

**Village of Downers Grove  
Community Events Commission  
Committee Room  
Downers Grove Village Hall  
February 9, 2012**

**PRESENT:** Chairman Becky Rheintgen, Mr. Dave Humphreys, Mr. Mike Kubes, Ms. Maura Towery, Ms. Linda Kunze, Ms. Andrea Knudsen(arrived 6:18)

**Staff:** Ms. Mary Scalzetti, Ms. Marcia Schirdewahn

**ABSENT:** Ms. Patti Marino, Ms. Ellen Pendola, Mr. Scott Jacaway

**GUESTS:** Mr. Jay C. Turner, Ms. Barbara Taylor

Chairman Rheintgen called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

**I. APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 20, 2011 MEETING MINUTES**

Mr. Mike Kubes moved to approve the minutes of the December 8, 2011, meeting. Ms. Maura Towery seconded the motion. Minutes were approved unanimously.

**II. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**III. DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

**IV. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Downtown Market Application**

Barbara Taylor and Jay Turner, both representing the YMCA, gave a brief overview of the application submitted to hold the Downtown Downers Grove Market. Ms. Taylor noted that the Market has grown a lot in the last three years. They have 60-65 vendors on an average Saturday. The YMCA plans to run the Market as they did last year. Ms. Scalzetti noted that minor changes suggested by staff have been addressed.

Discussion followed on the site change during GroveFest. Ms. Taylor said that last year the Market closed at 12:30 p.m. when held at the Main Street Train Station and at noon on the Saturday that the Market was held on Main Street during GroveFest. The vendors have requested a 12:30 closing on the Saturday during GroveFest. Ms. Scalzetti stated that she did not think that would be a problem.

Ms. Taylor noted that attendance was down at the Market when it was moved from the train station. However, last year when the Market was held on Main Street the number of attendees was better than at previous year's off site markets. Ms. Kunze said that last year there was not a lot of time to advertise the change in venue. This year Downtown Management will help advertise the venue change. A suggestion was made that the Market vendors could hand out reminders cards and signs could be placed at earlier Market days.

Mr. Humphries stated that GroveFest starts at noon on that Saturday, but the Craft Show in Fishel Park starts earlier and there is a nice ambience with the Craft Show and Market in close proximity.

**V. OLD BUSINESS**

**A. 2012 July 4 Parade discussion**

Ms. Rheintgen stated that at the last meeting of the Community Events Commission there was discussion of reversing the direction of the parade and co-sponsoring a concert with the Downers Grove Park District. The XRT concert idea will not be possible for this year, but perhaps some other entertainment can be found. Ms. Knudsen agreed to talk with the high school band directors to see if the band might play at Fishel Park. Another idea was to end the parade with the band and have them lead parade watchers to Fishel Park.

Ms. Scalzetti mentioned the construction at DGN might make staging in that area difficult. Mr. Humphries noted that staging occurred on streets in the past and the streets, except for possibly part of Prince Street, should be open around DGN.

Ms. Kunze said she has been getting mixed signals from the downtown businesses about being open on July 4. Some said that it is not a shopper day; some were interested in being open. Mr. Kubes suggested a sidewalk event. It was agreed that even if a few restaurants were open or if they had booths at the park it would be good for a first year event.

Other suggestions included getting Dominick's and Jewel to donate watermelon, asking a scout group or YMCA group to cut and distribute the watermelon, and using Village resources, i.e., DGTV, council meetings, and Facebook, to "get the word out."

The next meeting of the Community Events Commission will be held on Thursday, March 15, 2012, at 6:00 p.m. in the Committee Room at Village Hall. This will be the day after Ms. Kunze meets with downtown businesses and receives more feed back on July 4 activities.

## **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting with all in favor and Chairman Rheintgen declared the meeting adjourned at 6:37 p.m.

**VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE -  
Stormwater and Flood Plain Oversight Committee Meeting  
September 22, 2011, 7:00 p.m.**

**Downers Grove Public Works Facility  
5101 Walnut Avenue, Downers Grove, Illinois**

**CALL to ORDER**

Member Gorman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. A roll call followed and a quorum was established.

Members Present: Mr. Crilly, Mr. Gorman, Mr. Ruyle, Mr. Scacco

Absent: Chairman Eckmann, Mr. Austin, Mr. Schoenberg

Staff Present: Village Engineer, Mike Millette; Staff Engineer, Jeff Loster

Others Present: Mr. Eric Otto, 2531 N Talman, Chicago

**APPOINTMENT of CHAIR PRO-TEM**

**Mr. Scacco moved to appoint Mr. Gorman as Chair Pro-Tem in the absence of Chairman Eckmann, seconded by Mr. Ruyle. Motion carried by voice vote of 4-0.**

**APPROVAL of APRIL 15, 2010 MINUTES**

**Mr. Ruyle moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Mr. Crilly. Motion carried by voice vote of 4-0.**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS** - No comments.

