WINNETKA PLAN COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
JANUARY 25, 2023

Members Present:	Bridget Orsic, Chairperson
	Jonathan Alt
	Matthew Bradley
	Mamie Case
	Layla Danley
	Chris Foley
	John Golan
	Liz Kunkle
Non-Voting Members Present:	Tina Dalman
Village Staff:	David Schoon, Director of Community Development
	Ann Klaassen, Assistant Director of Community Development

Call to Order & Roll Call:
The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Orsic at 6:00 p.m. Ms. Klaassen took roll call of the Commission Members present.

Approval of Minutes:
a. December 21, 2022, Regular Meeting Minutes.
Chairperson Orsic asked if there were any comments or corrections or for a motion to approve the December 21, 2022, meeting minutes. A motion was made by Ms. Case and seconded by Mr. Bradley to approve the December 21, 2022, meeting minutes. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 7 to 0:

AYES:	Alt, Bradley, Case, Danley, Foley, Kunkle, Orsic
NAYS:	None
NON-VOTING:	Dalman

Public Comments:
No comments were made at this time.

Community Development Report:
Mr. Schoon confirmed there is no Community Development Report.

Comprehensive Plan:
a. Review of Draft Comprehensive Plan.
Mr. Schoon stated the Village has worked closely with the consultants on the draft Comprehensive Plan and identified the members of the consultant team not available for this meeting. He then asked for any comments or corrections relating to the draft, to direct them to the Village staff. Mr. Schoon stated the Commission is being asked for their comments following the consultants' presentation. Chairperson Orsic stated in terms of order and for typographical corrections, they should be emailed to the Village staff unless they are substantive.

Siraj Asfahani stated the presentation would represent an overview regarding the Comprehensive Plan's current content which originated from the Existing Conditions Report, the Visioning Goals and Initiatives that were developed with the Commission during a series of working sessions, and Land Use Strategy section and the Implementation section which will be reviewed for the first time by the Commission this evening. He described the three stage planning approach undertaken noting engagement was a core step throughout the process. Mr. Asfahani referred to the Vision Statement which was supported by ten pillars which categorize the goals and initiatives.

Mr. Asfahani reviewed the Future Land Use Strategy and compared the differences between the proposed future land use map with that in the 1999 Comprehensive Plan. He summarized the differences between land use classifications and map designations between the two maps, with most changes on the map occurring in or near the business districts and along north Green Bay Road.

Mr. Asfahani then referred to the public/semi-public land use category from the 1999 Comprehensive Plan which is now identified as an institutional category. He referred to the map identifying North Shore Country Day School and the New Trier campus as examples. Mr. Bradley asked if the name change represented a better way of defining the use or is it only semantics. Mr. Asfahani responded for this particular category; it is a more common designation. He then referred to the slide which defined what is encapsulated by the institutional land use category. Chairperson Orsic asked if the Village defined what fell into the institutional use category and questioned how parks would fall into this category. Mr. Asfahani later responded that parks do not fall within the institutional use category. They fall within the open space category and that we will need to clarify that throughout the plan. Mr. Alt referred to the change in the designation of parking to multiuse and asked if they are attempting to demonstrate the best/highest use for the parcel. Mr. Asfahani stated they are to consider what they want the Village to be in the next 20 years in terms of potential uses.

Mr. Asfahani identified the land use categories which remained and which categories are merged in the new Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Bradley referred to institutional uses and questioned the consequence of combining uses into a single category when in the future a use no longer existed and referred to a scenario that had Sacred Heart School no longer being in operation, which is in the single-family residential zoning district. Mr. Schoon stated if for example the proposed use was something other than a single family residence or institutional use, the applicant would have to request an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan land use map and to rezone the property to a zoning district to allow such use. He stated for a property zoned single family residential that the future land use map designates as appropriate for another land use, the zoning would not change with the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan. A specific request would need to be made to rezone the property.

