

MINUTES
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE
November 29, 2018

The November 29, 2018 meeting of the Environmental Review Committee was called to order at 7:00 PM by Chair Judy Beck in the board room of the Village Hall. Roll was called and a quorum was present. Upon roll call, the following were:

Present: Chair Beck, Committee Members Willink, Johnston, and Pollwy
Absent: Committee Member Derby-Lewis
Also present: Jeff Rogers, Planning Manager and Tony Repp, Senior Planner

GENERAL COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Repp stated that there were no general communications for tonight's meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chair Beck asked for comments or corrections to the minutes from the May 10, 2018 ERC meeting.

No comments were made.

Committee Member Johnston moved to approve the minutes of the May 10, 2018 Environmental Review Committee meeting as presented. Committee Member Willink seconded the motion. Upon roll call, the vote was:

AYES: Committee Members Johnston and Willink, Chair Beck

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: Committee Member Pollowy

Motion passed.

Chair Beck asked for comments or corrections to the minutes from the November 15, 2018 ERC meeting.

No comments were made.

Committee Member Pollowy moved to approve the minutes of the November 15, 2018 Environmental Review Committee meeting as presented. Committee Member Johnston seconded the motion. Upon roll call, the vote was:

AYES: Committee Members Johnston, Pollowy and Willink, Chair Beck

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

Motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS

ERC 2018-002 1421 Milwaukee Avenue – The Grove

- Environmental Plan Approval

Present to petition for the Grove proposal were:

Jim Warnstedt, Superintendent of Park and Facility Services

Lorin Ottlinger, Director of the Grove

Tom Rychlyk, Engineer, representing Park District

Chair Beck explained that the purpose of the meeting was for the ERC to review the presented case and forward recommendation to the Plan Commission.

Mr. Rogers presented a brief background for the property under discussion and summarized the proposed improvements which entailed approval of an environmental plan to allow for modifications to the existing site plan including

- An enlarged entrance including a new deceleration lane for northbound right-turns into the site from Milwaukee Avenue, new dedicated outbound left- & right-turn lanes, and a new sidewalk extension from the Milwaukee Avenue right-of-way into the subject property;
- Modifications and expansions to the primary drive aisle;
- Paving and addition of sidewalks to the existing west parking lot;
- Expansion of existing area of stormwater detention and mitigation of existing wetlands; and
- Alterations to site lighting.

Following the summary from staff, Mr. Tom Rychlik of Gewalt Hamilton came forward to address the Committee. Mr. Rychlik provided a narrative for the overall plan and direction of the improvements.

Mr. Rychlik also answered technical questions relating to the application of the aggregate surface and binder to be used in the parking lot improvement. As explained by the applicant, this process involves grinding the existing surface and material, mixing it with a binder material, and relaying the material. This is intended to be a repeatable and environmentally friendly solution to repaving.

Committee Member Willink inquired about the use of pervious pavement as an alternative in the parking areas. Mr. Rychlik responded that should a grant become available, it could be an option, but currently it is not within the project's budget.

Committee Member Johnston inquired about the plans to protect fauna in the area of the detention basin, which is expanding. Mr. Rychlik explained that the areas of expansion would be wet, except in cases of drought, and this should provide a habitat for amphibians. Committee Member Pollowy explained that the plans indicate that a number of the areas are above the prevailing grade or bottom of the basin and it could be difficult to keep them wet for wildlife protection. The applicant and the committee discussed the plans and dimensions. Mr. Rychlik explained that these plans had to be reviewed by MWRD and that they were preliminary in design which would account for the discrepancies in the basin area.

The Committee questioned some of the best practices the applicant was proposing to use in the construction of these projects. Mr. Rychlik provide a brief summary, but was open to suggestion from the Committee. The Committee suggested that haul roads should be managed to minimize the introduction of new soil, disruption of wildlife and be easily removable when the project is complete. The Committee also added that fill removed from the detention basin should be utilized on the site for responsible grading and berming projects.

