

Information of developer source.
Size of Commercial Area -
Vacant properties at the present time
Streets
Census - Fox Seal.

JW
=====
=====

AGENDA MEMORANDUM December 16, 1974
Village of Barrington, Illinois
Continuation of Adjourned Meeting from December 9, 1974

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ROLL CALL
3. APPOINTMENT TO FILL THE UNEXPIRED TERM OF THE VILLAGE CLERK
4. REPORTS OF VILLAGE OFFICIALS:
PRESIDENT'S REPORT:
a) President's report will be verbal

MANAGER'S REPORT:
a) The Manager will present a brief report comparing the recommendations contained in the BACOG Land Use Plan (Mini Plan) and the recommendations contained in the Village Comprehensive Plans, as they impact on the Draper proposal. The report will be made in conjunction of the Board's consideration of the Plan Commission's recommendation concerning the Draper proposal. Copies of recommendation and stenographic report have been forwarded in earlier agenda packets.
5. ADJOURNMENT

3012

Office of the Village Manager
D. H. Maiben

Hold Dec 23 Mtg on 30th
✓

Board has done a lot of work on BACO's. lead by an
Village President -
Support of village in BACO's. unincorporated area. money,
members of all organizations would be in support of Bannock
Village plan + BACO's plan. in particular

67,000 vs 47,000 population
meansistencies.

Have + more funds

Corner Ela - Lake Creek route vs 1 acre

North of Hart road 5000 -

Corner Ela + Cuba road.

Area Bannock + Dundee road.

Almost every boundary quarter

North Bannock

Basic + Fundamental difference

Bannock area plan - Not more than 2 units per acre

516 - 686 -

Bank - about 10 acres of commercial zoning

1 unit per acre -

Should be annexed + developed

Density - not greater than 1 unit per acre
single detached houses.

- townhouses: inappropriate
305 to 400 houses.

- Sewer Capacity problem -

- Brandt. Dinger property, with great care

325 of 381 -

Kindergarten + middle school.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

THIS MONDAY'S ADJOURNED VILLAGE BOARD MEETING WILL BE HELD AT THE BARRINGTON UNITED METHODIST CHURCH, IN THE LOWER LEVEL ASSEMBLY ROOM. JUST A REMINDER----village trustees should first meet at the village hall council chambers at 7:45 p.m. to reconvene the meeting. After calling for a short recess, the meeting can be called to order again at the church.

ADMINISTRATIVE ABSTRACTS

THE VILLAGE STAFF THIS WEEK BEGAN TAKING TRAFFIC COUNTS AT TWO KEY INTERSECTIONS IN THE VILLAGE CENTER AS PART OF THE DOWNTOWN BEAUTIFICATION PLAN NOW BEING PREPARED. Traffic counts and origin and destination studies are being made at the Station/Cook Street intersection and the Cook Street/Main Street intersection. This information will determine both the number of cars and the kind of traffic passing through these intersections---that is, whether the traffic is bound for the village center to shop or attempting to avoid the Lake-Cook and Hough Street intersection.

The results from the studies will be used by the traffic engineering section of Barton-Aschman in its review of landscaping, shopper parking and traffic flow plans now being prepared by the landscape architect for the village center beautification project. This traffic analysis will be submitted to the downtown beautification committee as part of its review of the project. The committee is planning to make final recommendations for board consideration sometime in January.

YOU SHOULD KNOW

Board Meetings

12/16/74	. . .	Adjourned Meeting	. . .	Village Hall and Methodist Church	. . .	7:45 p.m.
12/23/74	. . .	Regular Meeting	. . .	Village Hall.	. . .	8:00 p.m.

Zoning Board of Appeals

1/ 7/75	. . .	ZBA14-74 N-18 McDonalds (continued)	. . .	Village Hall.	. . .	7:30 p.m.
1/ 7/75	. . .	ZBA15-75 N-16 Ford	. . .	Village Hall.	. . .	7:45 p.m.
1/ 7/75	. . .	ZBA13-74 N-10 Arco	. . .	Village Hall.	. . .	8:00 p.m.
1/ 7/75	. . .	ZBA18-74 N-1 Shell	. . .	Village Hall.	. . .	8:15 p.m.
1/ 7/75	. . .	ZBA19-74 N-2 Hrobsky	. . .	Village Hall.	. . .	8:30 p.m.

