

Town Hall Meeting
Saturday, Dec. 4,
8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.
Early voting hours at:
<http://www.glenellyncivicbetterment.com/page/early-voting>

Dear Members and Friends,

Your vote to help choose local candidates is of great importance to what will happen to the character of our village over the next 4 years. A very small percentage of voters takes part in this process, making each vote more influential. To help our members make informed choices, Citizens for Glen Ellyn Preservation forwarded several questions regarding preservation issues currently being discussed by village commissions to all candidates. Out of the six candidates running for 3 openings on the village

board, two Civic Betterment Party candidates and one independent candidate were kind enough to reply and their answers are below.

Sincerely,

Linda Gilbert
President
www.glenellynpreservation.org

2010 Survey Questions:

1. The recently created Glen Ellyn Strategic Downtown Plan recommends that the village's Main Street commercial district be designated as a historic district. This topic is currently under discussion by the Historic Preservation Commission. Do you support this recommendation? Please explain why or why not.

J.P Anderson:

I support Main Street be designated as a historic district. One of my key focus points is to maintain the Historic Preservation of our Community. It is important for us to change and to begin to create who we want to be, however, remembering where we came from should be threaded into our decisions.

Lyn Whiston:

The downtown business district is a special treasure of Glen Ellyn. I understand there is an effort to nominate the area to the National Register of Historic Places. This would have the advantage of calling attention to the district and providing tax incentives for investment in it. It is important that a store owner retain the ability to change or improve their buildings. Not every building downtown is necessarily a historic treasure. My understanding is that the National Register program allows such flexibility and I am in favor of such a plan. In the current economic environment we should ensure that we don't put extra costs on existing merchants or discourage potential new stores from coming to our downtown.

Peter Ladesic:

Yes I do support the recommendation. I have been instrumental in wanting to maintain the historic character of our town including looking into the Main Street Program created by the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

Robert Friedberg:

I believe that we should review each property on it's own value and with the help of the Preservation Society and other interested residents decide on what properties would be considered to be afforded this distinction. Applying it universally could diminish the value of the distinction.

2. Recently the Glen Ellyn Historical Society found it necessary to return property at 810 N. Main Street to the Village due to the financial burden of carrying the debt during the current economic downturn. This property was originally purchased to be a part of a museum-based park, relating to the History Center on one side and Stacy's Tavern Museum around the corner. Do you feel this property should be retained and eventually used in some way to relate to the History Park currently under development, do you feel that this property should now be looked at solely as a revenue generating resource, or do you see some other use? Please explain your answer.

J.P. Anderson:

I think this property needs to best be used to support the community. If we do not use this property to continue to develop that corner as a historic center (Historical Society Store, Park, and Stacy's Tavern) then I believe we should use that property to develop something that benefits the Community. I would support a Community Center that focuses on Present and Future needs of Glen Ellyn.

Lyn Whiston:

I would hope that this property could eventually become part of the History Park. Since the current economic environment makes this virtually impossible now, I favor the Village retaining the property until funding is available to develop it as part of the History Park. I would be very hesitant to demolish the 810 building or to do any thing else that would irreversibly lose this part of the Village's history.

Peter Ladesic:

Yes I feel that the property should be retained and used in some way related to the History Park. A prime example of a collaborative approach to accomplish both the goals of the Historical Society and a source of revenue generation for our community is our new History Center Store. I hope that you all have had an opportunity to visit and patronize the store. Please keep it in mind for Holiday shopping.

Robert Friedberg:

I think that the current structures on the property are inherently unsafe and are likely beyond the ability to preserve. I think that there are several potential uses for the property that can highlight the entrance to the Village and be in keeping with the history of the Village. I don't think that the decision to develop the property can or should be made in a vacuum. At some point we will come out of the economic downturn and options will begin to emerge. At that point, we as a Village fan look at these options and develop a plan that ultimately creates value for the residents whether it's revenue producing or not.