**OLD BUSINESS**

Mr. Ruyle inquired as to the status of the stormwater maintenance metrics.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Proposed Re-Write of the Countywide Stormwater and Flood Plain Control Ordinance**

Mr. Millette gave a power-point presentation (see attached hard-copy) highlighting the proposed changes to the County's ordinance including three examples of how the proposed ordinance compares to the current ordinance. Mr. Schoenberg submitted written comments (attached) in anticipation of his absence. Mr. Ruyle commented on the proposed Municipal Technical Advisory Panel (MTAP), indicating that he appreciated that it would be composed of technical practitioners, but concerned that it could be utilized as a political by-pass. Mr. Gorman noted that the intent of MTAP is to advise the County Stormwater Administrator, but he also thinks clarification will be added to the final draft indicating that the Panel's recommendations will not usurp the Village's Stormwater Administrator or this Committee. Mr. Scacco asked for clarification as to whether the new "certification" vs. "permit" concept would increase the workload on Staff. Mr. Millette replied that it would not; as the Village already has a lower permit threshold than the County ordinance and he felt that the same amount of project submittals would occur.

A general discussion ensued regarding the economic impact of the proposed re-write. Mr. Loster commented the first draft would have had a greater impact on single-family projects as it would have required water volume control starting at 2,500 square feet of disturbance, but that the 2<sup>nd</sup> draft went back to the current threshold. Mr. Millette agreed and reiterated that the impact to commercial redevelopment should be stimulative. Mr. Gorman agreed and added that the current proposal will be cost neutral or provide savings to single family owners.

The remaining discussion related to possible local amendments to the proposed ordinance including a concern expressed by Mr. Ruyle and Mr. Scacco that other techniques be considered to further minimize neighborhood impacts of redevelopment. Mr. Gorman indicated that he had developed some details which may be useful and would distribute them. Mr. Loster added that the Village's cost-share program may also be a venue to assist in some cases. Mr. Gorman asked that this be placed under new business at the next meeting.

The Committee expressed its consensus that the Council review the proposed 2<sup>nd</sup> draft and consider directing staff to send a comment letter suggesting clarification to as to the role of MTAP, specifically that it be clarified that it is not to supersede the authority of the Village.


Mr. Crilly suggested that some training sessions be held after the adoption of the revised ordinance, perhaps a Saturday in the spring.

#### **ADJOURN**

**Mr. Scacco made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:18 p.m., seconded by Mr. Crilly. Motion carried by voice vote of 4-0**

**Countywide Stormwater and  
Flood Plain Ordinance Update**

Stormwater & Flood Plain Oversight  
Committee Meeting  
September 22, 2011



---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

**Discussion Outline**

- Background
- Purpose of update
- Major proposed changes
- Comparison to current Village Ord.
- Cost comparison examples
- Current process status
- Possible future actions



---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

**Background**

- **Original adoption: Sept 1991**  
First Countywide ordinance in IL
- **Superseded Village's Ord.**  
Originally adopted in 1975
- **Revised eleven times**  
Latest revision: Feb 2006
- **Primarily focused on new  
developments**



---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

### Purpose of Update

- Clarify requirements for applicants
- Retain current flood protection levels
- Better align w/ National trends and requirements
- Remain economically competitive w/ other NE Illinois counties



---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

### Major Proposed Changes

- No longer based upon zoning
- Based upon new impervious area
- "Certifications" not "Permits"
- Remove penalty for reducing impervious areas or improving streams, etc.
- Option to combine detention and BMP requirements into one area



---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

### Comparison to Current Village Ordinance

- Residential, slight change
  - Proposed revisions are coming closer to Village's current amendments
  - More discretion will be allowed to reduce the complexity of submittals
  - Streamlining of small projects such as sheds and patios through "general certs."
  - BMP requirements are clarified; specific easements may not be required



---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

**Comparison to Village Ordinance**

- Commercial significant change
  - Removal of disincentive to reduce impervious area
  - Submittal requirements clearly indicated within the Ordinance
  - Clarification of wetland and riparian buffers
  - Confirmation of Municipal Engineer's group as advisory to County SW Comm
  - Creation of a Municipal Technical Advisory Panel to provide a venue to advise County Stormwater Administrator



---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

**COB Comparison**

- Taken from July 19, 2017 presentation to County SW Comm.
- Focus on three



---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

**COB Comparison**

Example 4 - Residential - Single Family Residence (Large Lot Teardown)

- Details of project:
  - Existing home on 4.13 acres
  - Zone AE floodplain and wetland exist on north side of site
  - Demolish existing home
  - Construct new single family residence



---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---






**Cost Comparison**

**Example 3, Commercial – Reconstruction of a Largely Impervious Site**

- Details of project:
  - Existing non-residential lot on 1.01 acres
  - Zone AE closed floodplain encroaches onsite by elevation
  - Demolish existing building
  - Construct new building, compensatory storage, parking w/ islands, sidewalks




---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

**Cost Comparison**

**Example 3, Commercial – Reconstruction of a Largely Impervious Site**

<p><b>Under Existing DCSEPO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Detention required for the 2-year 24-hour event</li> <li>- BMP required</li> <li>- Zone AE floodplain fill, floodplain submittal required           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Incremental comp. storage required at 1:1.5 ratio</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Riparian impacts proposed, riparian submittal required but no mitigation necessary (impervious to impervious), no wetland.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Under proposed DCSEPO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Detention not required since impervious area reduced by 5%. Potential savings of \$54K</li> <li>- Additional BMP not required, reduction in impervious area recognized as BMP</li> <li>- Zone AE floodplain fill, floodplain submittal required           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Incremental comp. storage required at 1:1 ratio – fill area is a closed depression. Potential savings of \$8K.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Floodplain considered Buffer, but mitigation not required for previously existing areas.</li> <li>- No wetland.</li> </ul>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------