Plan Commission

2/26/75	. . .	PC8-74 N-18 40 acres - Dundee	. . .	Village Hall.	. . .	8:00 p.m.
---------	-------	----------------------------------	-------	---------------	-------	-----------

Office of the Village Manager
D. H. Maiben

Resolution

WHEREAS the Village of Barrington is a member of and firm supporter of the Barrington Area Council of Governments and is devoted to regional cooperation within the Barrington area through the Barrington Area Council of Governments; and

WHEREAS the Barrington Area Council of Governments has undertaken to develop a new Comprehensive Plan for the unincorporated territory within the BACOG area; and

WHEREAS there are currently discrepancies between the existing Comprehensive Plan of BACOG and the Comprehensive Plan of the Village of Barrington; and

WHEREAS such discrepancies between the two plans are undesirable and are not in the best interests of this municipality or of BACOG and it may become desirable for the Village of Barrington to consider amendments to ^{its} ~~is~~ Comprehensive Plan;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the President and Board of Trustees of the Village of Barrington, Cook and Lake Counties, Illinois, that:

SECTION 1: The Village of Barrington commends the efforts of BACOG in seeking to develop a new Comprehensive Plan for the unincorporated BACOG area; and

SECTION 2: The Village of Barrington requests that its representatives to BACOG present to the Board of Trustees a report as to the status of the proposed new BACOG plan at the first regular Village of Barrington Board Meeting in the month of March, 1975.

PASSED THIS _____ DAY OF DECEMBER, 1974.

AYES _____ NAYS _____ ABSENT _____

APPROVED THIS _____ DAY OF DECEMBER, 1974.

Attested and filed this _____ day of _____, 1974.

Village President

_____, Village Clerk

REMARKS OF
GEORGE H. FOREMAN, PRESIDENT
FOX POINT HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
TO
THE BARRINGTON VILLAGE BOARD
DECEMBER 16, 1974

THE FIRST POINT I WOULD LIKE TO BRING TO THE ATTENTION OF THE VILLAGE BOARD IS THAT FOX POINT IS IN AGREEMENT WITH THE BARRINGTON PLAN COMMISSION THAT THE BRANDEL-DRAPER PROPERTY SHOULD BE ANNEXED TO BARRINGTON AND SHOULD BE DEVELOPED. WE WANT OUR VILLAGE TRUSTEES TO BE IN A POSITION TO CONTROL THE TYPE DEVELOPMENT THAT GOES INTO THIS AREA. WHERE FOX POINT DISAGREES WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION IS THE TYPE DEVELOPMENT THAT SHOULD GO INTO THIS AREA. SPECIFICALLY, WE ARE AGAINST HIGH DENSITY AND THE MULTIPLE FAMILY TOWNHOUSE CONCEPT APPROVED BY THE PLAN COMMISSION ON THE BASIS THAT IT DOES NOT REPRESENT THE HIGHEST AND BEST USE OF THIS PROPERTY.

AS FAR AS DENSITY IS CONCERNED, WE URGE COMPLIANCE WITH BOTH THE BARRINGTON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND THE GUIDELINES ESTABLISHED BY BACOG FOR THIS PROPERTY. WE SUGGEST THE VILLAGE BOARD CAN BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH BOTH "PLANS" BY APPROVING A DENSITY NOT GREATER THAN ONE UNIT PER ACRE - SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED HOUSING.

WE ARE ALSO RECOMMENDING COMPLIANCE WITH A CONCEPT OF THE BARRINGTON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN STATING DENSITY SHOULD DECREASE AS DEVELOPMENTS MOVE AWAY FROM THE CENTER OF THE VILLAGE. THE REVISED PLAN COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATION REPRESENTS A DEVIATION FROM THIS CONCEPT AND FROM LIMITED GROWTH OBJECTIVE OF BACOG AS THE PROPOSED DENSITY FOR BRANDEL-DRAPER IS 61% HIGHER THAN THE NORTH SIDE OF FOX POINT (RE BRANDEL-DRAPER 1.85 UNITS PER ACRE VERSUS 1.15 UNITS PER ACRE NORTH SIDE OF FOX POINT).

AS FAR AS TOWNHOUSES ARE CONCERNED, FOX POINT PRESENTED EXPERT TESTIMONY THROUGH A PROFESSIONAL CONSULTANT, MR. ABBOTT NELSON, VICE PRESIDENT, REAL ESTATE RESEARCH, WHO STATED THAT

- TOWNHOUSES ARE CLEARLY INAPPROPRIATE FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT ON THE FRINGE AREAS OF BARRINGTON.
- BARRINGTON IS KNOWN LOCALLY AND NATIONALLY AS AN AREA OF BEAUTIFUL, SINGLE FAMILY HOMES. THIS IMAGE IS IMPORTANT IN THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE VILLAGE AS AN EXTREMELY DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE.

MULTIPLE FAMILY CONSTRUCTION MAY BE APPROPRIATE FOR ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, PALATINE OR OTHER VILLAGES, BUT BARRINGTON'S IMAGE AND ENVIRONMENT IS DIFFERENT. THIS MUST BE RECOGNIZED, AND BARRINGTON MUST BE WILLING TO FIGHT TO RETAIN THIS IMAGE.