3. This year the Glen Ellyn Environmental Commission has been reviewing potential amendments to the Tree Preservation Ordinance which currently does not mandate protection of any trees on private property. The Commission has determined that the bulk of tree loss in the community occurs during demolition and new construction, sometimes in the form of clear-cutting. To address this problem, there has been discussion of a number of proposals.

a. One proposal is that since tree removal companies already must be registered with the village and, in addition, are required to report trees removed, it is suggested that those companies should instead complete a permit form that identifies trees to be removed before the work is started. All tree removal would be approved except for any trees that are of a few particularly desirable varieties that are also within the setback (that is, only within the unbuildable area on a lot). If those protected varieties happen to be diseased, damaged, and/or too close to buildings or other trees they could still be removed. If a tree still falls

within the protected category, it would be necessary to apply to the Environmental Commission which could either require a new planting elsewhere on the lot or a fee paid into a general tree fund to compensate for the loss to the tree canopy. What are your thoughts and recommendations regarding this type of limited tree protection?

J. P. Anderson:

All efforts should be made by contractors and owners to preserve healthy, desirable trees on the property. Trees are a part of Glen Ellyn and are a key part of what makes this town a beautiful place to live.

If trees are diseased or damaged they need to be removed. A Tree for a Tree would be my belief. If one is removed one needs to be planted. This should be reported and monitored.

Lynn Whiston:

Before addressing the three specific recommendations in the questionnaire, I'd like to point out the importance of trees to our community. New residents often cite our tree-lined streets and the variety of homes in Glen Ellyn as the principal reason why they chose to move to Glen Ellyn. Long-time residents are equally proud of our trees and are saddened when a tree is lost, especially a desirable tree lost because of new construction. At the same time we cannot ignore the rights of the property owner.

The Environmental Commission has worked hard for a long time trying to come up with appropriate language that balances the community's interest in protecting our trees with the rights of private owners. I appreciate the hard work the Commission members have done struggling with this issue.

a) I am comfortable with the idea that tree removal companies should complete a permit form so that "particularly desirable varieties" of trees can be protected. Instead of penalties, I'd like to try to find a positive way to reward builders and residents who preserve desirable trees and who plant new ones.

Peter Ladesic:

(answer below question 3c)

Robert Friedberg:

I am very much in favor of preserving trees. I do believe that it is difficult and beyond the scope of the Village to try and manage the loss of trees in this manner. Education and communication is a better tool than imposing paperwork that has no ultimate effect on the removal of trees.

b. Another proposal recommends that the removal of desirable varieties of healthy trees in the setback may only be done by the primary resident of the property. Please give your thoughts on this suggestion.

J.P. Anderson:

Removal of desirable varieties of healthy trees is a serious matter and should only be taken after the primary resident has vetted all other possibilities.

Lyn Whiston:

In considering trees on private land, I don't think it's appropriate to distinguish between the rights of resident and non-resident property owners.

Peter Ladesic:

(answer below question 3c)

Robert Friedberg:

I think this is similar in response to the question above.

c. The commission also addressed the problem of tree loss and damage on properties adjoining demolition and new construction. It was proposed that trees within a to-be-determined distance from the work be protected. Also, adjoining owners would be advised that pending work or demolition on a neighboring property may impact their nearby trees and, if interested, they should check with the village for current tree protection practices. Do you support these recommendations? Please explain your answer.

J.P. Anderson:

Yes, and if damage is done to adjoining property trees, contractors should be liable to replace any trees damaged.

Lyn Whiston:

It's a good idea to provide protection for trees adjacent to an area of demolition and new construction. Advising the owners of adjoining trees of possible impact on their trees and providing them with information on how best to protect their trees is an excellent idea. These steps involve a minimal cost to protect the trees in a neighborhood while construction is going on.

Peter Ladesic:

Although we all want to be mindful of our private property rights we all should realize that Trees are an important part of our community. Efforts need to be stepped up to ensure that residential, commercial and public utility contractors make every effort to protect desirable trees in and near the work site. At minimum we need to continue to educate residents on the value of desirable trees and encourage tree preservation whenever possible. With some effort and open dialogue we should be able to come up with a program which is acceptable to most residents.

Robert Friedberg:

Again, while I am in favor of trying to preserve trees, I don't think this is an effective way to achieve the goal. More education, and perhaps a net zero would be a different solution (for every tree removed in the set backs, a new tree needs to be planted to create a net zero effect.