable situation and that he wanted the zoning (B-2???) along the Waukegan Corridor re-evaluated.

Larry took a moment to again state that the meeting is an opportunity for the community to express its concerns so that a Plan can address the issues. Larry summarized some of the comments he had heard including:

- Residents liked the character of Jefferson/Monroe/Rogers area
- Residents want more certainty so they can invest in homes
- Residents have cited problems with infrastructure
- Residents have cited problems with cut through traffic due to Waukegan Road traffic trends
- Residents are concerned with disposition of fenced-in land in Sub-area B

A resident of Sub-area B again asked about the fenced in area—which he said was a large area. He wanted to know what can be done about this area. He asked, “What are you bringing to the table?” He said he wanted to come to a meeting where actual recommendations are made, so he can respond.
A resident from the West side of Grove Avenue, near train station, said that stop signs do not work.

A speaker said he was frustrated in trying to get answers to questions from the Village. He said he wanted to see answers, and that he was very agitated and tired. He wanted to see action and real plans in response to residents’ questions.

In response to a question, Larry stated that as a property owner, you have the right to do what is allowed under currently zoning ordinances and legal procedures.

Speakers again commented on the fenced-in property saying that they had requested that the area be cleaned up, and that buildings be demolished (applause)... but village attorney turned it down. A resident said the Village told him that the Village put up the fence to prevent dumping on the property.

A speaker said it seemed that the owners are not responsive. A speaker said he felt the chain link fenced area wouldn’t get resolved for a decade.

Dave Sliktas said he would get the speaker’s name and try to answer questions about the fenced in property.

Larry said he was hearing the following general comments:
- residents are having difficulty getting responses concerning the fenced-in area
- residents have asked about demolition
- residents are concerned about a lack of maintenance on existing property
- residents feel there is uncertainty about zoning, particularly in light of the rezoning to be discussed November 13 before final recommendations come out of the ongoing planning process

Residents said traffic “cut through areas” are serious on Sunset Road, Wagner Road, Woodlawn and Glenwood, and they want these traffic areas looked at. It was added that patriot was used by drivers who don’t want to use Waukegan Road.

It was asked if the traffic lights could be staggered on Waukegan Road so that motorists can turn left?

HNTB answered that ideally, this is what you would want and that it needs to be addressed.

HNTB said that when the lights get timed, traffic moves in clusters. A large number of cars go through, then there is a gap. However, the gap can disappear if everyone is trying to turn left into and onto a property. It is hard to arrive at the right timing.

A resident asked if Chestnut Avenue would remain two lanes.

HNTB responded that, at this point, there is no plan to expand it more than 2 lanes.

A resident asked if Waukegan Road, as well as other streets, can be managed to allow motorists to stop to use businesses. He said that currently, Waukegan Road is used to go through the village to get from point “A” to point “B.”

In response to a question, Larry said that this region is going to have more and more traffic—with or without The Glen. That this is a problem that needs to be fought on all levels.

In response to a question, Gaurie said, “We would anticipate making recommendations on zoning.”

A resident asked, “What is the Village doing to coordinate traffic problem with other communities?”

Gaurie described the regional traffic process. It was commented that there is countywide planning—but it is not always effective... no one community wants the traffic.

A resident made the suggestion to connect Lake Street and Lehigh.

A resident from Sub-area B said they liked their neighborhood, that it was like a small pocket in a growing community. He did not want to see huge multi-family houses jammed into small lots.

A speaker said he had called the Village to clean up abandoned houses, and that he would like better, safer streets.

John Hedrick said that he would like to further discuss general appearance issues at another meeting and that he would welcome anyone to participate in the group.

Dave said there was a sub-area meeting on Milwaukee on Nov 15 and on the downtown on Dec 13.

A resident said she hadn’t received a survey.

Dave said that the surveys were sent out to same address used for the Glenview newsletter. He assured everyone, that anyone could still fill out a survey. He had some available now.

Meeting Adjourned
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE

October 11, 2001
Sub-Area C Meeting Notes

Attendees:

Introductions and General Overview:
Special Sub-area: Area C

PDI's Gaurie Rodman and Larry Witzling gave an overview of the planning process. It was explained that PDI is updating the Village’s overall Comprehensive Plan, as well as addressing several Neighborhood Plans. Over the last few months, PDI has been collecting base information, doing mapping, and preparing a land use map—PDI is updating 1993 maps.

Dave Slitkas said about one year ago, his department was directed to look at possibilities for the future of the Lehigh Avenue triangle area. He stated that the Village had prepared packets for tonight’s attendees to take home. The packets had copies of an ordinance approved by Village Board, which explains future land use for this area. There is also a resolution that states that the Village will not condemn any property.

Amy Anard from the Village planning staff spoke on the road improvement project for the Lehigh area, which will extend from Lake to Willow Road.

She explained that the road is currently in Cook County, but that Glenview is looking to have it transferred to the Village.

She said road improvements are 100 percent funded by Cook County.

She said EDA also did some funding for a traffic signal.

Overall, she said this could be a 2-year construction project, during which access to all driveways will be maintained. She said it would involve a new road surface and storm sewer system, as well as lighting and landscaping. She said they hoped to award contract in January.

Next meeting of the committee will be Nov 15.

Summary of Public Comments:

Speakers addressed the following:

1. Concern about the Village condemning buildings to facilitate a comprehensive plan that called for new residential or commercial development
2. Concern by building owners over the uncertainty of the Village’s intentions, which in turn made it hard for them to make investment decisions at this point
3. Resistance to relocating businesses that have been held by residents for 2-3 generations
4. Willingness to accept the idea of commercial development, and even residential, provided that it did not limit the ability to conduct current businesses
5. Concerns about the speed, shoulder width and safety of Lehigh Avenue
6. Questions about widening Chestnut eastward towards Lehigh Avenue
7. Bike path locations
8. Concern that increased traffic creating more safety issues
9. Questions about the possibility of business zoning, or other zoning changes
10. Question about the likelihood of multi-level buildings
11. Questions about the addition of a drive or access point to current property
12. Concern about regaining and protecting access points to current property
13. Support for aesthetic improvements

One speaker suggested strongly that the speed limit on LeHigh be reduced from 45 mph. He said the traffic is way too fast, and that it will only get worse with more people moving into area, and with the development of The Glen. He suggested reducing it to 35 mph.

Amy (Village planning staff) explained that the design of the proposed road is geared to slow people to 20 mph near train station. She added that due to construction, traffic would likely become congested and slows naturally.

Another attendee said he thought there should be a big paved shoulder on one side of the road (east side of LeHigh, particularly to accommodate semi’s) near Standard Plumber, Pete’s…. He stated it was a safety issue.

There were conversations regarding bike path locations, especially along the west side of the industrial property adjacent to the Glen.

In summing up some of the comments, Larry said that over the long term, there will be bike traffic, pedestrian traffic, and truck traffic all contributing to increased safety issues.

