

Present: **Council** - President Stearn; President Pro-Tem Pfeifer; Members: Craig, Domzal, Downey and Walsh  
**Planning Board** - Chairperson Jensen; Vice-Chairperson Borowski (late); Members: Bliven, Hayes, Nedley, Smith, Tillman and Woodrow

Absent: Council - Munguia  
Planning Board – Schneiders

Also Present: Village Manager, Murphy  
Village Building Official, Byrwa

Chairperson Jensen called the meeting to order at 7:34 p.m. in the Village municipal building at 18500 W. Thirteen Mile Road.

Jensen referred to a memo he drafted listing topics that have been the focus of Planning Board activities over the past year. He will update Council on the status of these items and ask for direction that will assist the Planning Board in establishing a work program and priorities for the coming year.

#### Minor Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments

The Planning Board reviewed and drafted a series of minor text amendments, which were adopted by Council to update or correct specific zoning ordinances. The Planning Board is not presently working on any ordinance text amendments.

#### “Big Foot” housing

In response to a concern with the tear down and build up of new homes in Beverly Hills, the Planning Board looked at “big foot” development as it applies to residential site design and redevelopment standards. The Planning Board first reviewed current Zoning Ordinance restrictions to consider how Village regulations would impact “big foot” development.

The planning consultant prepared a comparison of the Village’s current setback, lot coverage, and height restrictions on its smaller lot single family home districts with those of surrounding communities that are similar in size and have well established downtown areas. It was the consensus of the board after review of the material that the Village’s side, front, and back yard setbacks and height requirements are sufficient to prevent “big foot” housing given the economics of the community. The Planning Board recommends that there is no need to pursue “big foot” housing issues at this time. The Planning Board will monitor this phenomenon and revisit the issue if necessary.

MOTION by Craig, seconded by Downey, that Council accept the recommendation of the Planning Board that the Beverly Hills Zoning Ordinance is adequate and no further action on “big foot” development is needed.

Motion passes unanimously.

Above ground utilities and the possible study of their relocation

The Planning Board considered initiating a study that would look at what is involved in the future relocation of above ground utilities to below ground utility service. A report would study the challenges, jurisdictional issues, and costs associated with such a move.

Jensen related that the Planning Board discussed this issue and came to the conclusion that there is no action required because it is improbable that the Village could enforce restrictions with respect to utilities in the rights-of-way. In response to a question, Jensen stated that any new utility service is required to be underground. This item was listed to inform Council that it was one of the Planning Board's discussion points.

Pathways Plan

The Planning Board worked on the pathways study over a period of 18 months. Two public discussions were held during that time. Upon completion of the study, the plan was forwarded to the Village Council for review and consideration. Council held a public hearing at its October 1, 2001 meeting. The Planning Board anticipates that Council will either accept the plan, adopt it in part, or drop it. Jensen asked for Council input on the status of the Pathways Plan.

Stearn stated that Council adopted the Pathways Plan at its October 1 meeting with the exclusion of the proposed new sidewalk on Evergreen Road. Council has suggested further consideration of alternatives for that area.

Council members discussed their views of the action taken on the Pathways Plan and how to proceed with the plan as adopted. Questions on the plan were addressed by board members.

Walsh referred to a 1985 sidewalk study that recommended sidewalk on the east side of Lahser south of 13 Mile Road. He asked why this section was omitted in the current Pathways Plan.

Tillman responded that the Pathways Plan focuses on providing routes to primary destinations in the Village. It is a conservative plan that provides accessibility to community facilities, schools, and churches. She believes that the perception was that sidewalk south of 13 Mile on Lahser does not provide a route to a neighborhood destination.

Jensen added that this has been referred to as a minimal plan. Sidewalks originally proposed in the plan were removed. A right-of-way study was instrumental in paring down the plan. There are rights-of-way issues from Lahser to the Village limits that would make it difficult to install sidewalks.