MR. NELSON'S SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS WERE AS FOLLOWS:

- ANNEXATION OF SUBJECT PROPERTY TO BARRINGTON
- DEVELOPED FOR RESIDENTIAL USE
- DEVELOPMENT RESTRICTED TO SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED HOUSING
- DENSITY TO BE 1.0 TO 1.3 UNITS PER ACRE -
THIS WOULD PROVIDE 305 TO 400 HOMES

IN REVIEW, OUR CONSULTANT'S RECOMMENDATIONS ARE COMPATIBLE WITH THE BARRINGTON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND THE GUIDELINES ESTABLISHED BY BACOG FOR THIS PROPERTY.

ANOTHER ISSUE THAT APPEARS TO NEED FURTHER CONSIDERATION BY THE VILLAGE BOARD IS THE SEWER CAPACITY PROBLEM. WHILE THE FOX POINT SEWER SYSTEM WAS ORIGINALLY DESIGNED TO SERVE THE BRANDEL-DRAPER AREA, NUMEROUS "HOOK-UPS OR TAP-ONS" FROM NEIGHBORING SUBDIVISIONS MAY WELL HAVE TAXED OUR SYSTEM'S CAPACITY. WHILE THIS IS CLEARLY A PROBLEM FOR THE VILLAGE STAFF TO RESOLVE WITH THE DEVELOPER, WE ARE NOT AWARE THAT A SATISFACTORY SOLUTION INCLUDING COST FACTORS HAS BEEN RESOLVED.

ANOTHER AREA OF GREAT CONCERN TO THE COMMUNITY SHOULD BE FACTS CONTAINED IN THE LAKE COUNTY SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT REPORT DATED OCTOBER 11, 1974.

IN SUMMARY, THE REPORT INDICATED:

- DEVELOPMENT OF BRANDEL-DRAPER PROPERTY SHOULD BE APPROACHED WITH EXTREME CAUTION
- EVERY ACTION SHOULD BE TAKEN TO PRESERVE WETLANDS
- 29% OF THE SITE, OR 110 ACRES, IS IN THE FLOOD PLAIN, AND THE LAKE COUNTY BOARD OPPOSES ANY CONSTRUCTION IN THE FLOOD PLAIN AREA IN ORDER TO PRESERVE FLOOD PLAIN CAPACITY AND TO INSURE THAT FLOODING PROBLEMS ARE NOT MAGNIFIED IN LAKE COUNTY

- 59% OF TOTAL SITE, OR APPROXIMATELY 225 ACRES,
IS IN THE SEVERE TO VERY SEVERE LAND USE LIMITATION
RATING

WE DO NOT BELIEVE PROPER EMPHASIS HAS BEEN GIVEN TO THIS REPORT,
AND URGE ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATION BY THE VILLAGE BOARD.

ANOTHER AREA OF GREAT CONCERN TO FOX POINT AND SCHOOL
DISTRICT #220 IS THE IMPACT THE BRANDEL-DRAPER DEVELOPMENT
WOULD HAVE ON LINES SCHOOL AND THE MIDDLE SCHOOL. IT IS MY
UNDERSTANDING THESE TWO SCHOOLS ARE CURRENTLY AT CAPACITY OR
OVER AND CANNOT ADEQUATELY HANDLE THE RAPID GROWTH BROUGHT
ABOUT BY THIS HIGH DENSITY DEVELOPMENT. IT ALSO APPEARS THE
FINANCIAL CONSIDERATION FOR ERECTING A NEW SCHOOL BUILDING OR
AN ADDITION TO AN EXISTING BUILDING HAS BEEN COMPLETELY OVERLOOKED.

WHILE THIS IS OF MORE CONCERN TO THE VILLAGE STAFF AND
TO THE VILLAGE BOARD THAN TO FOX POINT, ANOTHER AREA OF CONCERN
THAT HAS BEEN VIRTUALLY IGNORED UP TO THIS TIME IS INFORMATION
CONCERNING THE DEVELOPER'S FINANCING CAPABILITIES AND AVAILABLE
SOURCES OF FINANCING FOR PROSPECTIVE NEW HOME BUYERS.