A property owner asked if business zoning was currently encouraged in this area. Dave Slitkas stated that the past plan did favor changes to business zoning, but that the new plan would revisit this issue comprehensively and it could be continued or revised.

Larry asked if this would be good for the resident’s property. The owner stated that he thought it would, but that he may want something that might be better. He said he appreciated the discussion process.

Another owner stated that he had a 2-story building, but was interested in adding a story, and asked that this issue be looked into.

An attendee said that Merrill Lynch had earlier done a study with multi-story, multi-level family housing. He stated that part of his property was shown as a parking lot, and that there was no indication as to how he would be compensated for his property, or if there was a way for him to remain on his property and continue to run his current business. He said many people in Glenview thought that the Village would condemn property to
facilitate the plan.

He added that said several people in Glenview had owned their property for 2 or 3 generations. He said that there was a non-monetary value to this. He stated that many did not want to relocate, and were not bent on getting the highest dollar value out of their property.

Several residents were concerned that new residential or commercial development might lead to condemnations or other changes that would limit their ability to conduct business.

The owner of Stone Cutters said that some access points to his property had been closed. He indicated that truck access east of the tracks; southward to Chestnut had been eliminated using weight limits. This area should be looked into.

An owner in the southwest area had questions concerning a future road indicated for the bank lot. He said it appeared that the driveway would only benefit the bank.

Dave stated that the driveway was not set in stone. Someone else wondered if the drive way was left over from a previous plan.

Larry said that there is a strong correlation between property value and access points, and that the drive may have come about to maximize the property’s use and value in the future.

Owners seemed receptive to the idea of making aesthetic improvements

Several owners had expansion plans, and one in particular wanted to add a story to his building

Several seemed willing to accept the idea of commercial development, and even residential, provided that it did not limit their ability to conduct business.

Owners were concerned that the uncertainty of the village’s intentions made it hard for them to make investment decisions at this point

Owner in southwest also had questions about future widening of Chestnut eastward to Lehigh

Larry explained the relationship of long term planning to future changes in zoning and that this did not constitute spot zoning. Current zoning was not being challenged

Larry also noted that current businesses provide jobs, property, and sales taxes, and that this was an advantage to the village

Larry also indicated that owners seemed to agree that protecting access to businesses and creating guidelines for buffers between uses would facilitate transitional development patterns in a fair manner

Meeting Adjourned

OPEN HOUSE

October 10, 2002

Sub-Area F & H Meeting Notes

Attendees:
General Public (approximately 25 participants)

Introduction and General Overview:
6:00—Public meeting started

Larry Witzling presented the recommendations for the two sub Areas; F – Unincorporated Glenview and H - Milwaukee Avenue Corridor.

Summary of Public Comments:
Following PDI’s presentation of the recommendation, the meeting was opened for the public to comment. It was reiterated that these are draft recommendation and that the final recommendations will take into account input from the general public. The recommendation text in its entirety will be on display at the Village Hall for public review:

Sub Area F Question/Comment:
Residents (4) of Timber Trails subdivision did not get the survey. What information was used in determining the need for lane increases? If Milwaukee Ave. is increased to 6 lanes, will it not make it more difficult to cross and get in and out of the existing subdivisions? Where is the needed R.O.W. obtained from for the lane increases? Are the existing businesses going to lose the little green space they have in the front? They do not have much green space currently.

Sub Area H Question/Comment:
Does an annexation guaranty improvement such as sewer/water service? Residents are interested in annexation in order to receive village services.

Multi-family resident – Lake in the Glen was filled, now there are flooding problems. Regular flooding since the Glen was developed. Why is she getting billed for sewer from the Town and the Village?

In favor of annexation. Main issue – can annexation protect neighborhoods from development? Detailed information should be mailed out to the unincorporated areas regarding annexation and the process involved.

Would like to maintain the single-family environment in the neighborhood, would not like more multi family. Lived in the same neighborhood for the past 16 years, stormwater drainage has become an issue since the Glen has been developed.
Trees are plugging the creek, sewer backing up; stormwater and sewer need to be separated.

Water is a problem since the Glen has been developed. Is there a detailed plan for stormwater management? Can the level of the lake in the Glen be adjusted and controlled? It could be a solution to the flooding.

Resident in area H, former employee at the Naval Base. The Army Corp of Engineers built a retention pond years ago to eliminate the flooding problems from surrounding areas including area H. The Glen has filled in that specific retention pond; currently, it is a nursery.

What impact will annexation have on affordability?

Meeting Adjourned at 8:30 p.m.
expanded library (110,000 square feet). He recommended that PDI speak with neighboring communities, such as Wilmette, Niles and Prospect to help determine whether their library expansions were beneficial to their communities.

5. Questioned how plan would be implemented in light of his experience with zoning decisions that seem arbitrary

Speaker Scott Foremen said that currently developers are frustrated with the community’s zoning procedures, and have difficulty knowing what is feasible ahead of time. He expressed the comment that zoning seemed arbitrary. He questioned how the Comprehensive Plan would be implemented so that it would be effective.

6. Stated that results of local survey by Waukegan Road Improvement group generally support recommendations/observations of PDI, including:

   a) Notion that different segments of Waukegan Road have different characters
   b) Incremental installation of medians on Waukegan Road
   c) Further improvements/landscaping to enhance the appearance of Waukegan Road
   d) Placement of centerpiece at Lake and Waukegan
   e) Locating library in downtown with small landscaped public area

   Speaker Gary Bruckner of Scenic Illinois Glenview Chapter that supports improving the quality and appearance of Glenview.

7. Recommended development of vision statement

Speaker: Norma Morrison, 822 Lenox Road, urged development of a Vision Statement that would verbalize the kind of community Glenview will be and guide future decisions of the community.

8. Opposed quasi-urban developments with 3-story buildings in commercial district

Speaker Norma Morrison

9. Favors homey residential neighborhood with small scale retail district

Speaker Norma Morrison favored homey residential neighborhood with small-scale retail district. Cited 1800 block of Glenview Avenue as a model. She favors angle street parking with narrow sidewalks that bring storefronts closer to pedestrians. Norma greatly appreciates residential aspects of Glenview.

Other comments/concerns received by PDI staff include:

10. Concern that one-hour limited street parking in the area of Pine and Prairie is difficult for business

   Speaker: Kathie Peterson

   Husband has law office at 1029 Pine, and finds that clients are inconvenienced by having to move cars during appointments due to parking limitations.

   The speaker also stated that there was difficulty renting out space they own in this area due to the parking issues.

   It was suggested that some kind of special use permits be made available, or consideration be given to extending the parking hours. Previously, parking was unlimited.

11. Concern about lack of Village parking due to METRA spaces near Dewes West

   Speaker: Tony Mariella

   Mr. Mariella is condo president of new housing at 1800 Dewes. Two commercial units should be in place in near future.

   Although there is limited interior parking, it is somewhat inconvenient.