Craig expressed disappointment that Evergreen Road was omitted from the approved plan. It is his view that the solution for a pathway along Evergreen Road does not have to be an independent sidewalk. People are currently walking and riding bikes along that road. There is a 25 MPH speed limit on the road. Craig suggested that re-striping the road to narrow the lanes would create enough space on the paved shoulder for a walking path. Ribs could be installed in the roadway so that motorists are aware of going off the road.

People have complained about the speed on Evergreen Road since it was repaved and straightened. Narrowing the road will reduce speed and also create enough asphalt surface to generate a bike path along that road. Craig suggests a crosswalk going across to the Douglas Evans nature preserve and a crosswalk at Riverside. There are concrete sidewalks on the bridges. He proposes constructing an approach so that the bike path can cross the bridge. Craig thinks that there are economically feasible solutions, and the Village owes it to its citizens to make it safer for people walking and riding their bikes along Evergreen Road.

Craig stated that filling the gaps between existing sidewalk on Lahser Road makes sense. Sidewalks on 13 Mile Road from Lahser to Groves High school is an element of the plan, but it will not be a high priority. A bigger safety concern is the need for sidewalk on 13 Mile Road west of Lahser and on 14 Mile Road in the area of Berkshire School. Craig suggests that there may be a way to narrow the lanes and use the existing shoulder on 13 Mile Road for pedestrian traffic as an intermediate step.

Craig commented that a safe path includes crossing the roads. He maintains that the Evergreen and 13 Mile Road intersection does not need to be a five lane intersection in all four directions. The current design encourages people to get in the far right lane, pass traffic and then merge back. He suggests designating the far right lane as “right turn only” coming into the intersection. A reduced amount of pavement would lessen runoff, decrease traffic safety issues, and shorten the distance that someone has to travel across this intersection.

Downey related that he has spent time in Europe recently where he observed the use of raised walkways, paving stones, and roundabouts or islands to control traffic flow and speed at intersections. He commented on the effectiveness of these measures. The Planning Board has discussed some of these methods of traffic calming as part of this study. He would consider a Council motion to direct the Planning Board to look at Evergreen Road in terms of how to control traffic.

Stearn asked if there were any objections to Council referring the Pathways Plan back to the Planning Board to look at alternate strategies for Evergreen Road.

Pfeifer commented that she thinks Council should have an opportunity to provide input on this topic. Jensen asked that Council members forward their comments and suggestions in written form to the Planning Board.

Jensen commented that the Pathways Plan is based on reaching destinations in the community, which makes it critical for those who live south to get to Evergreen and up to Beverly Road. Evergreen Road is the link that ties the plan together. Jensen remarked that this is a conceptual plan. it was the intent of the Planning Board to have the plan adopted before providing specific recommendations and detailed information.

MOTION by Domzal, seconded by Downey, to refer the Pathways Plan back to the Planning Board to consider alternate strategies for a pathway along Evergreen Road with the request that a recommendation come back to Council within 120 days and with

the understanding that Council will provide its ideas to the board within the next 30 days.

Pfeifer expressed concerns about the safety of placing a pathway along Evergreen Road. She views it as a dangerous route for pedestrians and bicyclists because of the configuration and topography of the road, the amount of traffic, and the blind spots. She suggested an alternative of coming down Riverside to where sidewalks connect to Beverly Road on Rosevear and Weston. She would install a crosswalk at Evergreen and Riverside.

Craig made the point that people are already using Evergreen Road for walking, jogging, and bicycling. He would like to make an existing situation safer. Craig suggests that narrowing the lanes will slow traffic and make the road safer for pedestrians.

Downey concurred that people go where they want to go, and we need to facilitate their safety. Downey commented that he and others visit the Douglas Evans nature preserve.

Walsh commented on the heavy traffic volume and speed on Evergreen Road. Jensen mentioned that the firm of Birchler Arroyo has the top traffic and safety experts in town. The Planning Board will study this and present the alternatives to Council.