Chairperson Orsic commented the draft felt heavily drafted toward zoning. Mr. Schoon stated the land use map related to what they want future uses to be and is not specifically directed toward zoning. He informed the Commission they have a future land use map today. Mr. Asfahani stated in the existing and proposed future land use map, he described the change as minimal with the goal being to provide flexibility. Mr. Bradley stated all of the schools existed in 1999 when the land use map was addressed in the Comprehensive Plan with the goal to improve it to create a category of uses. Mr. Schoon further explained the reasoning behind the category change and how the zoning implementation would occur. Chairperson Orsic questioned what they are solving by re-categorizing. Mr. Asfahani responded they are defining a character and not necessarily solving for the issue of institutions. He added there is a section in the Comprehensive Plan which relates to institutional uses running into zoning relief issues. Ms. Dalman provided further clarification regarding the distinction between a future land use classification in a comprehensive plan and the zoning of a property. Mr. Asfahani went on to state when considering items for re-categorization, they must keep in mind that some of the uses are adjacent to single family homes.

Mr. Asfahani then referred the Commission to samples of Pillars to elaborate how the structure appeared in the draft document. Mr. Asfahani referred to an example as Pillar One, its Vision Statement and the fact that each Pillar is supported by existing conditions analyses which helped them get to the goals they are aiming for and what they heard from the community such as from the Open House, etc. Mr. Asfahani then referred to Pillar One's six defined goals that they worked on with the Commission. He then referred to Initiative 1.2.1 as an example of an initiative and described how the initiatives were set up and text which provided additional background information.

Ms. Kunkle described the document as beautiful and referred to the text which represented additional information. She suggested for those initiatives without bold text, additional explanatory information be inserted. Ms. Danley referred to page 116 as example initiative nos. 3.1.1 and 3.3.2 and the manner in which they are identified as being referenced. Mr. Asfahani stated the Comprehensive Plan is not meant to be dissected in that manner and noted a lot of the documents correlate heavily. He stated it was the most efficient way in terms of addressing it. Ms. Danley suggested the initiative number or page number should be added. Mr. Asfahani explained that they attempted to be cognizant of the document length and for instances where it did not merit additional explanation, they did not include it.

Ms. Case stated in furtherance of Ms. Danley's continuity questions, she referred to the Implementation section and asked why not put each implementation piece at the end of each Pillar. Mr. Asfahani responded they discussed that option with Village staff and the Implementation section was meant to be a workbook with the ability to update it instead of having to flip through 300 pages. Mr. Alt described the Implementation section as the executive summary and suggested they consider what they need to accomplish over the next few years. Mr. Schoon agreed with the comments made and stated they identify them as low, medium and high priorities with several of them being interrelated and described several examples of where certain items would be addressed simultaneously.

Ms. Kunkle suggested with regard to high priority items, they discussed the same issues on the Environmental and Forestry Commission as to what items are in process. She also stated while a lot of the items are priorities, they all do not have to be done in the next three years while identifying items which are in the works. Ms. Danley stated if there are items which are not considered high priority, the Commission Members should identify them. Mr. Asfahani reiterated the implementation chart is meant to be updated as opportunities come up. Chairperson Orsic agreed with Mr. Asfahani's comment in that the document would be allowed to be updated.

Mr. Asfahani then referred to Pillar Eight which identified case studies to show how they have happened in other communities and have had an impact. He noted the communities they selected were comparable to Winnetka in terms of planning.

Andy Cross stated he spent his career as a city planner and has worked with a lot of Comprehensive Plans which lacked implementation. He stated the idea is to keep the implementation plan as the actual workbook for the Village to review regularly in order to measure progress. He referred to an illustration of how the format is laid out with bold text direction to salient fact with the goal for it to be a more concise, readable format. He also referred to the implementation partners included in the document which are needed to help the Plan come to fruition.

Mr. Asfahani stated the last piece of the Comprehensive Plan represented funding sources which are not identified in the document noting there are grant opportunities and other examples. He then asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Alt questioned how grants are chased now. Mr. Schoon responded those efforts are coordinated by the Finance Director which has a list of grants the Village is currently pursuing with the appropriate departments. Mr. Asfahani noted some of the initiatives also stress identifying grants.