---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

**Current Process Status**

- Currently in month 23 of the process
- Public input began in November 2009 w/ listening sessions
- Initial 60-day comment period on full draft began January 4, 2011
- Final 45-day comment period began on September 6, 2011




---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



- Village Council may prepare formal comment during 45-day response period
- Write local amendments (cannot be less restrictive)
- Council adoption of revised Village Code, Chapter 26 – late fall, early winter

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



- Background
- Purpose of update
- Major proposed changes
- Comparison to current Village Ord.
- Cost comparison examples
- Current process status
- Possible future actions

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Date: September 15, 2011  
To: Mr. Mike Millette  
Village of Downers Grove  
From: Daniel H. Schoenberg  
Re: Ordinance Rewrite Discussion

---

I will not be able to attend the Stormwater and Flood Plain Oversight Committee meeting of September 22, but this memorandum details my observations about the totally revised DuPage Stormwater Ordinance now open for public comment. The claimed objectives of the rewrite are as follows:

1. To comply with current and future NPDES requirements
2. To make the Ordinance more "user-friendly" and to simplify and streamline the review process
3. To address some long-standing issues

I will discuss each objective in order.

#### **Complying with NPDES regulations**

The 2009 federal permit that covers all discharges into Illinois lakes, rivers and streams requires new strategies to reduce the discharge of pollutants. Studies have said most water-borne pollution is carried by the small-intensity frequent storms. In order to control water runoff quality, the first flush of water which carries most pollutants must be intercepted and stored long enough for the pollutants to settle out. Other federal studies say impervious cover is a good proxy for development control for water quality. Therefore, new regulations emphasize the smaller storms and the impervious lot coverage. This emphasis is non-negotiable and inevitable. Fortunately the threshold at which on-site water quality storage is required (2500 square feet additional impervious cover) is high enough to avoid adverse impacts to small single-family residential projects.

#### **Making the Ordinance "user-friendly"**

Today all developments requiring a permit must provide the same one-size-fits-all submittal. Some applicants have complained to the County that these requirements are onerous for small projects. In the new draft, a hierarchy of submittals is established. Small projects outside floodplains and wetlands can use a simplified process using a Letter of Permission. Simple projects within floodplains or near wetlands can use a streamlined General Certification process. Fewer projects will require a full application, an improvement. Communities can be more restrictive as they wish.

The new draft simplifies floodplain applications with less modeling, exempting tiny projects in the flood plain and providing easier rules for routine work within the floodplain. It simplifies floodplain applications by eliminating floodways in small floodplains. It simplifies wetland applications by fast-tracking restoration and enhancement work. These are improvements over the current ordinance.

However, the new draft goes too far to accommodate developers in Sections 15-16 and 15-25E. Today the local Ordinance Administrator has the last word in determining procedural and technical requirements for a submittal. If an applicant and an Administrator disagree, the applicant's only recourse is an appeal per Section 15-226 which goes before a local Stormwater Committee such as our group. Current Section 15-95 also establishes Watershed Basin Committees as a mediator of technical issues between the County and any community which have never been used. County Staff wants more technical

guidance based upon discussions by technical people and with the blessing of the appointed Committee officials. County Staff claim applicants also desire a forum to challenge technical findings without the appeal process, which takes time and money. The draft ordinance proposes a new formal advisory group to vet technical issues. Decisions will be disseminated throughout the County so a standard practice can be established, but the results remain advisory only. Some local Administrators welcome the opportunity for community discussion and the addition of a due-process procedure to deter possible lawsuits. I see this as a loss of autonomy. Under the current draft, applicants can initiate MTAP review on their own, bypassing the local hearing process. Applicants should be required to get a community sponsor before using this forum.

#### **Address Long-standing issues**

A total rewrite presents an opportunity to address contentious and poorly working procedures. Some issues have been addressed. One of these issues has been the treatment of accessory structures in the flood plain. Today they must be a foot above the base flood elevation (BFE). The draft follows federal guidelines which allow vents below the BFE, an improvement.

The existing ordinance requires easements for all drainage facilities on private property. Easements do not work well on small parcels of land. Fencing or landscaping may affect easements. A blanket recorded document requiring maintenance and allowing municipal access is now allowed.

#### **Overall comments**

The proposed draft does meet the goals set out for the rewrite but it has shortcomings.

- This is still not easy to use.
- It is not clear when a wetland determination will be needed. (15-85A) The County will not provide an overall map of areas possibly near a wetland.
- Site storage facilities cannot be under single ownership, only public or association ownership is allowed. (15-55A) Small Homeowner Associations are often ill-equipped to maintain these facilities. Chasing after a single owner for compliance is easier.
- Enforcement still requires cumbersome notice provisions, extending response time unacceptably. Many communities enforce violations through their municipal code, not this ordinance. (15-19)

Ultimate user-friendliness will take more than an ordinance change. There is no indication that getting a permit through the County will become any faster. The corporate culture of County review has been rather rigid. The changing requirements of the FEQ model have been questioned, too.

I can fault neither the effort behind the draft nor the new emphasis on water quality which is a given. The current draft is better than the last draft which was more complex, had a 500 square foot thresholds for water quality action, and envisioned MTAP as an arbitration body. This draft is not perfect, but the good should not be held hostage by the ideal.