ANOTHER AREA OF CONCERN IS THE SIZE OF THE PROPOSED
SHOPPING CENTER. THE CURRENT BRANDEL-DRAPER PROPOSAL REQUESTS
A 90,000 SQUARE FOOT COMMERCIAL CENTER INCLUDING 40,000 SQUARE
FEET OF OFFICE SPACE ON 6.43 ACRES OF PROPERTY. WE FEEL THIS,
TOO, IS A VIOLATION OF THE BARRINGTON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN IN THAT

WE DO NOT FEEL THE PLAN ENVISIONED A CONVENIENCE SHOPPING WITH MORE THAN TWICE THE SQUARE FOOTAGE OF THE ENTIRE JEWEL CENTER AND MORE THAN FOUR TIMES THE SQUARE FOOTAGE OF BARRINGTON COMMONS. I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO CALL THE BOARD'S ATTENTION TO THE NUMEROUS VACANT STORES AND OFFICES ON NORTHWEST HIGHWAY BOTH NORTH AND SOUTH OF LAKE-COOK ROAD. WITH VACANT PROPERTIES ALREADY IN THE AREA, IT IS QUESTIONABLE ADDITIONAL STORES OR OFFICE SPACE IS NEEDED; AND WITH THE DOWNWARD TREND OF THE ECONOMY, I AM SURE BARRINGTON MERCHANTS DO NOT NEED OR WANT ADDITIONAL COMPETITION.

ANOTHER AREA OF CONCERN TO THE COMMUNITY IS THE IMPACT THE BRANDEL-DRAPER DEVELOPMENT WOULD HAVE ON TRAFFIC CONDITIONS AND TRAFFIC COSTS INCLUDING THE POSSIBLE WIDENING OF ELA ROAD FROM LAKE-COOK TO CUBA ROAD, THE WIDENING OF CUBA ROAD AND EVENTUALLY THE POSSIBLE WIDENING OF LAKE-COOK ROAD AS WELL. THE NOISE AND TRAFFIC POLLUTION FACTOR SHOULD NOT BE NEGATED.

IN CONCLUSION, IT IS THE CONCENSUS OF FOX POINT THAT APPROVAL OF THE PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ANNEXATION AND REZONING WOULD LEAD TO:

- A BREAKDOWN IN COMMUNICATIONS/COOPERATION BETWEEN VILLAGE OF BARRINGTON AND BACOG TO ACCOMPLISH PREVIOUSLY STATED MUTUAL GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

- PASSAGE OF THE PROPOSED TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT WOULD BE PRECEDENT SETTING AND LEAD TO A FLOOD OF REQUESTS FROM OTHER PETITIONERS FOR SIMILAR DEVELOPMENTS THUS COMPLICATING BARRINGTON'S ATTEMPT TO RETAIN ITS COUNTRYSIDE ENVIRONMENT.

WE HAVE EVERY CONFIDENCE THAT, IN VIEW OF PREVIOUSLY EXPRESSED WRITTEN OPPOSITION TO BRANDEL-DRAPER BY FOX POINT, WYNGATE, BARRINGTON MEADOWS, FAIRHAVEN, NORTH BARRINGTON, INVERNESS, BARRINGTON COUNTRYSIDE ASSOCIATION, SCHOOL DISTRICT #220, BARRINGTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, AND BACOG, OUR VILLAGE BOARD IN ITS WISDOM WILL DENY THE PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ANNEXATION.

GEORGE H. FOREMAN
PRESIDENT
FOX POINT HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION

MAJOR ISSUES ON BRANDEL-DRAPER PROPOSAL
THAT APPEAR TO REQUIRE FURTHER
CONSIDERATION BY BARRINGTON VILLAGE BOARD

1. The Barrington Area Council of Governments passed an 11 page "Comprehensive Land Use Plan" plus a Land Use Map on February 13, 1973 to establish land use goals for the unincorporated territory in the BACOG area. This plan dealt with land use policies, open space system implementation, and recreational land. The Land Use Map which was adopted, recommended that the Brandel-Draper property be developed at a single family residential density of not more than one unit per acre. This plan was approved in principal by the BACOG Executive Board, subject to Board action at the next Village Board Meetings of the respective villages involved.

On August 27, 1974, the Barrington Area Council of Governments reaffirmed its position by voting to oppose the L. F. Draper project on the basis of its incompatibility with the BACOG Comprehensive Land Use Plan for unincorporated areas. This reaffirmation was based on a 5 to 1 vote, with Mr. Keith Pierson abstaining.

It is our view that the Barrington Plan Commission should have given greater weight to policy guidelines of BACOG. The prime motivating force behind the formation of BACOG was the urgent need to develop a strategy of mutual support for area-wide goals and policies so as to succeed in the limited growth objectives of BACOG.

2. The original Barton-Aschman Comprehensive Plan for the Village of Barrington issued in December, 1970 contained recommendations for high density development of the Brandel property which is in Neighborhood 12. It specifically recommended a planned unit development with a variety of housing types, plus other highly intensive uses. However, after numerous hearings and 18 months later, the final Barrington Comprehensive Plan was issued in June, 1972. The matter of a "variety of housing types" had been thoroughly discussed with the Plan Commission and the Village Board, and consequently this reference was removed in the final report with the full intent of the Plan Commission and the Village Board to specifically preclude the injection of townhouses or multi-family apartment housing on this property.