Chairperson Orsic asked the Commission Members for general feedback first. She agreed the document is beautiful and is reflective of their discussions. Chairperson Orsic noted there are some inconsistencies and identified an example as referencing both high vacancies and a lack of housing for the number of people in the Village and that businesses have increased during Covid. Ms. Danley referred to page 71 which discussed the vacancy rate as an example of contradictory statements. Mr. Cross indicated some of the data may be dated. Mr. Asfahani stated when the data was initially pulled together, it was done with 2019 in mind. He then stated when we started working on the plan after the start of pandemic, the Existing Conditions Report was updated. Mr. Asfahani then stated vacancy rates were determined by a snapshot in time. He agreed the wording can be amended so that it is not contradictory on pages the Commission Members identified. Ms. Case referred to page 145 with regard to schools being within walking distance and the comment below that children get rides to school which should be clarified. The Commission Members discussed ways in which it can be rectified. Mr. Bradley referred to instances which would be temporal in plans such as this in terms of wording clarification. Mr. Asfahani reiterated incorrect wording can be clarified. Mr. Schoon provided additional explanation in terms of what the Commission Members are interpreting as inconsistencies. The Commission Members discussed ways in which the language relating to property rentals can be tied to the content. Mr. Asfahani stated notations were made at the bottom of the document indicating that the analyses represented a point in time. Ms. Kunkle suggested with regard to the Existing Conditions Report being incorporated, to the extent possible within the text, to make sure that it is a 2019 data point compared to 2022 or 2023. Mr. Schoon provided the Commission Members with background in terms of the initial information presentation done in 2021 and attempts to keep the data updated. He agreed inconsistencies should be corrected or the points they are attempting to convey need to be clearer. Mr. Asfahani asked for the Commission Members to point out any other inconsistencies in the document.

Mr. Bradley commented the document was well done and well presented. He stated in 2021, he brought up his concerns with the initiatives presented in an order implying importance in terms of their significance. Mr. Bradley suggested a line be inserted that the initiatives are not being presented in a certain order. He then stated the inconsistencies would not be extremely upsetting to the reader. Mr. Bradley referred to quotes that were provided which is in some places and not in others and as an example referred to the comment "We need to promote smaller homes for empty nesters and homebuyers" as a comment from community conversation which applied to the Pillar with the implication that would be promoted over other items in that section. He then referred to the Vibrant Business Section Pillar and the comment that they are either growing business or going out of business in comparison to Pillar One relating to being stewards over good business. It was agreed these quotes would be removed.

Mr. Alt agreed with Mr. Bradley's comments in that their attempts to show that they are listening to the community comes across as the highlight on the page. Chairperson Orsic referred to Goal 1.4 on page 81 and stated the words "parks" and "Institutional" were being used interchangeably and should be separated when they are talking about zoning. She also suggested word searches be done to ensure that interchangeable items be referred to similarly.

Chairperson Orsic asked the Commission Members if they would like to discuss any items in Chapter 1 with the exception of typographical errors which do not change the context. She then referred to page 28 relating to negative commentary from long term residents. Chairperson Orsic suggested those references should be identified as opinions and Mr. Asfahani agreed. The Commission Members discussed whether to take the references out versus leaving them in. Chairperson Orsic suggested clearly noting the comments as “Community Conversation.” Mr. Asfahani stated the Comprehensive Plan was done differently than for other communities’ Comprehensive Plans in that they wanted to highlight targeted particular Winnetka persona groups and agreed it could be color coded similarly. Ms. Kunkle referred to Chapter 2 and Pillar 6 on page 7 and referred to the “quality of life” phrase and its intersection with Pillar 6. She suggested changing “lifestyle” at the end of the mission statement to “quality of life.” Ms. Kunkle then agreed the document was well done and described the photos in the document as striking and well balanced with the amount of text and making it an engaging document.

Mr. Alt referred to Chapter 3 and page 52 and corrected the address in the photo of Good Grapes. Ms. Case stated she would provide notes on a few other photos which are mislabeled to staff. Chairperson Orsic referred to Chapter 3 on page 46 and the Plan overview which appeared negative and which was identified as having good bones. Mr. Asfahani responded the point to be made was that they have a strong foundation on which to build and was not meant to be negative, but it was agreed to change the wording. Chairperson Orsic then referred to “Proud Tradition and Bold Ambition” and the statement in bold which stated, “Winnetka needs a plan” and its negative connotation. Ms. Danley stated they can say they have a plan and change the wording to be forward thinking or its time to update the plan. Mr. Alt suggested dropping the line completely. The Commission Members agreed.