# DRAFT

## TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION Minutes

January 11, 2012, 7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers - Village Hall  
801 Burlington Avenue, Downers Grove

Chairman Stuebner called to order the January 11, 2012 meeting of the Transportation and Parking Commission at 7:00 p.m.

A review of the meeting's protocol followed. Chairman Stuebner reminded the public that the commission was a recommending body to the Village Council and stated the minutes were being recorded on village-owned equipment for transcription purposes.

The commissioners and public recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll call followed and a quorum was established.

### **ROLL CALL:**

Present: Chairman Stuebner, Commissioners Mr. Saricks, Ms. Vlcek, Mr. Wrobel, Mr. Schiller, Ms. Van Anne, Student Rep. Ms. Aguzino

Absent: Mr. Cronin

Staff Present: Sgt. Harry Andler – Police Dept., Traffic Manager Dorin Fera

Visitors: None

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The November 16, 2011 minutes were approved on motion by Mr. Wrobel and seconded by Mr. Saricks. Motion carried by voice vote of 7-0.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS** - None

**1. File # 01-12 Turn Restrictions – Main Street at Maple Avenue.** Traffic Manager **Mr. Fera** reported this matter was before the commission for final approval because it needs to become an ordinance. It was part of the recommendations of the 2010 Neighborhood Traffic Study completed at the end of last year that came with short-term, mid-term and long-term improvement recommendations. Tonight's discussion would focus on a short-term improvement, which was done in conjunction with DuPage County's left-turn signal (eastbound) improvement completed at 55<sup>th</sup> and Main Street. Per **Mr. Fera**, the exclusive northbound right-turn lane on Main Street appears to be very effective. However, due to phone calls and staff review, there was now reconsideration for addressing the northbound through-lane to only prohibit northbound left-turns during peak hours of travel which would be a better balance for all the traffic through the area. **Mr. Fera** stated this was one of the additional line items in tonight's recommendation.

**Mr. Fera** reported what the traffic counts reflected when this matter was reviewed by staff, i.e., that 95% of the traffic was traveling north or turning right, but the remaining 5% were making left turns but with great difficulty. He felt that with the latest improvements, all traffic could be better served.

When traveling the intersection personally, **Mr. Wrobel** thought there would be a permanent illuminated No Left Turn sign along with the regular signal but he saw no such device, wherein, **Mr. Fera** mentioned that the current static sign would be replaced with an automated LED sign.

Asked whether the problems with LED lights being kept clear during snow storms was solved, **Mr. Fera** explained there such traffic signal heads do exist with louvers that re-direct the snow to maintain signal vision. However, based on the levels of winter snowfalls in the Village, staff has not yet decided whether those devices are needed at this time.

**Chairman Stuebner** opened up the meeting to public comment. No public comment received. The chairman entertained a motion

**MR. SCHILLER MADE A MOTION TO FORWARD STAFF'S RECOMMENDATIONS, AS WRITTEN, TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL TO COMPLETE THE IMPROVEMENTS AT MAPLE AND MAIN STREET.**

**SECONDED BY MR. SARICKS.**

**MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 7-0.**

**2. File # 02-12 Policy on Neighborhood Intersection Control.** **Mr. Fera** explained that the policy before the commission was a request from the village to address safety issues, traffic control issues, access issues, and continuity issues throughout the village, specifically to address about 480 intersections that have no intersection control. To be more consistent, the Village is following the model that the Village of Mt. Prospect has implemented with its intersections, with one exception. The Village of Downers Grove will continue to utilize Yield signs.

**Mr. Fera** stated he plans to review the simpler intersections. A consultant would be hired to conduct studies of the more difficult intersections. He reported on the traffic control crashes for 2010 (by intersection and severity) throughout the state, as reported by the Illinois Dept. of Transportation (IDOT) show that the most severe crashes occurred in those intersections with no controls. His goal was to systematically look at the village, address the safety issues now, and continue to review the neighborhood study areas.

Staff would apply the policy criteria in a two-step process: With the first step, the simpler intersections, such as dead-ends, cul-de-sacs and some T-intersections would be implemented at the staff level with no Commission review. The second step would consist of the more complex intersections reviewed by a consultant, and then brought before the commission for review and approval.

**Mr. Saricks** confirmed with staff that the village was within its rights to move forward on this matter, to which **Mr. Fera** confirmed affirmatively. **Chairman Stuebner** raised concern that if the proposal did not give the village additional discretion -- for instance, where to install stop signs --an uncontrolled intersection could exist (and not meet the warrant criteria for a stop sign) and a number of yield signs could be installed at the 491 intersections. **Mr. Fera** stated that the Village has full discretion on implementing intersection controls, based on sound study and engineering judgment. Also, part of the study process would have the consultant reviewing the more complex intersections. Details followed on how the consultant would have to look systematically at places to install the controls and review neighborhoods as a whole.

Asked if traffic counts, speed counts, etc. within a study area would be taken by the consultant, **Mr. Fera** confirmed they would. He discussed that for the data collection phase, the Village would obtain traffic counts either by its own staff or through a separate traffic counts contract. Another question was raised on how the signage would be enforced, wherein staff responded it would be through the Village's Police Department.