Nevertheless, the Village Staff and the Plan Commission have adopted the posture that the Barrington Comprehensive Plan allows the inclusion of townhouses, or what is euphemistically referred to as single family attached housing, on this property. Under this premise the Plan Commission has recommended the inclusion of R9A multi-family housing on this parcel of land. Only one Plan Commission member felt that this proposed R9A utilization was against the principals expressed in Barrington's Comprehensive Plan.

3. Three homeowner's associations from the east side of Barrington held a Candidate's Forum prior to the April, 1973 Village election. At that time, Mr. Voss passed along a letter of March 27, 1973 from Mr. L. F. Draper to be read to the audience. This letter, which was addressed to the Barrington Village Board, stated emphatically that the proposed multiple family and townhouse concepts for the Brandel property would deviate from the present comprehensive plan of the Village of Barrington, and that Draper did not plan to proceed with proposals to develop the Brandel property on a multiple family or townhouse basis.

At the recent hearings, Mr. Draper chose to say little about this commitment despite the strong feelings on the part of the audience that a serious moral commitment was at stake. However, two Plan Commission members took the emphatic position in defense of Mr. Draper that this commitment was no longer applicable to this new Draper proposal.

We question the appropriateness of the Plan Commission's providing assistance in making the Petitioner's case for allowing R9A multi-family housing on the Brandel property, when the Petitioner could not support this recommendation at the hearing, and in fact had previously agreed to the premise that townhouses were in violation of the Barrington Comprehensive Plan.

4. The Plan Commission has properly interpreted the Barrington Comprehensive Plan recommendations as permitting two or less units per acre on that part of the Brandel property that excludes the Cuba Marsh.

The original Draper proposal called for a housing density of 2.33 units per acre exclusive of the 68 acres of Cuba Marsh set-aside, the 15 acres of commercial land and the 5 acres of church property.

The revised Plan Commission recommendation involves a gross housing density of 1.85 units per acre on 307.12 acres which excludes the 68 acres of Cuba Marsh set-aside and 6.43 acres of commercial land.

However, after reducing the 307.12 acres by the mandatory 15 per cent for public streets, the 569 units recommended is the absolute maximum allowed under R5 20,000 square foot zoning, and takes full credit for 76 acres of greenways and lakes. If the 76 acres of greenways and lakes were excluded in arriving at maximum permissible density, as is the case in Fox Point, then the maximum permissible density would be 428 units under the PUD zoning basis. The PUD ordinance does not make it mandatory to give the Petitioner credit for the 76 acres of greenways and lakes.

We conclude that the Plan Commission should not have given the Petitioner the absolute maximum of two units per acre, and allowed full credit for the 76 acres of greenways and lakes in arriving at permissible density for this countryside property.

5. The north side of Fox Point which is zoned R5 (20,000 square feet minimum lot size) consists of 257 gross acres on which there are 295 single family homes. This represents a gross housing density of 1.15 units per acre for Fox Point. This contrasts with the recommended gross density of 1.85 units per acre for the Brandel property. As mentioned earlier, this is based on the 307.12 acres of the Brandel property which excludes the 68 acres of Cuba Marsh set-aside and 6.43 acres of commercial land.

At a gross housing density of 1.85 units per acre, the residential area of the Brandel property is 61 per cent more dense than the north side of Fox Point. If this Brandel property had the exact same gross density as the north side of Fox Point, or 1.15 units per acre, then only 353 single family homes could be built on the 307.12 acres of Brandel property.

The Village of Barrington should not permit a greater housing density on the Brandel property than exists on the north side of Fox Point.

6. The Fox Point area north of Lake-Cook Road was built as a "Planned Development" long before the adoption of a PUD ordinance. This development was intended as a buffer between the relatively higher density areas of Barrington and the countryside. The Brandel-Draper property is in the countryside, and it would appear that the overall limited growth objectives of BACOG and as well as Barrington would be seriously compromised with the kind of density being recommended by the Barrington Plan Commission for this property.

7. The 1972 Barrington Comprehensive Plan supported the current applicability of the older 1958 Barrington Comprehensive Plan. A basic tenet of the older plan still considered applicable is that housing density should decrease as developments are established further away from the center core of the Village.

Although one Plan Commission member brought this point up, in the final analysis, it was ignored through the unanimous decision to give Draper 61 per cent higher density than the north side of Fox Point.

8. Fox Point retained Abbott L. Nelson, Vice President of Real Estate Research Corporation to study the proposed Brandel-Draper project. Both Mr. Nelson and the firm which he represents have nationwide reputations and nationwide operations in the field of land utilization.

Mr. Nelson testified that:

- a. It was clearly inappropriate to incorporate townhouses on the fringes of Barrington.
- b. Barrington is known nationally as well as locally as an area of single family homes. This image is important in the establishment of the Village as an extremely desirable place to live and, hence in the maintenance and enhancement of property values.
- c. There are hundreds of communities where multiple-family construction is appropriate. Barrington has a wholly different image and environment which creates the very strong demand potential which Draper is seeking to capitalize upon. Barrington should fight to retain this image.
- d. Inclusion of townhouses would tend to erode the general marketability for single family homes in Barrington.