Chairperson Orsic referred to Pillar One on page 48 and referred to the fact there was no mention of the lakefront which makes the Village unique. She suggested adding the wording “unlimited access to natural assets and recreational opportunities.” Chairperson Orsic also stated under “Future Land Use” on page 50, she suggested adding “…and natural assets” to the end of the statement “The future land use strategy also emphasizes the preservation, conservation and enhancement of the Village’s business districts and surrounding traditional neighborhood blocks.” She then stated in the second paragraph on page 53, she questioned whether open space and parks become interchangeable if “institutional” is changed throughout the document. Mr. Asfahani agreed with the suggestions. Mr. Bradley suggested in the Future Land Use legend, the wording is close together and suggested different colors to be used to differentiate them. Ms. Kunkle stated to better understand why they are changing the designations on parking lots, she referred to page 56 and the land behind the Community House which is currently a parking lot, the discussion relating to parking being a longstanding issue for residents on page 113, she suggested that when they point out necessary public parking, they are taking into particular consideration the Community House needs.

Chairperson Orsic referred to page 64 and Goal 1.4 and questioned whether this is a place where the beaches and lakes be recognized as a natural community asset expanding the existing goal or adding it as a new goal. Mr. Asfahani stated it is addressed as a Pillar. The Commission Members discussed whether the lakefront is considered as a neighborhood and the fact the Village does not own Lake Michigan. Mr. Bradley stated the word “lakefront” is the first word in Winnetka’s overall vision. Mr. Schoon stated since the Commission last discussed the Comprehensive Plan, Chairperson Orsic is stating there has been a lot more discussion relating to the lakefront than before, and she is questioning how they insert the lakefront and if it should be identified as an asset to the community. He stated that staff and the consultants are waiting on direction from the Commission regarding if and how it would like to do that. Ms. Danley asked the consultant to provide the Commission with direction as to where it should fall in the Comprehensive

Plan.

Mr. Bradley suggested it be written into Goal 1.4 that the Village will consider that institutional uses and open spaces are compatible with the residential neighborhoods in which they are located and the Future Land Guide will describe what those open space and institutional uses are. The Commission agreed and stated that examples of what is included in each land use category be listed in the goal.

Ms. Danley referred to page 79 and the focus on independent housing and senior living facilities and the three to ten year priority for it, she informed the Commission she read several articles on senior independent dedicated housing with a huge need for it within the next 10-20 years and after that, the dedicated housing would no longer serve a purpose due to demographic contraction. She suggested it be addressed as a lower priority as opposed to a medium priority. Ms. Danley then referred to page 233 Initiative 1.1 which related to the review of codes and regulations to ensure they do not present obstacles for residents renovating their homes and demolition and asked if those items should become a higher priority whereas on page 234, she referred to Initiative 1.2.5 which should change from medium to a low priority.

Mr. Asfahani asked if there were any other comments on Pillar One. Chairperson Orsic stated with regard to entitlements for zoning, she asked specifically what that meant. Mr. Schoon responded it is a term for rezoning of a property, granting a special use or variation which is a land use entitlement. Chairperson Orsic then referred to Initiative 1.6.4 on page 85 and asked how the elimination of required building components or systems such as means of access and mechanical systems is done. Mr. Schoon responded for means of access, for a certain building code type, access is required for a residential use that may not be required for a commercial use and eliminating that type of access would make it harder for the use to be converted back to a residential use. No additional comments were made at this time.

Chairperson Orsic then referred to Pillar Two. Theresa Lucas stated the Village website indicated the meeting started at 7pm and they missed the Public Comments section and asked if they could speak to this section. Chairperson Orsic agreed to let audience members speak and then asked for public comments. She swore in those speaking to this matter.

Theresa Lucas, owner of Good Grapes, 821 Chestnut Court, stated she reviewed the Business District section of the Comprehensive Plan and would like to provide comment on a few themes. She stated with regard to the discussion on the number of new businesses, etc., generating foot traffic for a new business takes time and resources and between districts, it takes even more time. Ms. Lucas commented the increased number of new businesses seemed like a high amount of turnover to her with the type of business use not changing significantly in terms of the mix according to the Comprehensive Plan. She suggested the Village perform exit interviews to determine why businesses are leaving to provide insight and allow for improvement.