   Would like to work with METRA to free up some parking spaces particularly up against the Railroad tracks to help the parking situation.

Open House Concluded at 9:15 p.m.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE

December 13, 2001 Sub-Area G Meeting Notes

Village Hall, Glenview, Illinois

Attendees:
Over 200 in attendance

Introduction and General Overview:
Sub Area G: Downtown D-I District

Larry Witzling and Gaurie Rodman gave an overview of the planning process, including discussion of the household survey, and an explanation of the open house/workshops designed to obtain perceptions about the sub-areas from residents/property owners.

Summary of Public Comments:

1. Condemning properties – is it part of any of the plans? Hobby store owner, successful business owner for 9 years, parking has not been an issue. Lot of the stores cannot move, lot of seasonal customers who would not know if business is moved. Traffic and parking density will be increased if there is mixed uses (retail with condos).

2. Bob Anderson – private resident, would like businesses to stay where they are.

3. Kenneth – orthodontist, speaks against C-3 recommendations, does not want more retail space, there is enough vacant retail spaces. Had a business, the village wanted building he owned, when he was not willing to sell, the village condemned the building, and made him move out. Now the village wants to do the same. Leave things as they are.

4. Ed Teski – lived in village since 1964, likes the community, would like suggestions, which will lead to a final concept to be published, leave north stuff alone, rather go south. Leave the businesses alone. Let’s not get hung up on architecture; successful commercial areas are not uniform in architecture. Could use a gallery, bakery, and financial facility to complement what is already here. Incubator building for artist, first floor retail, second floor small rent able art studios. 200-300 seat theatre. Post office is third on the services needed in the village; village should make an offer to the post office that they cannot refuse. John’s Drive industrial area would be best suited for the post office. Glen is competing with downtown; the downtown is continuously undercut by all the new development.

5. Richard – 34-year resident. The village has not faced the failure of d-1 zoning and plan; empty storefronts are a proof. Why is it so difficult to deal with the empty storefronts, the village has hired 2 consultants in the last few years.

Common sense concepts:
A. Façade renewal – on a selected basis, no need for a complete tear down; not all facades are unattractive down town, this would preserve the businesses
B. Parking – as long as we continue to build more and more 3-story condos, we will not have enough parking in the village. Angled parking could work here.
C. Dump the d-1,
D. Library – we all know the library is a major draw for all the downtown businesses. The Library needs to be extended, but wants to keep it where it is, community does not want to loose the draw. The library board wants a 100,000 square feet, which eliminates the possibility for the downtown location. Expand the present library with 20,000 sq ft additions using the ebco paint property, parking would be underground.

6. Sharon – Tearing down the businesses is not in the interest of the village. Likes the existing stores. The businesses deserve the community’s support. Appearance could be simply fixed and upgraded with façade improvements. Two major vacancies in the 1800 block, both are attributed to retirement. Village should require a new business for the Reneckar’s site, a senior center would be ideal in that location, this would increase pedestrian traffic.

7. Elizabeth – has lived in the community since 1955. Pleased with the use of citizens groups and committees. The community needs to talk to one and other to come up with an effective vision for Glenview. A citizens advisory group should be created. The community should understand the boards and commissions have their usual meetings besides these public meetings.

8. Burt – public relations firm, has been on Glenview rd for 30 years. In support of retailer in 1800 block, what is done to keep people here in Glenview to shop, village should help retailers to keep shoppers here. Reneckar’s did not leave because of retirement, village should have helped Reneckar’s to stay. The village has to help retailers to promote. Great community.

9. John Smith – is not crazy about tearing the 1800 block down, would like to keep library in its current place.
10. Cat's meow – would like to stay where he is at, no category on survey to include his business, no hobby store listed in the survey, parking is in the back, there is no indication for visitors that they can park in the back.

11. Harry – AAA Lock and Key – 110 parking spaces in the back of business, village board should change the d-1 zoning, retail will not work on dew street, retail, offices and library will bring people to the down town, façade improvements would help make down town look better. Spend some money to help existing retailers, leave as is, and help retain it. Get rid of d-1 for Optima to help them survive. Loves the fact that he can walk down town.

12 Patricia Kelly – retail merchant for 12 years, took 8 years to become profitable, does not want to see retailers go. The village needs to help; a simple spelling change on her sign took 3 months, affordable space rental. Would loose business if she would have to move. Resident owned store works as safety for children.

13 William Burkhard – since 1951, seen a lot of changes, was not aware of earlier plans. Village has spent a lot of time and money on planning, concerned about coming up with a plan when the village is in the middle of construction, once a plan is started, everything should be frozen, how can one plan for something that is already being changed. Worked in a credit union, village promised façade improvements and street scraping, including angled parking, but it did not happen so the credit union moved. In favor of keeping businesses, façade improvements should happen. Deerfield is beautiful. Do not tear down stores, unify the fronts and change some of the architecture, help the retailers

14. Luann – resident with 2 kids in public schools, against major revitalization, number one issue, library – needs to come up to speed now, community does not have 15 years to wait, likes it at Glenview and Waukegan. All options suggest keeping library downtown, library does not necessary needed to save the businesses of downtown, and library could include and should senior center

15 Ralph – born and raised in Glenview, generations in Glenview, does not want to see 3 story buildings downtown, does not like Optima, keep 1800 block as is, need family restaurant, no more coffee shops.

16 John - Member of comprehensive committee – in favor of appearance issues of community, tries to work with retailers and community, current variety of architecture and setbacks are important elements of whatever is done downtown, some historical reference is important, but should be compatible, neon framing around windows in the down town is an issue also.

17. Post office – years ago the Saturn site was open, we are not interested in 25 years, what can we do now; the issue is what can be done now, people had enough of tear downs, save what is left, we want action right now. Get together and work together, cannot just rely on the trustees.

18. Brian Barret – realty group – seen a lot of business aspects, recent Glenview is a fine community because of the people who live here, levels of retail – first is necessities, second is clothing and such and third is crafts and hobbies. Down town is a tertiary retailer. They should not be torn down. Get rid of d-1. it does not serve the purpose. Mixed uses will bring more people down town, Glenview is based on mixed uses. If downtown is to be revitalized it should be done all the way with new zoning.

19. Bob – dental practice – tearing down the 1800 block has a huge impact on the downtown, nobody will rent and no new retailers will come in with the threat of tear down. How can a retailer plan effectively when they cannot count on the village. Planners and the village need to take into considerations the individual businesses’ losses if they have to move.

20. Dentist – chamber of commerce – this are only concepts, one of the concepts his building is gone, the planners are just looking at changes that will happen, the committee did not decide on taking a whole block down, is happy about how many people are here tonight. Maybe d-1 needs to be reconsidered

21 resident for 46 years – does not agree with tear downs, the difference in architecture and setbacks is what gives the area a character, have not had any problems with parking, keep things as is, does not support d-1 zoning,

22 Deno Voss – Voss realty – found the article in the paper chocking about the tear down, watched the development of the Glen, he watched the input on the Glen, but things did not happen, how is this different, how are tonight’s input and the surveys included in the overall plan. As a realtor, concerned about vacancies. Down town should remain as is, has 4 letters of intent from retailers who is interested in the Renneckar’s building. Look at d-1 zoning; village should hire a commercial investment director.