- e. From a reading of the Comprehensive Plan of the Village of Barrington and the BACOG report, it seems quite clear that townhouse or other multiple-family uses were not contemplated on the fringe areas of the Village of Barrington.
 - f. The area should be restricted to a single family residential density of 1.0 to 1.3 units per acre, with preferably 305 homes and not more than 400 homes.
9. Based on the Plan Commission recommendations of 569 total units, the average allocation of land per housing unit in the Brandel-Draper proposal is 15,040 square feet. This is based on the 307.12 acres less the 76 acres of lakes and greenways and a 15 per cent or 34.7 acres allowance for streets or a net acreage of 196.45 acres. If a maximum of 400 homes were placed on the Brandel-Draper property, the average lot size would be 21,394 square feet or still well below the average lot size per home for the north side of Fox Point.
10. At least two Barrington Plan Commission members stated emphatically that in their view it was not economic to serve the Brandel-Draper property with water, sewer and other utilities on the basis of a housing density of only 400 homes. It is our view, that the burden of proof for such economic conclusions should rest with the developer and not the Plan Commission. At no time was Draper asked or did Draper volunteer support for such a conclusion.
11. Page 9 of the Barrington Village "Staff Study And Recommendation" indicated that utility off-site costs for the Draper development will be \$1,257,540.00 less recovery of \$290,363.00 from other developers, leaving a net cost of \$967,177. This represents a net

unit cost based on 684 units of \$1,414.00 per unit. If this cost were to be spread over 400 units rather than 684 units, it would increase the per unit cost by \$1,004.00 to \$2,418.00. Since there would be less requirements for sewer and water with 400 units as opposed to 684 units, the \$1,004.00 increase per unit cost is probably on the high side. Certainly, this represents a very nominal increase in cost as opposed to the overall price of a single family home in a 400 unit development on this property. Also, the 400 homes will be clustered on this property because of the soil situation. This will reduce the on-site cost of utilities to serve a 400 home single family PUD.

We conclude that 400 units serviced by Village sewer and water will be only nominally more expensive than development of single family homes using one acre county zoning with individual wells and septic systems. Therefore, in our view the Brandel-Draper property can be economically developed on the basis of 400 single family homes. This conclusion is backed by Mr. Abbott Nelson as well as other well-informed people in Fox Point who work in this field of expertise.

12. Data developed by the Plan Commission were in error and helped contribute to an unsatisfactory recommendation. The northwest quadrant of the Ela Road-Cuba Road intersection was indicated to be zoned B2 business by a member of the Plan Commission. This area

is in the Lake Zurich Village limits, and is actually zoned R2 One Family Residence District which is the second least dense residential zoning in Lake Zurich. There is no B2 zoning in this area.

The same Plan Commission member stated that the northeast quadrant of the Ela Road-Cuba Road intersection was zoned B2 business. This area is in Deer Park, and it is actually zoned Office and Research. There is no B2 zoning in this area. B2 zoning is Deer Park's most intensive business zoning which is only used along Rand Road.

Mention was also made of the Deer Park Heavy Manufacturing zoning in the 300 foot* corridor of Deer Park that runs across the top of the Brandel property. The implication was that some concessions would have to be made to the developer since this zoning existed. Actually, this zoning was established only to provide flexibility on zoning to the land owner as an inducement to create the corridor so that land west of the EJ & E tracks could be annexed to Deer Park.

There is no market for "Heavy Manufacturing" zoning in a strip of this size. Deer Park cannot provide sewer and water to a "Heavy Manufacturing" use, and most importantly, the owner of the entire Brandel parcel has no intention of putting this strip to such an unusual use since such action would seriously downgrade the value of the rest of his property.

* Per Barton Aschman December, 1970 report.

The land directly west of the EJ & E tracks is also zoned Heavy Manufacturing by Deep Park. However, this land which is in Neighborhood 11 is supposed to be rezoned to single family residences of no more than two and no less than one and one-third units per acre and served by public sewer and water facilities under the final Barrington Comprehensive Plan of June, 1972.

We conclude that the zoning on the vacant lands near the Brandel property would be adversely effected if the excessive density and multi-family housing now recommended by the Plan Commission is allowed to stand. There are close to 1,000 acres of vacant land that could eventually be downgraded to more intensive use if Barrington were to go ahead with current recommendations for the Brandel property which are definitely precedent-setting.