Because there was no formal plan to vote upon, **Mr. Fera** clarified for the commissioners that he was asking to postpone the recommendation to the village council for now. He believed that once Area 2 became underway, it would be a good time to bring the topic back to the commissioners and for a formal policy approval. Staff wanted the commissioners to be aware of the issues and hear feedback at this time.

After the Area 1 Study was completed, a question was asked whether staff would review the positives and negatives of that study and incorporate it into the Area 2 study. **Mr. Fera** responded that, yes, staff has discussed the pros and cons for Area 1, and will incorporate the best practices and lessons learned for Area 2.

Asked whether the data from the Police Department will be collected as part of the criteria and could the data be broken down further. **Mr. Fera** stated that after speaking with officers at the Police Department, indicated that they collect their data in a different software and summarize it by an area grid. Generally, it is not possible to focus on any one particular street or intersection, but only the streets in the grid are summarized. However, under special circumstances when the Police Department is requested about providing data on a specific block, they could provide information but only if sufficient notice is given so their personnel have opportunity to collect and tabulate their data based on the request.

**Ms. Vicek** asked staff to explain what a delineator is. **Mr. Fera** explained that it is a metallic, reflective device installed in pavement. **Mr. Fera** spoke about the usefulness of the devices, and also stated they were quite expensive to install. The DuPage County DOT has installed them on their 4-lane roadways.

In response to a question regarding implementation of the policy, **Mr. Fera** replied that the signs would be fabricated and installed by our Public Works staff. The Village has its own sign shop for this procedure.

**Chairman Stuebner** invited the public to speak. No public comment was received.

**3. File # 03-12 2012 Neighborhood Traffic Study Area (Area 2).** **Mr. Fera** explained that Neighborhood Traffic Study Area 2 will basically be a continuation of the processes and objectives of Traffic Area No. 1 but is somewhat larger than Area No. 1. The area covers Main Street to Lee Street and from Ogden Avenue to Warren Avenue with about 43 intersections existing within the area. **Mr. Fera** explained that many of the complaints received from this area were requests for stop controls at intersections, speeding concerns, and concerns as to how residents will be getting around the construction occurring at Downers Grove North High School.

**Mr. Fera** explained the staff criteria that would be utilized. He reminded the commissioners that there were no traffic calming construction-type of improvements made in 2011 due to budget constraints. However, there were a series of traffic calming measures that were more operational in nature. Staff has used the LED radar feedback signs. Police enforcement was requested and provided along several streets based on complaints received. Additional speed limit signs were installed where none existed. Lastly, pavement markings were used on streets to channel the traffic flow and also to delineate pedestrian crossings in an effort to alert and remind drivers to slow down.

Referring to Exhibit 1, a question was asked whether the configuration of the area around Prince and Grant and the intersection to the north, would change as a result of the North High School expansion, to which **Mr. Fera** stated it would. The changes would include the closure of Prince Street, from Grant St northward to (south) St. essentially converting that area to a

pedestrian walkway. It is understood that the school buses would park in their own lot, located north of Grant St.

**Mr. Fera** commented that he felt there may be neighborhood issues east of Main Street because the small parking lot would be expanded all the way to Sherman, at the funeral home. He voiced concern that many vehicles (about 400) could be exiting the parking lot relatively at the same time. However, the school assured staff that the vehicles would not be exiting simultaneously, but rather in stages after 3:00 PM. **Mr. Fera** pointed out that he did ask the school and contractor to consider a right-in/right-out access at mid-block on Main Street between Grant and Sherman. There is proposed a gated crossing, which would be supervised by crossing guards during school events across Main Street. However, the design proved to be unworkable due to the potential for unsupervised and unsafe pedestrian crossings there during regular school hours.

A commissioner suggestion was made to place a right-in/right-out at the south end of the parking lot in front of the church at Sherman, since a traffic signal already existed. **Chairman Stuebner** confirmed with **Mr. Fera** that a right-turn only would exist at Grant and a left-turn only at Sherman. **Mr. Fera** responded that he would have to review the drawings again. Asked if the village had some influence on what School District 99 can do on a public street, **Mr. Fera** indicated he did not know but that the Village has the ability to recommend improvements as needed for safety and operational reasons. However, the school district is another governing body which is responsible for their designs and plans.

**Chairman Stuebner** asked for a legal opinion on how much the village could control District 99, as far as entering/exiting from village streets. He stated the village did have the right to state whether to use a right turn or a left turn and it was done everywhere else and for businesses. **Mr. Fera** believed that the Village Council has been involved with this project, and that he would need to review the plans again. **Chairman Stuebner's** concern was that if the school was going to place the entrance and exit on the east side, along Highland, the village had the right to say no left-hand/no right-hand turn, which made it an ineffective entrance, or, if the school placed the entrance and exit on the south end, the village had the right to say only a left-turn towards Main Street. Again, **Mr. Fera** stated that he would need to review the plans, and that the issue has been discussed and may have already been addressed.

Referring to page 3 of staff's handout, regarding the traffic calming measures, Mr. Wrobel asked staff whether it had the various deployed traffic calming measures inventoried since he felt it was important and to possibly receive more funding if the measures proved beneficial. Dialog followed that the LED radar signs used minimal village resources as compared to the other traffic calming measures. **Mr. Fera** clarified that the three locations for the LED radar signs -- 68<sup>th</sup>, Carpenter, and Woodward Streets -- were requested by the neighbors, but the issue was that the village has four devices of which two needed servicing so, consequently, only two LEDs could be deployed at one time. However, **Mr. Fera** stated that the Village did apply for the Safe Routes to School funding in December 2010 and it was waiting for a response from IDOT as to which items will be funded. He offered to return with additional information once available.