23 resident – keep down town as is, Renneckar’s could be a restaurant or bakery, needs professional people downtown, across Washington street could offer a site for the addition for the library. Library should stay as is
24. Jack Ryan – owner of flower store, have already lost businesses due to the article, optima building location, how many of the businesses that used to be on that site are still in Glenview? How can he negotiate with landlord because of not knowing what will happen. The village should tell retailers if they want them or not. Feels no support from the village, how many years does he have?

25 Harry Pearl – resident – downtown area needs some help, but mostly support, encourage more businesses to come in, do it with zoning and façade improvements, need to create atmosphere for mixed uses and first floor offices. Village should try to help not make major changes that will hurt the businesses.

26. Resident and library board member for 8 years – explained the process of space needs study for the library to the audience. Explained the need for such a large library. Cannot wait years with a new library

27. Resident – would not mind if there was a new library built somewhere other than downtown, but there should be a library downtown

28 Downtown resident – does not want more multi unit housing, keep downtown as is, improve facades, needs a facelift, no multi story buildings either

29. Resident – used to be called uptown, not downtown, liked the common sense ideas. Glenview is not sure of what it wants to be. Parking is not an issue. Improve the looks of existing parking areas. No need for big stores in Glenview. Village hall could move some of its offices to downtown to generate more pedestrian traffic and fill vacancies (need to renew dog tags, licenses, etc. could generate a lot of people).

Meeting Adjourned

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE

June 21, 2001
Sub-Area G Meeting Notes

Attendees:
About 20-25 attendees

Introduction and General Overview:
PDI’s Gaurie Rodman and Larry Witzling give an overview of the planning process. They introduced themselves and stated that the purpose of the meeting was to hear from property owners and residents. The consultant’s briefly discussed their morning meeting with representatives of the Glenview Chamber of Commerce and the site walk-thru with Larry Carlson, Donna Pappo, Dave Sliktas and Mary Bak.

Summary of Public Comments:
The issue of parking in the downtown area was discussed. Some of the existing public parking is not clearly marked therefore it is underutilized. For instance, there is public parking at the optima east development.

Information regarding the market needs to be obtained from the retail consultants.

The questions of why come downtown? What are its attractions and amenities?

There is a perception of not having anything to do downtown and that the existing businesses downtown are not thriving.

There is a need for an exciting plan that can be implemented.

The downtown physical and social characteristics need to be defined.

Downtown was seen as the
Heart of the community
Needs smaller specialty shops
Needs restaurants
Potential to create a ‘Civic Row’
Need to create aesthetically pleasing public places with mixed uses, pedestrian friendly.

Focus on nighttime activity
Create a strong sense of place.

Downtown Constraints/Challenges:
Traffic
Density of housing development in the area
Aesthetic quality
Some existing shops/uses: unattractive and/or undesirable
Concern regarding vacancies
The management of open space
Parking – where and how to improve
The potential impact of the Glen

Larry Witzling discussed the concept of density:
More traffic vs. creating more pedestrian presence
Getting thru vs. safety

The Strengths of the Downtown:
OLPH (the School)
The Library
The existing stores such as the shoe store and the hardware store
Vistas down Glenview Road
Downtown is clean and safe

Larry Witzling outlined the next steps in the planning processes, the workshops, household surveys and the stakeholder interviews.

Meeting Adjourned

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE
November 15, 2001 Sub-Area H Meeting Notes
Village Hall, Glenview, Illinois

Attendees:
Over 20 in attendances

Introduction and General Overview:
Sub Area H: Milwaukee Avenue Corridor

Larry Witzling and Gaurie Rodman gave an overview of the planning process, including discussion of the household survey, and an explanation of the open house/workshops designed to obtain perceptions about the sub-areas from residents/property owners.

Summary of Public Comments:
It was noted that Waukegan, Glendale, Milwaukee are among traffic corridors getting special study

A speaker asked if PDI could explain improvements to Milwaukee area corridor.
Larry explained that none had been proposed, as this was an information-gathering phase.

A resident noted accessibility problems going north, to Sanders Road—stated that a bottleneck develops and cars back up.

Rod Greco—added that the Intersections at Sanders and Lake is a jam from 3 to 7 pm.

Another resident from the Timber Trails neighborhood agreed, saying she had to turn onto Milwaukee in order to get out of her neighborhood—and it was as jammed in the morning as well when she had to leave for work. There is a light at Sanders where it meets Milwaukee, but it is not helping effectively.

The owner of the building at 3510 said you can not get in and out of her establishment—can not make a left turn if going north.

A speaker had questions about Milwaukee from Lake Street going south to Golf and asked if there was a comprehensive plan?

Larry: There is a comprehensive plan, but this process is to revise that plan
Zoning regulates all the land, and that determines your rights as to what you can or cannot do, or whether you need to request a change.
Comprehensive plan will not change zoning, but may change direction of zoning

Dave S: Village Board is using this process to seek to change plan that was adopted in 1990

In certain areas that seem that commercial is appropriate, there seems to be appearance of residential development…notice another residential area on Milwaukee that seems to be cropping up in areas close to commercial areas. Refers to post office that was ONCE TO BE BUILT --- questions whether there is something afoot to get Milwaukee residential…

Would rather see the development kept commercial, which is the character of the street….the residential development seems inconsistent….would like to see greater consistency for street (does not view introduction of townhouses as positive or wise)

Larry: We saw a very diverse land use pattern some clear retail nodes around Milwaukee and Sanders, and perhaps at a different scale, there are smaller nodes….. from a planning perspective you could argue that the subcomponents would have character in smaller areas

Resident: will plan make it clear as to how much residential and commercial will be expected in next 20 years?

Larry: yes that is our intent

Was there a post office intended for the area?

They looked, but no strong support

Area seems to be seedy….overall street needs sections developed for retail. The street does not have a focus.