Ms. Lucas then described West Elm as a village within a village and referred to store diversity which attracted different consumer segments. She then stated with regard to resident feedback in the Comprehensive Plan, it asked what would cause you to come into the business districts more frequently and referred to the examples of delis and bakeries. Ms. Lucas then suggested the Village target those types of businesses and for the younger demographic, they stated they cannot afford to shop at the women's stores in town. She referred to customers’ comments relating to the ability to find affordable, repeatable input. Ms. Lucas also referred to the post office redevelopment frequently mentioned in the Comprehensive Plan and the discussion regarding possible replacements which was based only on the building and not parking for example which represented a disconnect. She then stated none of the West Elm business owners are in favor of the current redevelopment proposed project for the post office site and distributed a letter to the Commission signed by 27 business owners. Ms. Lucas stated the proposal does not address the parking issue in West Elm for businesses .

Ms. Lucas then referred to the parking requirements for new development such as One Winnetka as well as the figures relating to the amount of current parking available for existing businesses which are used by both residential and commercial tenants which are not zoned. She then stated the Village invested a lot of money into streetscape which eliminated parking spaces and stated businesses cannot survive based on current households in the Village. Ms. Lucas then stated businesses which pull from a wide geographical demographic validated the high priority on parking. She stated the new Comprehensive Plan did not address current parking issues which would become more severe if the post office development parking issues are not addressed and she did not see how Goal 2.4 relating to retaining existing successful businesses can be achieved without addressing parking issues and should allow for businesses' input. Ms. Lucas stated people will not come to areas which are known for difficulty in terms of parking and asked for the Commission to not support the post office redevelopment if parking is not addressed.

Stephanie Hochschild, owner of the Book Stall, stated that she agreed with Ms. Lucas' comments relating to parking. She referred to their competition with online retailers and stated in order to have a vibrant downtown, the needs of local retailers need to be kept in mind.

Chairperson Orsic then swore in Jeffrey Liss, 640 Winnetka Mews. Mr. Liss first thanked the Commission for their work and agreed with the parking concerns raised. He stated public parking should be a separate consideration apart from parks and beachfront properties. Mr. Liss stated parking in Winnetka has always been in short supply and referred to those who do not shop in East Elm and other locations due to the lack of parking. He stated if parking is combined with a multi-use facility, it would be something a developer can play with and suggested the default is that parking must be preserved with the burden being on the developer. Mr. Liss also referred to the neighborhood and housing sections which discuss new construction conforming to neighborhood characteristics and commented Winnetka should not be a Brigadoon. He then referred to several new construction homes which are strikingly different than others and the conforming to neighborhood characteristic wording would prevent new architecture from coming to Winnetka when they should be encouraging new architecture and design.

There were no additional public comments.

Chairperson Orsic stated the Commission would take a five minute break.

Chairperson Orsic stated the Commission would now resume their discussion relating to Pillar Two. Ms. Danley referred to page 242 and the first initiative under Goal 2.5 discussing streetscape improvement efforts in the business districts. She questioned the effect on business owners and how decisions on streetscape were made. Ms. Dalman stated the business owners were consulted with the streetscape program although some of them have changed over time. Mr. Asfahani indicated it is implied that the community voice is crucial and they feel the need to point it out in the document and it can definitely be included. Mr. Alt stated during the discussions, he was surprised they did not opt for more parking as the standard during the discussions with The Lakota Group. He stated the result was a balanced approach to suggest that parking is an issue which they should take a look at holistically. Ms. Dalman stated the public comments received relating to parking were strong and suggested they be considered during the document drafting. She then stated it is rare that variations are given to developments for parking requirements. Mr. Bradley stated the Pillar wording meant to support business districts as being vibrant and is not to be the business districts' primary solve for growing their business and they cannot solve every business's need to grow to maximum viability and sales. Mr. Asfahani stated if parking is taken as their priority, they would contradict other Pillars in the community vision and it related to balance. He then referred to the public comment made relating to special events and stated it can be mentioned as an addition to one of the initiatives to keep that in mind while they are considering daily parking needs. Mr. Bradley stated with regard to Pillar One, the same concept should apply to other Pillars as well and to keep in mind in terms of the key demand considerations on page 94 as it related to vibrant business districts. Mr. Asfahani agreed with Mr. Bradley's suggestion to be made to Pillars One and Two. No additional comments were made at this time on Pillar Two.