Referring to the study, **Mr. Schiller** asked whether all of the recommendations made in the first study would be completed before the second study was initiated, as his concerns had to do with finances and getting the first study completed before the second one started. **Mr. Fera** responded that the recommendations for Area 1 were short-term, mid-term, and long-term and it was safe to say the long-term recommendations were not on the radar. The mid-term recommendations had only two recommendations remaining: Washington and 55<sup>th</sup> and Blodgett and Maple, which he envisioned would be completed this year before the majority of the 2012 study began.



**Mr. Saricks** stated that looking at that section of Ogden Avenue, it was safe for the commission to assume there would be no interference or direct complications for the neighborhoods north of Ogden by the Improvements that were made south of Ogden Avenue, to which **Mr. Fera** concurred. Dialog continued with **Mr. Fera** stating that along Warren Avenue all of the intersections terminating at Warren Avenue had an existing type of control -- mostly yield signs. Details followed on the RFP's that were sent out and that he would be updating the commission on same next month.

**MR. SARICKS MADE A MOTION THAT THE TRANSPORTATION & PARKING COMMISSION APPROVE THE AREA 2 (AS DELINIATED BY THE FIGURE SHOWN IN EXHIBIT 1) FOR THE NEXT PHASE OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC IMPROVEMENTS.**

**SECONDED BY MR. SCHILLER.**

**MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE: 7-0**

### **OLD BUSINESS**

**Chairman Stuebner** recalled at a prior meeting this commission asked that procedures/policies on public/private funding or combined funding be researched. He asked that the commission be updated next meeting.

**Mr. Schiller** mentioned a response memo that the commissioners received from the police and fire departments on a request from last month regarding a street closure. He asked if it should be formally placed in the minutes or was it informational, wherein **Mr. Fera** stated it was informational. **Mr. Wrobel** added that at the village council meeting the prior night, the petitioner withdrew the petition and the village council did not see it necessary to follow through on this commission's recommendations. Because **Mr. Fera** did not have the information at hand, he offered to get a copy of those minutes and forward them electronically to the commissioners.

**Mr. Schiller** recalled that the residents came to this commission with a petition to close their street and while the commission said no, it recommended other changes. He felt that it had nothing to do with this commission's recommendation to change the left turn status on the street corner and felt there were two separate issues at hand. Commissioners agreed to have clarification of the council's meeting and minutes from same.

Regarding the status report, **Mr. Stuebner** asked that as part of this commission's regular agenda to have staff provide a brief summary of any updates, with the goal to have the backlog of traffic issues as part of the regular agenda. **Mr. Fera** responded and suggested that the commissioners review the current spreadsheet and provide him feedback on the format of the document.

### **COMMUNICATIONS**

**Mr. Fera** reported he received one petition for a parking change on Elm Street between Ogden and Sherman. The work at Belmont continues which is expected to be completed by this spring. Following that, the culvert at Main and Belmont will be widened, along with the intersection, followed by the installation of new signals at Haddow. **Mr. Fera** also described the traffic issues at Puffer School.

The topic of FOIA training was brought up with **Mr. Fera** mentioning that all commissioners will have to participate in the training but will have this entire year to complete it. He pointed out some of the easy violations that can occur, while another commissioner pointed out that this commission does not formulate policy or have decision-making authority under its charge.

As a last question, **Mr. Fera** was asked if staff would notify the residents of the Area 2 study prior to its initiation, to which he replied that yes, they would all be notified.

**ADJOURN**

**MR. SCHILLER MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:25 P.M.  
MR. WROBEL SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE  
VOTE OF 7-0.**

Respectfully submitted,

Celeste Weilandt,  
Recording Secretary  
(as transcribed by MP3 digital recording)

DRAFT

**TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION  
Minutes**

November 16, 2011, 7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers - Village Hall  
801 Burlington Avenue, Downers Grove

Commissioner Schiller (in place for Chairman Stuebner) called to order the November 16, 2011 meeting of the Transportation and Parking Commission at 7:00 p.m.

The commissioners, along with the public, recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll call followed and a quorum was established.

**ROLL CALL:**

Present: Commissioners Mr. Schiller, Mr. Cronin, Mr. Saricks, Ms. Vlcek, Mr. Wrobel

Absent: Chairman Mr. Stuebner, Ms. Van Anne, Student Rep. Ms. Aguzino

Staff Present: Public Works Dir. Nan Newlon, Traffic Manager Dorin Fera

Visitors: Paul Simms, 5210 Blodgett, Downers Grove; Curt Harper, 5204 Elmwood, Downers Grove; Ron Gandolph, 5317 Webster, Downers Grove; Jason Hagen, 5417 Webster, Downers Grove; Mike Ruta, 5405 Webster, Downers Grove; Dr. Sivasreeyanonda, 5420 Webster, Downers Grove; Tom Barrett, 5423 Washington, Downers Grove; Kevin Osterman, 5406 Webster, Downers Grove; Don Schultz, 5400 Webster, Downers Grove; Waring Webb, 5401 Webster, Downers Grove; Rory McGinty, 5205 Blodgett, Downers Grove