Larry: how does a plan change the nature of an area? Changed did not happen overnight…it takes years. Visual character of street can take place more quickly…streetscaping plans can do a lot to change perceptions

Mike Dally…has office on Milwaukee Ave….long time resident……get updated base map….many facilities are not represented on maps in front of room tonight

This area used to totally unincorporated, and probably explains some lack of continuity in development of this street…..also, intersection of Milwaukee and Sanders is horrific…good Milwaukee designated as strategic road…could be 6 lane road… but this

Intersection,……gaps are insufficient….business owners are correct about accessibility….traffic flows well once you get past south of Glendale road

Resident: From what I can tell, a six-lane road would destroy businesses and destroy the parkway

Restaurant owner speaks to traffic and notes difficulty customers have turning into or leaving his business--- good idea to consider a turning lane near center …traffic is fast and there are accidents

Larry: Due to increases in regional traffic flow, there will be continual pressure to take arterial road and turn them into wider roads. A traffic study is a major component of this planning process

Mike Dally speaks again and suggests that one way to create gaps is to install intermittent signals…change warrants (do a study that proves whether a signal is warranted)

Context sensitive traffic planning…..new jargon……

Residents say that part of the problem may be due to impact of 5000 employees of All State, and suggest that All State help finance road that runs directly west like a frontage road in order to alleviate congestion during rush hour…would they work in partnership with village….at times security police are directed traffic in and out. You can sit there for 30 to 45 minutes to go from Sanders to entrance of timber trails….all state contributes significantly to problem

LARRY: WE CAN ASK TRAFFIC ENGINEERS TO GET SOME NUMBERS

Mike Dally…..agrees with comments by residents of Timber Trails, and also supports some kind of employee count

Larry we could ask All State if they had studied this issue and arrived at any other considerations

Also, Arthur Anderson and household finance are in the area
PDI AND HNTB TRAFFIC MEETING NOTES
20 December 2001

- Discussed the concerns of Glenview's future growth.
- If the Village stops developing today, Glenview's traffic would still increase over time.
- Discussion of Milwaukee Avenue becoming a 'small freeway'.
- Milwaukee Avenue was discussed as a Strategic Regional Arterial (SRA).
- Potential to redevelop a 20' median down Waukegan Ave.
- Discussed what the median would do to existing businesses' access drives.
- Discussed the cost (social and economical) of not having Willow Road continue through.
- Discussed HNTB's draft of a Traffic Report for the January 17th meeting.
Appendix

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Village of Glenview and the surrounding area have experienced unprecedented development pressure in the past 20 years. The Comprehensive Plan is intended to guide the Village in its planning efforts over the next 10 years. This survey is one component of the community participation process in the development of the Plan. In addition to this, stakeholder interviews, community wide open houses and sub area workshops have been scheduled to discuss issues, ideas and recommendations in depth. Please take a few minutes to tell us who you are and to share your views and opinions about Glenview. Your responses will be confidential but, feel free to have any question blank. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1. Resident status:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner in Glenview 95.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter in Glenview 2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not live in Glenview 1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business owner in Glenview 0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business renter in Glenview 0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2. Residence location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 17.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3. Your sex?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male 43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 56.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4. Age?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-9 34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19 40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29 18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-44 18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64 24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-84 17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+ 32.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q5. In which residential building type do you live? (If applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family 79.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family (2-6 units), non-elderly (includes townhouses, apartments, condos) 10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family (+ units), non-elderly (includes townhouses, apartments, condos) 9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family, elderly 1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q6. How many years have you lived in Glenview?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 20 20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own property, but don’t live in Glenview 0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q7. Do you plan to move in the next 5 years?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No 84.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, within Glenview 15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, outside Glenview 0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q8. Please tell us something about yourself, work and/or affiliation (Check all that apply):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business owner/operator 21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building owner (other than your own home) 5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer 6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q9. Number of children (under 18 yrs.) for whom your household is their primary residence:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 69.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ 0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q10. Please indicate your entire household income:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-$29,999 5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-$59,999 15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000-$89,999 19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90,000-$149,999 28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000-$199,999 13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000-$499,999 15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000+$ 3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q11. What type of property do you own in Glenview, other than your own residence?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial or industrial property on (Road/Street) 1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential property on (Road/Street) 7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t own any other property 80.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q12a. Of these are within walking distance from your home?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shopping district 58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church/Synagogue/Place of worship 39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 58.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park or open space 75.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library 29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of employment 7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus stop 68.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train station 33.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q12b. If yes, which of these do you walk to (Check all that apply):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shopping district 31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church/Synagogue 12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park or open space 59.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library 16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of employment 3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus stop 12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train station 19.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q13. How many members of your household are employed for more than 30 hours per week:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None 29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ 0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q14. Where are the primary places of employment for adult members of your household (check all that apply):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenview 19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northshore outside of Glenview 28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago 29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other suburbs (not Northshore) 20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the State 2.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15. How do the adult members of your household get to their place of employment (check all that apply):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work at home/Telecommute 10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private automobile 64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car pool/van pool 3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus 1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk 2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train 16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RETAIL AND BUSINESS

Q16a. How often do you use/shop at these businesses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Retail</th>
<th>Almost Daily</th>
<th>About 2-Weeks</th>
<th>About 1/Week</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grocery</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakery</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delicatessen</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug store</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home furnishings</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware store</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video/music store</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy center</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florist</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoe store</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q16b. What type(s) of new business uses do you WANT to see in Glenview?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>2-3/week</th>
<th>1/week</th>
<th>1/month</th>
<th>No Want</th>
<th>Don't Want</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q17. Where do you shop, and how frequently, other than for groceries and drug store items?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Glenview</th>
<th>Almost Daily</th>
<th>About 2-Weeks</th>
<th>About 1/Week</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown/Glenview Road</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Oak Plaza</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carillon Square</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza Del Prado</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Creek</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Glenview</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q18. How do you rate the visual appearance of retail areas in Glenview?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village Crossing</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Somewhat Good</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Somewhat Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village Crossing</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oak Mill Mall</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Somewhat Good</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Somewhat Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oak Mill Mall</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dining & Entertainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>2-3/week</th>
<th>1/week</th>
<th>1/month</th>
<th>No Want</th>
<th>Don’t Want</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office &amp; Institutional</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Somewhat Good</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Somewhat Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office &amp; Institutional</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious institution</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Somewhat Good</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Somewhat Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious institution</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial office</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Somewhat Good</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Somewhat Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial office</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial institution</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Somewhat Good</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Somewhat Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial institution</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business signage</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Somewhat Good</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Somewhat Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business signage</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall image – architectural style</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Somewhat Good</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Somewhat Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall image – architectural style</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q19. How do you rate the overall quality of each of the following in Glenview?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Facilities</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Somewhat Good</th>
<th>Somewhat Neutral</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm sewer</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water service</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer service</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional street (maintenance)</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm water drainage</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping convenience &amp; quality</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cultural facilities (e.g. museums, galleries)

Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Very Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown on Glenview Rd.</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a planned development including open space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Very Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q20. How important is each of the following factors when considering plans for new residential development?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-family development:</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form of ownership - condominium or rental</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-use for elderly housing</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-use for single family</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specified for multi-family</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In business/industrial park</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In small commercial nodes</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural quality and materials</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of ownership - rental or owner</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal traffic impact</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffering from other residential uses</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive use for elderly housing</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a planned development</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q21. What factors are important when considering plans for new Retail/Office Development?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown on Glenview Rd.</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a business/industrial park</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In small commercial nodes</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural quality</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of ownership - rental or owner</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal traffic impact</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffering from other residential uses</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q23. How much of an annual property tax increase would you accept, to spend on any of the items in Q22?