Chairperson Orsic then referred to Pillar Three and referred to the lakefront issues and where it should be integrated. Ms. Kunkle suggested it be integrated into Pillar Three and referenced in more than one Pillar such as placemaking for example. The Commission Members discussed the use of the natural resource wording and its placement in the document. Chairperson Orsic suggested the wording be included in the Pillar's mission statement. Mr. Asfahani agreed with Chairperson Orsic's suggestion. Mr. Bradley referred to the case studies on page 116 and their previous discussion regarding them being uniquely situated on the lakefront and the number of beaches. No additional comments were made at this time on Pillar Three.

Chairperson Orsic then referred to Pillar Four. Ms. Case commented this section read differently than the rest of the Pillars. Ms. Danley commented it may have read differently since they have the integration of a lot of these things throughout the Plan and the items in this Pillar have not been discussed previously in the document. The Commission Members discussed moving the Pillar. Ms. Danley indicated they do not want sustainability to appear to be the last issue and questioned a manner in which it can appear to be the last thing they talked about. Mr. Bradley stated it should be noted that the Pillars are not in priority order. Ms. Danley suggested wording to be added to note that since the Pillar touched on the remaining Pillars, that identified its order in the Plan. Ms. Kunkle agreed with the suggestion that the Pillar be moved to the back of the Plan and made sense conceptually. Mr. Asfahani noted the Vision Statements are introduced for all of the Pillars on page nos. 48 and 49. The Commission Members then discussed moving the Pillar and took a straw poll in terms of its movement. The Commission decided not to move it at this time.

Chairperson Orsic then referred to Pillar Five. The Commission Members referred to their previous discussion relating to removing high school students' concerns with housing. Mr. Asfahani explained the reasoning for its inclusion. He then stated if the wording read too negative, it can be removed. Mr. Bradley referred to their previous whole child discussion in the Vision Statement and suggested the growth journey be followed and to adequately word the child's descriptions. Chairperson Orsic referred to page 149 and Initiative 5.2.2 and the ZBA's frustration at considering variations for institutional uses for special use permits for additions, etc. Ms. Case stated people move next to schools and then complain about the school's impact. She stated they are suggesting to allow administrative changes for schools so they do not have to go through the public comment process. Mr. Asfahani confirmed no changes are to be made to Pillar Five. Chairperson Orsic stated her concern related to requests not going through the process for items being changed to institutional uses. Mr. Asfahani reminded the Commission of the discussion which said to use the word "consider" at the beginning of the sentence with the Village to go through the exercise. Ms. Case asked for an example of Initiative 5.3.2 on page 52. Mr. Cross responded it was displaying District 36 work in the West Elm district. Mr. Asfahani stated it also related to activating vacant storefronts. No additional comments were made at this time on Pillar Five.

Chairperson Orsic then referred to Pillar Six and the discussion relating to well-connected parks and open spaces and questioned what that meant. Mr. Asfahani responded it referred to access and possible trail connections. Chairperson Orsic then referred to page 154 and suggested adding the wording "natural resources." The Commission Members discussed removing the word "unlimited" in terms of access. Chairperson Orsic referred to page 155 and suggested adding the beaches and lakefront, etc. wording. She also referred to page 157 under Community Open Space and suggested eliminating the names of the two agencies managing various parts of the beaches, water, etc. Mr. Schoon stated these are public parks and open spaces and related to who is responsible for them. Chairperson Orsic stated her concern is the Plan wording being used in the future relating to possible future controversies. Mr. Schoon stated a plan was adopted to ensure the long term lakefront enhancement and asked the Commission Members if they feel the wording is loaded. Mr. Asfahani stated the Park District Vision Statement stated to maximize access to the lake and to include wording stating the Park District adopted a plan. Mr. Asfahani confirmed the reference to the Park District's lakefront can be changed to Winnetka's lakefront. The Commission Members discussed the Community Open House results and that someone expressed a preference for an expanded marina. The Commission Members also discussed positioning themselves in terms of the gaps in Initiative 6.4.4. Ms. Danley then referred to Initiative Nos. 6.1.4 and 6.2.2 relating to the special use process. Mr. Bradley referred to page 158 relating to the language on parkland level of service analysis, etc. Mr. Asfahani responded the language was greatly summarized from the original draft submitted for staff review. Mr. Bradley asked how the analysis fit into the context of the goals and their implementation. Mr. Asfahani responded the analysis was done to determine how much deficiency or surplus there was in providing parks and open space to the community and to determine if they were serving the entire Winnetka community in all the different locations. He stated, unlike Winnetka, most communities ran deficient on both. No additional comments were made at this time on Pillar Six.