Motion passes unanimously.

#### Village Entrance Signs

The Planning Board will be making a recommendation to Council on Village entranceway signs in the next 30 days.

#### 14 Mile Road Corridor Study

The Planning Board will finalize a cover letter at its next meeting that will accompany the 14 Mile Road Corridor study. The document will be forwarded to Council for review and response.

#### Major Road Study

The last Planning Board review of the Village Master Plan identified problems in areas of the Village along major roads including the 13 Mile and Greenfield Road corridor, 14 Mile Road, areas along Lahser Road, and the Southfield Road business district. It was suggested that there should be a study of these sub areas. This item will remain on the Planning Board list.

#### Town “Center” Possibilities

There has been concern expressed that the Village does not have a comprehensive land use plan for its major roads and corridors. People have put forward ideas relative to Southfield Road or Beverly Park becoming a town center.

Craig commented that this may come up when the Planning Board begins updating the Village Master Plan. Creating a central area would take a lot of vision and will never happen without a future plan. Council suggested leaving this on the list of Planning Board topics as a long-term issue.

Commercial Development or Re-development Handbook

The Village of Beverly Hills Site Development Handbook was prepared in 1996. A priority project of the Planning Board is to incorporate some of the items in this document into the Village Zoning Ordinance in conjunction with a thorough study of the Southfield Road commercial corridor. The Planning Board will look at this handbook along with planning for the future.

Southfield Commercial Corridor Study

Jensen stated that he believes that future thinking is important and that a comprehensive long-term plan for the Southfield Road corridor would be a useful tool. He thinks that the Planning Board and Council should anticipate what they want to see happen.

Two meetings ago the Planning Board and consultant did a walk of the Southfield Road corridor, taking pictures of the properties, curb cuts, landscaping, signage, and problematic issues. The Planning Board is beginning its study of the Southfield Road business district. The board will take a look at future uses. It will also do a study that looks at the commercial corridor as it is and make recommendations as to how the Village can make it look better now. The board will want feedback from Council not only on what exists but on future possibilities for this area.

The funds allocated by Council for this study were questioned. There was agreement that the Southfield Road corridor is a primary concern of the Planning Board and Council and should be thoroughly studied. Stearn suggested that the Planning Board provide Council with information on the scope of work and cost estimates from the planning consultant prior to budget preparation.

Murphy stated that the Southfield Road Corridor Study will qualify for Community Development Block Grant Funds. CDBG money can be used for consultant fees for this project. The required public hearing and allocation of CDBG money will be on Council's agenda in November. Murphy will contact Birchler Arroyo relative to cost estimates for this study.

Craig asked when the Planning Board will undertake its next update of the Village Master Plan. He suggested that the Planning Board have a preliminary discussion within the next 12 months of what needs to be done in terms of updating the document and when the board will schedule a review of the Master Plan.

Smith suggested that the Planning Board chair appoint a subcommittee to look at the Master Plan and make recommendations on the extent of the update.

Domzal thinks that the Master Plan should be updated to incorporate the Pathways Plan and Park Master Plan. Craig added that the 14 Mile Road Corridor study will be reviewed by Council before the Planning Board updates the Master Plan. These represent three significant studies that have been produced since the last Master Plan review. New census numbers should be incorporated into the Master Plan. Jensen concurred that these studies will meld into the Master Plan.

Planning Board members agreed that the Southfield Road Corridor study will be a major component of the Master Plan. A review of the commercial redevelopment handbook should be completed. At that point, the Planning Board will be ready to revise the Master plan.

Borowski entered the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

The next joint meeting of the Planning Board and Council will be held on a regularly scheduled Planning Board meeting date in October of 2002.