- $0  24.4%
- $1 - $50  33.0%
- $51 - $100  24.8%
- $101 - $150  8.8%
- $151 - $200  8.3%

Q24. Please rate the following roadways as to traffic and circulation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Congested at peak hour</th>
<th>Opposite</th>
<th>Right</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan Rd. &amp; Willow Rd.</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan Rd. &amp; Chestnut Ave.</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan Rd. &amp; E. Lake Ave.</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan Rd. &amp; Golf Rd.</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan Rd. &amp; Golf Rd.</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenview Rd., Harlan Ave., &amp; R.R.</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenview Rd. &amp; Sherman Rd.</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenview Rd. &amp; Greenwood Rd.</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenview Rd. &amp; Milwaukee Ave.</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Lake Ave. &amp; Greenwood Rd.</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Lake Ave. &amp; Sherman Rd.</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Rd. &amp; Sherman Rd.</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Lake &amp; Roscoe Ridge</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Lake &amp; Willimac</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan &amp; Forest Ridge</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Rd. &amp; Pfingston</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Rd. &amp; Landwehr Rd.</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Ave. &amp; Landwehr Rd.</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q25. How do you feel about the following transportation related statements?

- Strongly Agree
- Strongly Disagree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Undecided

Please refold with this page outside, tape closed and place a $.34 stamp in the upper right hand corner. Also available are free drop off box locations inside the main entrance to the Police Department lobby of Village Hall from 8 am. to 4 pm. Monday-Friday. Other locations include the Glen Park District Center at the Glen. Please return by October 31, 2001 Thank You.
## Village of Glenview Comprehensive Plan

### Population Demographics

#### Change in Population 1980-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmette</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Wilmette</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenview</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Glenview</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Village of Glenview Comprehensive Plan

### Population Trends 1960-2020

#### Development Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Rate of Expansion</th>
<th>Density (per acre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Village of Glenview Comprehensive Plan

### Housing Units, Occupied Units by Tenure, and Average Household Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Absolute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comparative Community Household Numbers (1960-2020)

#### Change in Population 1960-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenview</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>7,108</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>34,876</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>11,023</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>34,876</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbrook</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>11,391</td>
<td>12,203</td>
<td>23,608</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmette</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>9,720</td>
<td>10,039</td>
<td>23,608</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naperville</td>
<td>Lake &amp; Cook</td>
<td>29,101</td>
<td>43,751</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheaton</td>
<td>DuPage</td>
<td>4,038</td>
<td>8,875</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Heights</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>9,344</td>
<td>14,197</td>
<td>34,876</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix E.2.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenview</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>2,678</td>
<td>2,116</td>
<td>5,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>2,074</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbrook</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>2,575</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmette</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naperville</td>
<td>DuPage &amp; Will</td>
<td>14,450</td>
<td>10,482</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo Grove</td>
<td>Lake &amp; Cook</td>
<td>2,373</td>
<td>2,884</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Ridge</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheaton</td>
<td>DuPage</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Heights</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>1,953</td>
<td>1,772</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palatine</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>10,360</td>
<td>2,403</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Appendix E.2.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State of Illinois</th>
<th>Median Home Value</th>
<th>Cook County</th>
<th>101 Other Counties</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenview</td>
<td>$235,600</td>
<td>$102,100</td>
<td>1,344,362</td>
<td>10,670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix E.3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>1990 Median Family Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenview</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>$67,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>$62,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbrook</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>$62,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmette</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>$81,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naperville</td>
<td>DuPage &amp; Will</td>
<td>$67,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo Grove</td>
<td>Lake &amp; Cook</td>
<td>$62,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Ridge</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>$61,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheaton</td>
<td>DuPage</td>
<td>$60,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Heights</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>$60,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palatine</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>$57,377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix E.3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MUNICIPALITY</th>
<th>1990 Median Age (in years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naperville</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbrook</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmette</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naperville</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo Grove</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix E.4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>1990 Median Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenview</td>
<td>Cook $67,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>Lake $62,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbrook</td>
<td>Cook $62,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmette</td>
<td>Cook $81,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naperville</td>
<td>DuPage &amp; Will $67,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo Grove</td>
<td>Lake &amp; Cook $62,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Ridge</td>
<td>Cook $61,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheaton</td>
<td>DuPage $60,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Heights</td>
<td>Cook $60,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palatine</td>
<td>Cook $57,377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Employment Trends (1960-2020)

#### Appendix E.5.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenview</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>30,302</td>
<td>39,758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>11,782</td>
<td>14,956</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbrook</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>41,263</td>
<td>50,510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmette</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>7,670</td>
<td>9,471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naperville</td>
<td>DuPage &amp; Will</td>
<td>51,093</td>
<td>90,425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo Grove</td>
<td>Lake &amp; Cook</td>
<td>12,683</td>
<td>33,544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Ridge</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>18,749</td>
<td>24,068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheaton</td>
<td>DuPage</td>
<td>20,375</td>
<td>26,733</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Heights</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>52,850</td>
<td>59,335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palatine</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>29,098</td>
<td>40,594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment (Changes)

#### Appendix E.5.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Absolute Change</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenview</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>(30,302)</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>(11,782)</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbrook</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>(41,263)</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmette</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>(7,670)</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naperville</td>
<td>DuPage &amp; Will</td>
<td>(51,093)</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo Grove</td>
<td>Lake &amp; Cook</td>
<td>(12,683)</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Ridge</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>(18,749)</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheaton</td>
<td>DuPage</td>
<td>(20,375)</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Heights</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>(52,850)</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palatine</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>(29,098)</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment by Industry (1990)

#### Appendix E.5.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Glenview Employed Persons</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Cook County Total</th>
<th>Chicago MSA Total</th>
<th>State of ILL Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1,421</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Professional Services</td>
<td>5,285</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail and Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>4,129</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>2,899</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance, Real Estate</td>
<td>2,537</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Services</td>
<td>1,675</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Mining, Construction</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Communication, Utilities</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18,805</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment for Occupational Category (1990)

#### Appendix E.5.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Glenview Employed Persons</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Cook County Total</th>
<th>Chicago MSA Total</th>
<th>State of ILL Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive, Administrative &amp; Managerial</td>
<td>4,369</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Speciality</td>
<td>4,130</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Executive Professional</td>
<td>8,499</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>3,887</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative (Support) and Clerical</td>
<td>2,635</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision Production, Craft &amp; Repair</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operators, fabricators, Laborers</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical (Support)</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, Forestry &amp; Fishing</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix
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Ten largest Employers within Glenview