Chairperson Orsic then referred to Pillar Seven. Ms. Kunkle stated with regard to the paragraph relating to the history of storm water management, she suggested one sentence be added to bring the first paragraph more current following the adoption and implementation of the storm water master plan. She also referred to page 174 relating to the IMEA and suggested language for the last paragraph to clarify whether it is a municipally owned utility and to reference St. Charles and Naperville as examples of other municipally owned electric utilities. No additional comments were made at this time on Pillar Seven.

Chairperson Orsic then referred to Pillar Eight. Ms. Danley referred to page 192 and the Community Open House results relating to bike lane separation. Mr. Asfahani responded the trail can be separated in certain sections in terms of bikers and walkers. Ms. Kunkle referred to Initiative 8.3.5 on page 200 and asked for the Northfield reference to be clarified. Ms. Danley referred to Initiative 8.3.6 on page 200 and asked for the language from the prior discussion be clarified to include "and deemed safe". No additional comments were made at this time on Pillar Eight.

Chairperson Orsic then referred to Pillars Nine and Ten. The Commission Members stated they previously revisited Pillar Ten substantially.

Chairperson Orsic then referred to Implementation and questioned how the Commission should address it. Mr. Asfahani responded Ms. Danley previously referred to the chart as it related to a specific implementation strategy she wanted to discuss. He asked the Commission Members for specific comments that merit discussion. Mr. Bradley commented the level of priority and timeframe for implementation are not consistent between the Chapter introduction and how they are used in the charts. He stated in the Implementation section, it is not consistent in terms of how the priorities are described in terms of high priority such as time or length of time for achievement and asked the consultants to provide the Commission with guidance. Mr. Asfahani described it as an art more than a science and when a priority is considered high, it may be considered as quickly implementable than what would reflect in a shorter time frame. He stated the reference is that something has been initiated and did not necessarily have to finish in that time frame. Mr. Cross stated this is the most important part of everything they have done, and they should consider the time since the meeting has ran so long. Mr. Bradley suggested the Commission Members revisit the Implementation section as homework to provide comments to the consultants for consideration at the next meeting.

Mr. Schoon stated they need to have a formal public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan before a recommendation is made to the Village Council and if the Commission Members are not ready to make a recommendation, then the Plan can be continued to the next meeting.

The Commission Members agreed to discuss the Commission Members' markup of the Implementation section at the February 15, 2023, special meeting and hold the public hearing at that time.

Public Comment:
Mr. Liss stated he is not clear on the procedure the Commission Members adopted and asked if another draft would be presented on February 15th and if a draft would be made available to the public prior to that date. The Commission Members confirmed that is correct. He suggested the document cover be a different color and asked if a redlined document would be made available. Mr. Schoon responded he would look into it.

New Business:

a. Special Meeting Quorum Check - February 15, 2023.

The Commission Members discussed their availability.

b. Next Regular Meeting Quorum Check – February 22, 2023.

The Commission Members discussed their availability.

Adjournment:
Chairperson Orsic asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Bradley and seconded by several Commission Members. A vote was taken, and the motion unanimously passed, 8 to 0:

AYES: Alt, Bradley, Case, Danley, Golan, Foley, Kunkle, Orsic
NAYS: None
NON-VOTING: Dalman

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Antionette Johnson
Recording Secretary