Committee Member Willink asked to see some additional trees planted adjacent to the entrance to replace those disturbed. Committee Members Johnston and Pollowy commented on the condition of those trees to be removed. The applicant had not provided a planting plan for review. Committee Member Pollowy suggested they be required to provide a detailed planting plan to the Appearance

Commission for review. Tree species will need to be reviewed very closely in these areas given the soil types.

All the Committee Members agreed that the side slopes of the detention basin area relatively steep and should be softened to prevent detrimental erosion and encourage plantings.

Following the discussion, Mr. Repp summarized the conditions the ERC had outlined during its review as follows:

- Provide a detailed planting and species plan to the Appearance Commission for review;
- Side slopes of detention basin should be softened to prevent erosion and encourage plant growth;
- Haul roads should be installed to comply with Best Management Practices for environmentally significant areas and to minimize impact on plantings and wildlife;
- Spoils from excavation to be used in environmentally appropriate projects such as screening or berming;
- Additional trees should be planted south of the entrance; and
- Permeable pavement should be utilized in the parking lots if funded via grant.

Committee Member Willink moved in the matter of ERC2018-002, 1421 Milwaukee Avenue, that the Environmental Review Committee forward a positive recommendation to the Plan Commission based upon the petitioner's application materials, testimony, and discussion relating to the petition, which together demonstrate compliance with Chapter 98, Article IX, Section 98-357 of the Municipal Code, I move in the case of ERC2018-002, 1421 Milwaukee Avenue, the Environmental Review Committee forward a positive recommendation to the Plan Commission in accordance with the following:

- A. The civil engineering plans (Sheets 2-4 and 7-9) dated July 26, 2018 prepared by Gewalt Hamilton Associates, Inc., comply with the Environmental Plan Criteria and Requirements for Approval of the Glenview Municipal Code as follows:

Approval criteria.

- (1) All EPs shall address all vegetation elements, wetlands, drainage, visual and other such environmental effects of proposed developments as they relate to the criteria and requirements, and be consistent with the intent of this article as set forth in section 98-451. The EP shall be in compliance with federal, State and local regulations as such regulations may relate to environmental impact.
- (2) The major focus of the EP shall be first to avoid, second to minimize, and third to mitigate any detrimental impacts to resource characteristics of the ESA and PA consistent with the intent of this article as set forth in section 98-451.
- (3) Construction plans must comply with section 7 of the Illinois Endangered Species Protection Act, 520 ILCS 10/7, and sections 401 and 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. No adverse effect shall occur to any critical federal or State endangered species habitat.

- (4) Construction design plans shall preserve the hydrological characteristics essential to the integrity of the PA.
- (5) The natural functions of ESA wetlands or watercourses shall not be impaired. Specifically, the natural grade and soils of any wetland or watercourse and the flow or quality of surface water to and from any ESA wetland or watercourse at any time during the year shall not be significantly altered in such a way as to degrade rare habitat elements or cultural resources. If negative alterations occur, mitigation in the form of restoration of the wetland or watercourse function and value must be provided in writing and approved by the ERC.
- (6) Direct or indirect impairment to PA wetland shall be avoided. Impact shall be determined by the ERC. Examples of impact that could occur include, but are not limited to, wetland fill, drainage blockage or significant alteration to drainage patterns or subbasin watersheds. If a proposed development site contains areas of past wetland fill or drainage blockage, whether within the ESA or PA, such conditions shall be removed and wetlands restored by the property owner in conjunction with site development. Use of bypass flow-through piping shall be avoided or minimized in preference to preserving natural drainage. Stormwater control features (e.g., wet detention ponds) shall be designed to optimize protection of wetland areas.
- (7) Construction plans shall be designed to minimize the creation of impermeable surfaces by limiting pavements, roadways and building footprints to essential square footages and using permeable asphalt and pervious pavers, where practical.
- (8) Appropriate transport, detention and infiltration structures shall be incorporated in a coordinated stormwater management system to minimize both off-site outflow and surcharging (backwater) into the PA while maximizing groundwater recharge.
- (9) The important cultural heritage, wildlife, recreational and educational values of the PA shall be preserved by maintaining reproductive and regenerative capabilities of wildlife and associated habitats, protecting historical contexts, maintaining aesthetic visual characteristics, designing compatible adjacent building structures and providing visual buffers made up of trees and shrubs consistent with existing vegetation. Preservation of such values must satisfy requirements of the State comprehensive outdoor recreation plan, the State historic preservation office and the National Park Service.
- (10) Site design plans shall maintain or enhance the aesthetic, visual screening, windbreak, dust suppression, air quality improvements, noise barrier characteristics and other qualities of woodlands. All site improvements and structures shall be located and designed in such a way as to retain the maximum amount of natural vegetation on the site, especially existing mature wooded areas. Any structural design within the ESA should be designed so that building footprint roads avoid removal of trees with a dbh of four inches or more. Certain species of trees determined by the