Appendix E.5.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th># of Current Employees</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Sq ft - office</th>
<th>Contact Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kraft (Division Headquarters - 1 Kraft Ct)</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>525,000</td>
<td>Lynn Galya - 847.998.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABT - 1200 Milwaukee</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>18,862</td>
<td>Rosemary - 847.967.8830 or 919.3700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AON - 1000 Milwaukee</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>390,550</td>
<td>Karen McDonald - HR - 847.953.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenbrook Hospital - 2100 Pfingsten</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>33.24</td>
<td>352,179</td>
<td>Natalie - hr (847) 657-5800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraft (Research and Development - 801 Waukegan)</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>19.65</td>
<td>351,500</td>
<td>Lynn Galya - 847.998.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITW/Signode - 3610 W. Lake</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>Al White (847) 657.4471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anixter</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>184,264</td>
<td>Lisa - 847.729.1906 or 657.9281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenview School District - 6 sq miles</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Benoit - personell - 847.299.1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman - 1900 E. Lake</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>847.729.3001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarantee Trust - 1275 Milwaukee</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>Cheryl Cussen for acres &amp; sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenbrook South High School  - 363 HR</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>Peggy Mueller (847) 486.4707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American Corporation of Illinois - 257</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>Jackie - 847.832.4000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Village of Glenview

Parks and Recreation Facilities

Appendix E.6.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation Facility</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Vehicular Access</th>
<th>Horseback riding</th>
<th>Hiking Trails</th>
<th>Bike Trails</th>
<th>Walking Path (in Miles)</th>
<th>Dog Walking Path</th>
<th>Sidewalks</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village of Glenview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Tot Lot</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole Park</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Side Park</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunliff Park</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diederich Park</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flick Park</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flick Park (Picnic Shelter)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenview Ice Center</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenview Park Golf Club</td>
<td>110.0</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenview National 9 Golf Club</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenview Tennis Club</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Grove</td>
<td>123.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne Glen Park</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huber Lane Park</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Ridge Park</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Trail Park</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackman Park</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings Park</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Park</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladendorf Park</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor Park</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Center</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Services</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Park</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt Park</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugen Park</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schram Memorial Museum</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleepy Hallow Park</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swenson Park</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tall Trees Park</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Park</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollo School</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoca West School</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Grove School</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henking School</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman School</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon School</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Ridge School</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springham School</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington School</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbrook School</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willowbrook School</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winkelman School</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Village of Glenview Comprehensive Plan
## Public & Private Schools

### Appendix E.6.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Current Enrollment</th>
<th>Site Size (acres)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apollo School</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoca West School</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Grove School</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henking School</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman School</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon School</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Ridge</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springman School</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington School</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbrook School</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willowbrook School</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winkelman School</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenbrook South High School</td>
<td>Public High School</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Facilities Maintenance and Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Adequacy of on site parking</th>
<th>School Bus Service</th>
<th>Adequacy of site size</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Police Department Activity

#### Appendix E.6.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Sexual Assault</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agg. Battery / Assault</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burg. To Motor Vehicle</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Theft</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannabis Violations</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled Substance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI Violations</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Liquor Violations</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Criminal Activity</td>
<td>2,458</td>
<td>2,709</td>
<td>2,557</td>
<td>2,487</td>
<td>2,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. Damage Accidents</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>1,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inj. / Fatal Accidents</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Service Activities</td>
<td>19,274</td>
<td>19,504</td>
<td>18,221</td>
<td>20,401</td>
<td>20,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24,572</td>
<td>25,089</td>
<td>23,781</td>
<td>25,888</td>
<td>26,380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Appendix E.6.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P Tickets</td>
<td>4,957</td>
<td>5,573</td>
<td>5,738</td>
<td>6,124</td>
<td>5,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Tickets</td>
<td>6,849</td>
<td>7,286</td>
<td>7,447</td>
<td>7,418</td>
<td>7,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,311</td>
<td>13,461</td>
<td>13,804</td>
<td>14,410</td>
<td>13,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous</td>
<td>5,555</td>
<td>5,629</td>
<td>5,399</td>
<td>5,317</td>
<td>5,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hazardous</td>
<td>6,755</td>
<td>7,832</td>
<td>8,405</td>
<td>8,823</td>
<td>8,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felonies</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanors</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Village of Glenview Comprehensive Plan

#### Police Department Violations

Appendix E.6.4
Village of Glenview Comprehensive Plan
Downtown Glenview D-1 Zoning District Analysis (2002)
Appendix F.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Title</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>% of Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D-1 Residential District</td>
<td>91.81</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1 Residential District</td>
<td>70.34</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2 Residential District</td>
<td>554.39</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-7 Residential District</td>
<td>162.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4 Residential District</td>
<td>1217.19</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5 Residential District</td>
<td>165.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-6 Residential District</td>
<td>50.51</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-8 Residential District</td>
<td>33.93</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3 Residential District</td>
<td>46.70</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-15 Residential District</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>5111.27</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-1 General Business District</td>
<td>91.84</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-2 General Business District</td>
<td>332.50</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-7 General Service District</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-9 General Warehouse District</td>
<td>13.44</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-11 Hospital Business District</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total METAL/COMMERICAL</td>
<td>462.70</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-1 Downtown Commercial Area</td>
<td>229.56</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Light Industrial District</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total INDUSTRIAL</td>
<td>241.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-13 Public Land</td>
<td>537.67</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-20 Golf Course</td>
<td>18.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total PUBLIC LANDS</td>
<td>699.39</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total Zoning Districts</td>
<td>7637.73</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACREAGE OF VILLAGE</td>
<td>8657.75</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D-1**
- Dwelling units above main floor only
  1) first 200' north of Glenview Road R.O.W, and west of the Waukegan Road R.O.W. and 175' south of the Glenview Road R.O.W, and 200' west of the Waukegan Road R.O.W - 36 d.u./acre
  2) The areas within the D-1 District outside the above area - 24 d.u./acre
  3) Areas east of Waukegan Road - 18 d.u./acre (a minimum of 2420 sq.ft. of lot area/d.u.)

**R-18**
- A district designed for multiple family dwellings at a density not exceeding (18) units/acre not less than 2,400 sq.ft. per dwelling unit, 6,250 sq.ft. per lot
- Maximum Height 35'
A number of redevelopment concepts for Glenview Road in the Downtown District were generated for public comment. They are as follows:

**Concept W-1: Library Expanded/Rebuilt at Existing Site with Mixed-Use**
Rebuild the Library along Glenview Road between Harlem Avenue and Washington Street. Create an Urban Plaza along Harlem Avenue with the entrance to the Library, leading to the retail building at the corner of Harlem Avenue and Prairie Street. This retail building should face the train station. Develop a residential building along Prairie Street facing the Park.

**Concept W-2: Library Extends North and South on Same Site with Mixed-Use**
Rebuild the Library as a u-shaped building along Washington Street, Glenview Road and Harlem Avenue. The first floor east wing of the building should be a retail use. An urban plaza along Harlem leads to a mixed-use building at the corner of Prairie Street and Harlem Avenue, facing the Train Station. The parking court will be entered from Prairie Street.