13. The Board of Directors for the Lake County Soil and Water Conservation District submitted its recommendations on the Draper Plan under cover of its letter of October 11, 1974. The following are some of the more pertinent observations.
 - a. In the opinion of the Board, development of the Brandel-Draper property should be approached with extreme caution.
 - b. If lakes are constructed, proper means for maintenance should be incorporated.
 - c. Eutrophication (i.e., often shallow and seasonally deficient in oxygen) is a major problem where lakes are constructed in muck areas.
 - d. Twenty-nine per cent of the site (111 acres) falls within the flood plain of the 1960 flood of record.

- e. A large amount of natural storm water retention is provided by the depressional areas on this property.
- f. Topography on this site is steep; therefore the erosion potential is high.
- g. Twenty-seven per cent of the soil falls under the land use rating of very severe limitation for buildings of a residential-commercial nature. Thirty-two per cent of the soil is in the category of severe limitation for building. Forty-one per cent of the soil falls under the moderate limitation category. None of the soil falls under the slight limitation category. Therefore, 100 per cent of the soil falls under land use limitation categories, from moderate to very severe.
- h. The soils that exhibit the most restrictive qualities are identified as Houghton, Peotone and Ashkum. They are located in the depressional areas and waterways. Construction on this soil can result in settling of structures and lawns, and result in extremely high maintenance costs and innumerable management problems. The problems associated with these soils can be overcome, but the processes will be extremely costly and difficult. Failure of corrective measures would leave future homeowners with monumental, and in some cases, irreparable problems.
- i. A significant portion of this site consists of the Beecher, Nappanee, Wauconda, Frankfurt, Mundelein, and Elliott soils or combinations of these. All of these soils have been assigned a severe limitation rating for the proposed use primarily on the basis of a seasonal high water table. Common land use problems on these soils are cracking and heaving of roads, sidewalks and foundations; wet basements; excavations that fill with water; and ponding of runoff on the soil surface.
- j. Storm water management will undoubtedly present some problems on this site. The existing depressional areas provide a tremendous amount of natural storage that must be preserved in order to protect downstream properties. In addition, the nature of the development requires a large amount of impervious covers (e.g., rooftops, roads and parking lots), therefore, increasing the runoff.

Considering the innumerable problems with development of this area as outlined by the Lake County Soil and Water Conservation District, we question whether the Plan Commission has given this matter sufficient

attention. Practically, all of the discussion of this topic occurred after the Plan Commission had arrived at a favorable recommendation. If it had not been for questions from the audience, it seemed that this matter would have been put aside. In fact, one Plan Commission member said that he had talked to the Lake County Soil and Water Conservation District personally, and he found these people much more flexible than their report indicated. The thrust of this comment was to put everyone's mind at ease, and to proceed ahead under the assumption that we could depend upon Draper, the Village staff and Village engineers, to see that there are no problems.

14. The original December 6, 1972 Draper proposal for the Brandel property was based on a 1,431 unit apartment and townhouse development with a commercial center with 60,000 square feet of floor space.

The current Draper proposal requests a 90,000 square feet commercial center, including 40,000 square feet of office space on a 15 acre parcel of land. The Plan Commission has recommended retention of the full 90,000 square feet of commercial space, and merely reduced the acreage for the shopping center to 6.43 acres.

Certainly, the Barrington Comprehensive Plan did not contemplate a neighborhood convenience center of this size. The entire Jewel Center including other stores is only 44,300 square feet. Even the store area of the Barrington Commons is only 21,000 square feet. In effect, the Plan Commission, in its recommendations, is providing

for a substitute shopping center that will drain the vitality of the central business district of Barrington, and attract shoppers and traffic from a three to five mile radius.

Other factors of importance are:

- a. The approved Barrington Comprehensive Plan of June, 1972 states that the Neighborhood Convenience centers should not exceed approximately five acres of land area. Possible sites were stated to be the northwest quadrant, the southwest quadrant and the southeast quadrant. No statement in favor of a convenience center in the northeast quadrant was included in this Plan (page 20). Also, the Neighborhood 12 recommendations omit any reference to a convenience center. Only the map opposite page 19 of the Barrington Plan indicates that any thought was given to convenience center for the northeast quadrant.
 - b. Mr. Nelson Forrest, President Pro Tem of the Village of North Barrington objected to this Convenience Center, and stated that it would have a negative impact on the area, and set a precedent for unwanted non-residential land use on contiguous and nearby properties, including the other corners of the intersection.
 - c. The Vice President of Real Estate Research, Mr. Abbott L. Nelson, stated that a commercial center of this size would be a violation of the open and residential character of the area. It would have a detrimental effect on the surrounding environment, on traffic circulation, and on the viability of the Barrington central business district. Mr. Abbott Nelson recommended that the office space be excluded, and that only a total of 30,000 square feet of shopping area be included on three or four areas of land.
15. The Barton-Aschman traffic analysis of March 31, 1972 on the Draper proposal, as updated for the current application, states that this project will generate 705 a.m. peak trips and 1,410 p.m. peak trips. This is based on 682 townhouses and single family units, and 56,000 square feet of commercial space. Now we have 569 units instead of 682, and 90,000 square feet of commercial space instead of 56,000 square feet.