### **PLANNING BOARD COMMENTS**

Tillman commended Council on its public hearing on the Pathways Plan held at the October 1 meeting. She mentioned that the Planning Board held two public discussions on the plan and gained a feeling for what the residents want. Tillman expressed the view that taking Evergreen Road out of the pathways plan will result in an incomplete system.

Bliven stated that Council's motion of October 1 approving the zoning change requested by Charrington Associates did not direct the Village Attorney to prepare an ordinance to rezone the parcel from R-2 to R-3. Council indicated that this direction to the attorney is implicit in its motion to rezone the property.

Bliven commented on the current hodgepodge of zoning in the Huntley Subdivision as evidenced on the Village zoning maps. The current zoning maps reflect lot numbers that are different than the 1960 drawings used for the original rezoning. He will present information to Council indicating corrections to the zoning that would result in an accurate map.

Bliven noted that the Planning Board did not receive any communication from Council last year on the approved work plan and funds allocated for those projects. Council will inform the Planning Board of budgeted items this year.

Borowski stated that he was pleased by the Council public hearing on the Pathways Plan on October 1. Difficult issues cannot be resolved without people becoming engaged and impassioned.

### **COUNCIL COMMENTS**

Craig apologized for not being present at the October 1 Council meeting for health reasons. He watched a replay of the meeting on cable television and thinks Council did a very good overall job. The Pathways Plan has gone further than the prior two sidewalk studies. He thinks that the Council needs to keep the momentum going if it wants to see anything happen.

Domzal thinks that the Planning Board does a consistently excellent job. Its quality of discussion, level of thought, amount of time and effort, and number of meetings is consistently high. He welcomed any thoughts on how the Council can work better with the Planning Board as we move forward. Domzal welcomed the new members to the Planning Board

Downey remarked that he takes pleasure at being the Planning Board liaison. He thanked the Planning Board for the work that it does. The members of this board have the opportunity to reflect future thinking of the Village. He welcomed new members of the board.

Pfeifer commented on the need to improve communications between the Planning Board, administration, and Council. It was noted that the Personnel Committee is working on this.

Pfeifer asked if the Planning Board list of subjects has been prioritized. Jensen stated that he has a sense of Council as to what it would like the board to be working on next year. The Planning Board will discuss its 2002 priorities at an upcoming meeting and submit a work program with estimated costs to the Council for consideration.

Walsh commented that the Planning Board is a talented group of people who do a good job on a number of different projects.

Stearn affirmed that the Council and Planning Board have entered a new era of cooperation and are starting to work together as a team.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Gladys Walsh of 20655 Smallwood Court supported the idea that people need a way to get into the Douglas Evans nature preserve not only from Evergreen but perhaps from the residential areas that abut the park.

Walsh asked the Planning Board to remember as it goes into various planning phases that there are different generations in the community. There are residents who came into Beverly Hills in the 1970's looking for a quiet residential community with a rustic feeling. She hopes the Village can move forward with the changes technology brings while retaining its character and identity.

With regard to improving communications, Walsh suggests that there needs to be active listening without being defensive when opposing viewpoints are expressed. Opposing viewpoints challenge thinking abilities and promote growth. Walsh thinks that everyone should be able to voice their opinions and work together to make this Village the best place it can be.

#### **REFER LOT SPLIT REQUEST TO PLANNING BOARD**

MOTION by Craig, seconded by Downey, to refer a lot split request for property at 19745 Beverly Road to the Planning Board for review and recommendation to Council.

Motion passes unanimously.

MOTION by Downey, seconded by Craig, to adjourn the meeting at 9:26 p.m.

Motion passes unanimously.

**Carry over items:**

- 1 - Entranceway signs (10-27-99)
- 2 - Fourteen Mile Road Corridor Study (10-11-00).
- 3 - Opinion from legal counsel on current ordinance definition of family (01-24-01).

**David Jensen, Chairperson  
Planning Board**

**Ellen E. Marshall  
Village Clerk**

**Todd Stearn  
Council President**