**Concept W-3: New Retail and Residential Development on Site**
The Library is no longer located on this block in this concept. An L-shaped retail/commercial building should be located at the corner of Glenview Road and Harlem Avenue. Another retail/commercial building should be placed at the end of the urban plaza located along Harlem Avenue, facing the train station. Two residential buildings are located along Washington and Prairie Streets. Parking is located in a court at the center of the block.

**Concept W-4: Minimal Change to Site**
The Library could be remodeled and possibly expanded in its current location to meet the short-term needs of the community. The corner of Glenview and Harlem Avenue could be redeveloped. Other on-site uses remain with minor refurbishment.

**Concept C-1: New Residential and Retail Development, Library Along River**
This concept looks at redevelopment options for the south side of Glenview Road between the River and Glenview State Bank. A major civic plaza is placed across from the Playlum. The entrance to the Library is placed along Dewes and Church Street is from this civic plaza. A private garden is placed between the Library and the River. Parking is broken into smaller areas that serve both the library and adjacent uses. Retail buildings are placed along Glenview Road. Opportunities for residential/mixed use development are created along Dewes and Church Street.
Concept C-2: New Residential and Retail Development, Library Near Center of Downtown
This concept looks at redevelopment options for the south side of Glenview Road between the River and Glenview State Bank. A linear public space, which provides opportunities for parking, is created across from the Playdium. The Library is located west of this public place. There is some retail development in this building along Glenview Road. The block between the public place and the river is developed into a courtyard mixed-use development with retail on the ground floor. A public park and access to a river walk should be developed along River Drive.

Concept C-3: New Expanded Retail
This concept looks at redeveloping the block north of Glenview Road between Church and Pine Streets. Two mixed-use buildings with retail on the ground floor are placed along Glenview Road. The parking located behind is reached via a public square along Glenview Road.

Concept C-4: Minimal Change
Commercial development is in-filled where possible. Façade and street improvement recommendations will occur as properties are redeveloped.

Concept E-1: Grocery Leaves, New Residential and Retail, Existing Commercial Remains
This redevelopment concept for the northeast block of Glenview and Waukegan Roads retains the commercial development along Glenview Road. A new commercial building is placed along Waukegan Road and residential development is placed along the river. A parking court and public green space are created in the center of the block.

Concept E-2: Grocery Leaves, New Library, and Existing Commercial Remains
This redevelopment concept for the northeast block of Glenview and Waukegan Roads retains the commercial development along Glenview Road. The library is placed along Waukegan Road, with vehicular access from both Waukegan and Glenview Roads. Overflow parking is shared with OLPH, linked via a pedestrian bridge over the river. A significant public green space is created along the river.

Concept E-3: Grocery Leaves, New Library and Commercial
In this concept the library is placed at the corner of Glenview Road and Waukegan Road, creating a landmark building. Parking for the library is placed north of the building, with access from Waukegan and Glenview Road. Overflow parking is shown as being shared with OLPH, linked via a pedestrian bridge over the river. A significant public green space is created along the river.

Concept E-4: Minimal Change
Existing Commercial development and the grocery store should remain on site. Façade and site improvements are undertaken as properties are redeveloped.
This option accomplishes a number of key elements in revitalizing the downtown district; it retains the Library downtown, it maximizes the use of parking, continues commercial development along Glenview Road, creates a public plaza at the center of downtown, and enhances opportunities for a river walk and public access to the river (See Map 6.4).

Concept C-1 also places new commercial development along Glenview Road flanking the new public plaza placed across from Playdium and at the proposed library entrance. New residential development is proposed along Dewes Street. This takes advantage of opposing parking demands of the various land uses. At the western edge of Glenview Road new mixed-use redevelopment concepts are shown which place parking in internal courts. At the eastern edge the grocery store remains with improvements to parking and a possible new retail building along the northern side of Glenview Road.

If the library does not relocate in this location, due to other constraints such as cost, land acquisition, etc., these downtown redevelopment concepts will still be viable with alternate land use options. Other proposed downtown redevelopment concepts are shown in Appendix F.4.
Table A  
**Village of Glenview Transportation Reports**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Build-out Within the D-1 District Traffic Impact Study Report</td>
<td>6/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MURC Traffic Impact and Parking Demand Analysis Report</td>
<td>5/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenview Business Park TIA Report</td>
<td>4/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Development (SW quadrant of Milwaukee Ave &amp; Lilac Ave) TIA Report</td>
<td>11/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town &amp; Country Business Center TIA Report</td>
<td>1/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Creek Retail Center Outlot Traffic Evaluation (Update 1997 TIA)</td>
<td>3/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont Village TIA Report</td>
<td>2/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTIMA Glenview East TIA Report</td>
<td>7/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTIMA Glenview West TIA Report</td>
<td>3/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Creek Retail Center TIA Report</td>
<td>4/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts of Amber Woods TIA Report</td>
<td>1/89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Development (SW quadrant of Willow Rd &amp; Shermer Rd)</td>
<td>3/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtyard/Fairfield Inn TIA Report</td>
<td>12/87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut-thru Traffic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Drive Cut-thru Traffic Study</td>
<td>12/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springdale Ave Cut-thru Traffic Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington St. &amp; Lehigh Ave Cut-thru Traffic Study</td>
<td>4/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut-thru Traffic Study for Nine Areas</td>
<td>6/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Ave and Waukegan Rd Intersection Study</td>
<td>5/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenview’s Most Hazardous Intersections (Interdepartmental Memo)</td>
<td>11/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood Ave (Central Rd to W. Lake Ave) Speed Study</td>
<td>1/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signal Warrant Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colfax Ave &amp; Waukegan Rd Intersection Study</td>
<td>6/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Parking Lot Space Availability Survey (Train Station) – Summary of Findings</td>
<td>3/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Parking Study – Glenview Train Station</td>
<td>5/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Road &amp; Milwaukee Ave Corridor Study</td>
<td>7/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metra’s Your Region’s Railroad (Preliminary 2001 Program and Budget)</td>
<td>10/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision and Engineering Guide</td>
<td>4/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE Development Guidelines</td>
<td>6/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Glenview Traffic and Transportation Inventory</td>
<td>8/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellwood and Longmeadow Traffic Counts</td>
<td>4/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland Drive and Coronel Rd Traffic Counts</td>
<td>7/89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Code of the Village of Glenview</td>
<td>4/82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The exhibit listed as Map 5.2 “Proposed Land Use Plan” in the 2004 Village of Glenview Comprehensive Plan is misleadingly titled and should not be construed to represent the Village of Glenview’s Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map.

The Village of Glenview’s 1990 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map (Figure 2) should be referred to for the purposes associated with determining future land uses with the exception of those recommendations pertaining to the “Village Subareas” (as incorporated within the framework of districts, corridors and places) listed as Map 5.4 on Page 25 of the 2004 Village of Glenview Comprehensive Plan.