A review of the meeting's protocol followed. Mr. Schiller reminded the public that the commission was a recommending body to the Village Council and stated the minutes were being recorded on Village-owned equipment for transcription purposes.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The October 5, 2011 meeting minutes of the Transportation and Parking Commission were approved on motion by Mr. Cronin, seconded by Ms. Vlcek. Motion carried by voice vote of 5-0.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS** - None

**1. File # 12-11. Webster Street at 55<sup>th</sup> Street - Follow-up Safety Review.** Traffic Manager, **Mr. Fera**, reviewed a Power Point presentation on the data collection he received regarding the Webster Street at 55<sup>th</sup> Street petition. He reviewed the history of this area, discussed the neighborhood meetings that took place, and spoke about the various traffic counts from the study. A final traffic count was done in November 2011 only on Webster Street which resulted in a finding that the daily average traffic count from the last two traffic counts (September & November) on Webster is 230 cars, which was different from the original data collection due to it being a different time of year and other events going on in town. Speed was about 29 MPH which was in keeping with the neighborhood. Crash data for both streets and the intersection were reviewed.

In addition, **Mr. Fera** addressed the fact that both the DuPage County DOT and the Village of Downers Grove did receive some grant funding for improvements but the county's main goal was to address improvements along 55<sup>th</sup> Street, with focus on intersections such as Main St. and Fairview Ave. to consider providing exclusive left-turn lanes.

**Mr. Fera** recalled at the May (2011) meeting there were six alternative scenarios that were discussed for the area, with three of them being turn restrictions. Staff was recommending Alternative No. 3, an operational change, that included exclusive signage and striping to provide only a south-bound right turn lane off of Webster onto 55<sup>th</sup> Street. Staff felt the alternative would address many of the issues with the intersection and preferred that implementation and observation take place for approximately six to nine months. Staff also requested that a recommendation be made to the county to have the DuPage County DOT include the Webster Street intersection as part of its Phase I Engineering designs.

**Mr. Fera** reminded the Commission that the neighborhood request was for a full closure of Webster Street and Summit Streets. Staff felt a full closure would require many operational changes as well as a lowered priority of snow removal because the street would be treated as a cul-de-sac.

Asked why the retention of the left turn (eastbound 55<sup>th</sup>) into northbound Webster Street would remain prior to addressing the issue of sight distance through the re-design of Main Street/55<sup>th</sup> intersection, **Mr. Fera** explained that the best solution expected would be that the roadway was lowered to reduce the roadway profile but he did not expect that to be addressed by the county. However, he called attention that the eastbound left-turn maneuver onto 55<sup>th</sup> Street was a shorter maneuver and required less gap time versus making a full left-turn out of Webster and onto 55<sup>th</sup> Street. He reported that the data reflected that rear-end accidents were not occurring when encountering eastbound left-turners onto Webster Street because drivers were finding other ways to get to Webster. **Mr. Fera** had no specific turn data on that intersection due to it being the DuPage County DOT's jurisdiction.

**Mr. Wrobel** was concerned about left turners onto Webster due to the proximity of Webster to Main Street and the traffic flowing through the stop signs because they were very quick. He believed drivers would be traveling at higher rates of speed, because of the pressure from traffic, people's schedules, etc. He cited other examples and did not believe staff's study addressed those drivers coming straight across 55<sup>th</sup> Street from the southern part of Webster or those vehicles traveling to Maple.

Responses by staff included that No Turn signage would be installed on Webster St, and that the peak hours of Webster Street are approximately 8:15 AM to 9:15 AM and 5:00 PM to 6:00 PM. Also, the extent of vehicle stacking on both 55<sup>th</sup> Street and on Webster Street was asked. **Mr. Fera** stated from his observations, there was a lot of stacking on 55<sup>th</sup> Street at Main Street. Also, in the peak AM and PM hours, drivers on Webster need to be cautious and look in all directions in order to exit safely from Webster Street. Other questions followed regarding the land grades for both streets, sight lines, and where the money would come from for any physical barriers. **Mr. Fera** stated there was no money anticipated in the 2012 budget for physical barriers.

Should staff's recommendation be forwarded, **Mr. Schiller** asked if the recommendation for the DuPage County DOT's portion be put through in 2012, wherein **Dir. Newlon** explained she was meeting with the county next week to begin the process of hiring an engineering firm for the early part of 2012. Breaking ground, she expected, would be about three years after going through the various governmental agencies. Details followed on what was to be expected up to that time.

**Mr. Schiller** opened up the meeting to public comment:

**Mr. Mike Ruta**, 5405 Webster Street, on behalf of his neighbors on the 5400 block of Webster, prepared a packet of key points which he hoped the commission would consider. He stated it

was the neighbors' position, as well as the Public Works Department, that the recommendations did not address the true safety concerns, which were the sight line difficulties and the cut-through traffic. Instead he said it was more of a response to the proposed changes that were going to be made on Washington Street. He restated the cut-through traffic on northbound Webster from westbound 55<sup>th</sup> Street was still a concern, pointing out the data found by the Public Works Department, which supported same. Other concerns included the deficiencies in traffic patterns, increased traffic on Webster Street and the Public Works Department not following through on site/distance measurements for vehicles making a left turn off of 55<sup>th</sup> Street onto Webster Street. He stated the safety problems alone resulted in the inadequate sight lines and justified the neighbors' request for a dead-end.