ERC to be incompatible invasive trees in the ESA shall be exempt from protection (e.g., in the Grove National Historic Area, eastern cottonwoods, box elders and European buckthorns are not protected).

- (11) Landscaping designs shall maximize the use of compatible native species of trees, flowers and grasses to blend with or enhance the natural mosaic (complex) of ESA communities. Tree plantings shall be situated as buffers to protect the PA from adverse views, drainage and lighting effects. The objective is to soften impacts to the adjacent PA ecosystems. A variety of species shall be planted in natural arrangements to enhance the aesthetic and ecological value of such plantings.
- (12) All native tree species with a dbh of more than four inches shall be protected with barrier fencing enclosing an area that includes the dripline area of the tree. Unprotected tree species with a dbh of four inches or more shall be retained if they are determined to be important to the historical context of a cultural resource element or to general aesthetic value. The barrier fencing must be located at least five feet from the trunk of a tree at all points. The fencing shall be mandatory only during construction. No disturbance or mowing shall occur within the dripline of any protected tree subsequent to construction.
- (13) Soil erosion shall be minimized through compliance with the soil erosion and sediment control regulations set forth in article IX.
- (14) No bulk storage or release into air, land, or water of hazardous material is permissible within the ESA.
- (15) Developments within the ESA or PA shall be designed to minimize reflected or generated light leaving the property from any direction, including skyward, by using non-reflective building shell construction and careful orientation and shielding of lighting fixtures. The frequency and intensity of generated light impacts on the ecological or cultural resources of the PA shall also be minimized by limiting operation of lights to actual use periods and using low-wattage or yellow bulbs, whenever practicable.
- (16) At no point along the boundaries of the PA or further within the PA shall the noise (sound pressure) level exceed an hourly A-weighted decibel level of a 24-hour 62 leq. Such standard shall be applied for all times during the day and night. If it is found that such standard is not met, operational or shielding remedies shall be sought. If the exceedance will be created by the development under consideration, noise reduction shall be provided in design plans.

B. Provision of a detailed planting and species plan to the Appearance Commission for review.

C. Side slopes of detention basin shall be softened to prevent erosion and encourage plant growth.

- D. Haul roads shall be installed to comply with Best Management Practices for environmentally significant areas and to minimize impact on plantings and wildlife.
- E. Spoils from excavation to be used in environmentally appropriate projects such as screening or berming.
- F. Additional trees shall be planted south of the entrance.
- G. Permeable pavement should be utilized in the parking lots if funded via grant.
- H. All materials presented to the Committee on November 29, 2018 and associated revisions required by the Environmental Review Committee.
- I. Final engineering approval through the building permit process of the lot comprising the development site.

Committee Member Johnston seconded the motion.

Upon roll call, the vote was:

AYES: Committee Members Johnston, Pollowy and Willink, Chair Beck

NAYS: None

Motion passed.

There was no other business. Chair Beck adjourned the meeting at 8:14 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tony Repp
Recording Secretary