This traffic analysis also recommends the staged widening of Ela Road to four lanes all the way from Cuba Road to Lake-Cook Road. In addition, the widening of Cuba Road to include two eastbound lanes around the development is recommended. Finally, the recommendation is made to place an east-west access road just north of Fox Point through the heart of the Cuba Marsh from the Brandel development to Eastern Avenue extended.

To our knowledge, the Plan Commission did not address itself to these recommendations in its final report to the Village Board. However, they serve to clearly demonstrate the large impact that this proposed Draper proposal would have upon our village both in investment and operating costs, and in noise and traffic pollution. In fact, we would venture to add that if Ela Road must be widened to four lanes, then we will eventually be faced with a proposal to widen Lake-Cook Road to four lanes.

Certainly, we must conclude that the Draper proposal will be the catalyst for the complete destruction of our countryside environment in the east Barrington area.

16. The final recommendation of the Plan Commission on housing density involves 569 units with 190 townhouses and 379 single family homes. The single family units are supposed to average 3.5 bedrooms per unit, and the townhouses will average 2.5 bedrooms per unit. This development has all the characteristics of a young family development

20. We have noted that Barrington plans to install a 36-inch sewer from Hough Street to the Waste Water Treatment Plant when there is only a 24-inch line leaving the Waste Water Treatment Plant.

We conclude that the excessive density requested by Brandel-Draper will hasten the day when the Waste Water Treatment Plant must be expanded once again, and a new larger outfall line will have to be built to handle the effluent from this plant.

21. We feel that the various cost-revenue analyses performed by the developer and the Village staff fall far short of giving an accurate picture of the negative impact of this massive project. In addition to utility investment and operating costs, we have excessive school costs, traffic costs, police costs, fire costs, administrative costs and dozens of other hidden costs for this large population influx.

Taking the revenue analysis of the Barrington Homeowners Association as an example, will demonstrate how easily we can miss some important factors. In the Barrington Homeowner's letter of September 26, 1974 to the Barrington Plan Commission, the conclusion was developed that on a revenue comparison basis, the Draper proposal contributes \$30 more per capita than the Village receives from the current Barrington population. However, this conclusion involves three problems, as follows:

1. An error on license fees that was contained in the Applied Property Research Study.

2. An addition error.
3. Neglect in analyzing the individual categories.

On a restated basis, the proper analysis is as follows:

	<u>Dollars Per Capita</u>		
	<u>Barrington</u> <u>Only</u>	<u>Draper</u> <u>Project</u>	<u>Draper</u> <u>Advantage</u>
Real Estate Taxes	\$ 18.00	\$ 55.07	+ 37.07
Sales Tax	51.11	38.61	- 12.50
Licenses	11.20	2.60	- 8.60
Water Fees, Sewer Fees	<u>57.78</u>	<u>56.31</u>	- <u>1.47</u>
	\$138.09	\$152.59	+ 14.50

While this analysis is not too pertinent, it does show that there is a negative impact from three of the four categories. The Real Estate Tax category shows an improvement, but this is meaningless. If there were only 400 new single family homes on this property, the real estate tax category would also show a substantial improvement, whereas the other categories would have less of a negative impact. The addition of only one new house will show a positive real estate tax impact since its average value would likely be higher than the value of the older homes in Barrington.

It is meaningless to look at only the revenue side of the equation. A look at the cost side on an in-depth basis would show that density is a negative factor -- the more we have of it, the more costly it will be to the rest of the Barrington taxpayers.

22. Six homeowners' associations have taken a strong position against the Brandel-Draper development, including Fox Point, Barrington Meadows, Wyngate, Fairhaven, Barrington Countryside, and the North Barrington Area Association. The Village of Inverness and North Barrington have also stated their opposition to this development. In addition, BACOG, the Barrington Chamber of Commerce and Barrington School District 220 have expressed their great concern. Only one association, the Barrington Homeowners Association, took a favorable position on the Brandel-Draper proposal. This association, which consists of perhaps 20 or a maximum of 40 dues paying members, has not represented the citizens of Barrington in this matter.

The strong adverse reaction to the Brandel-Draper proposal makes us quite concerned in regard to the decision in favor of the project made by the Barrington Plan Commission. Certainly the Village of Barrington has no obligation to annex any land unless it is completely satisfied with what it is getting. If the annexation were denied, Barrington could still control the density of the Brandel-Draper development under Lake County zoning. The Brandel-Draper proposal represents a high density, high impact proposal which was presented with a minimum of detail. The annexation should be denied.

D. J. Beville