**Mr. Ruta** further cited other communities which had streets along 55<sup>th</sup> Street which were, basically, closed off due to cut-through traffic. He pointed out the fact that he reached out to surrounding residents and discussed with them the idea of blocking off Webster Street. Surrounding residents on Summit Street between Washington and Main agreed with his neighbors as well as residents along Main Street between 55<sup>th</sup> and Summit. **Mr. Ruta** stated that the residents' petition did meet all of the requirements of the village's Road Closure Policy. Lastly, he reported that should the commission and village council support the street closure, the residents agreed to fund the closure construction through an SSA (Special Service Area).

**Mr. Schiller** stated the PowerPoint presentation indicated that the 24-hour traffic volume had only 230 vehicles and that there had not been a large increase in vehicle volume since the other plan was implemented. Wherein, **Mr. Fera** responded that this matter was discussed at staff level and staff agreed that the original data from the first counts were not indicative of the actual traffic and the 230 figure was more representative of what was occurring currently. However, **Mr. Fera** did not believe traffic from the east was shifted westward to Webster. He stated the October 2010 traffic count was the "soft" number, while the counts in 2011 were more solid. Also, he pointed out the fact that it was a "snapshot" of the area at the time and date and, other factors, such as construction, could change the numbers.

Regarding the safety issue and the left turn issue, **Mr. Schiller** pointed out there were no crashes in 2009; there were two in 2010; and two incidences in 2011. He queried staff as to how the intersection under discussion compared with other areas, wherein **Mr. Fera** stated it had a very low number as compared to other locations in town.

**Ms. Vicek** asked **Mr. Ruta** if he and his neighbors were prepared that a street closure would affect access for safety vehicles, snow plows, etc., to which **Mr. Ruta** responded positively and believed the street would only be affected in severe weather. As to emergency vehicles, he and his neighbors spoke among themselves and he assumed that the emergency vehicles could "handle making it through the city and the one-way streets," etc. He and his neighbors did discuss that if parking was limited to one side of the street, it would be more than enough room for vehicles to back up. He and his neighbors understood the ramifications.

**Mr. Cronin** raised the question on whether the Commission could close a street thru Public Works only, without the consultation of the Police and Fire Departments and that possible liabilities existed to the village. **Dir. Newlon** responded that she was not too concerned about emergency vehicles since the village already had streets with similar configurations. Details followed on how various service vehicles already handled such streets. **Mr. Cronin** stated he wanted input from the police, fire, and emergency departments.

**Mr. Wrobel** discussed his observations seen in the Village of Cicero where streets were turned into one-way streets using a right-turn out to a main street only. He believed it could be a compromise for the residents and the service vehicles. A dialog followed on this suggestion.

However, **Mr. Ruta** pointed out that if the above suggestion was used, the house that sits on the east corner of Webster and 55<sup>th</sup> Street posed a sight line concern.

**Ms. Vicek** asked if time restrictions could be placed on Webster to restrict traffic volume during peak traffic hours, wherein **Mr. Fera** stated all of the turns off of Webster could be restricted but those on 55<sup>th</sup> Street would have to be agreed to by the county. Furthermore, **Mr. Fera** reported it could be done but it is not preferred due to the fact that sight line issues deficiencies are not tied to the traffic volumes, and happen every time a vehicle from Webster Street tries to access 55<sup>th</sup> Street.

**Mr. Jason Hagen**, 5417 Webster, stated that the fire station was a block away from Webster and he did not see any concerns with emergency access to the block. As to installing the restrictive signage, he asked how the signage would be enforced and questioned its effectiveness. He cited the points made by **Mr. Ruta** and the street's existing deficiencies.

**Mr. Cronin** did not believe there was any liability with unsafe conditions anywhere, which was why he wanted to hear from the other emergency departments.

**Mr. Schiller** summarized that he believed it was necessary to move from the least invasive approach to the most drastic. He personally supported staff's Alternative No. 3 as stated, with the understanding that the village did not know what the DuPage County DOT was going to do in the future. He did not support closing a street until there was more input and more study.

**Mr. Kevin Osterman**, 5406 Webster, did not see much difference with Alternative 3 as to what already existed. He questioned the collected data regarding speed on Webster and where the data locations were located. **Dir. Newlon** clarified the speed was in the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed, explaining that all vehicles traveling on the street were traveling less than the 29 MPH. It was not the average speed. **Mr. Fera** responded that data was collected at mid-block locations.

**Mr. Don Schultz**, 5400 Webster, discussed the petition and the unanimous decision that his block of residents and another block supported. He discussed the near misses his neighbors voiced when presenting them with the petition, the difficulty of making a right turn out of Webster Street and the backed up traffic on 55<sup>th</sup> Street. He supported signage changes or pork-chops in the future.

A resident asked whether other municipalities were contacted regarding their own experience with road closures, i.e., whether the results proved positive or negative.

**Mr. Wrobel** asked **Mr. Ruta** about the location of the property on the west side of Webster next to 55<sup>th</sup> Street and the sidewalk location, to which **Mr. Ruta** stated it was not similar to the property at the east corner and he was not sure of the position of the sidewalk.

**Mr. Cronin** closed by commenting that due to lack of money, the village could not construct any physical barriers. He asked staff why it did not consider Alternate No. 2. **Mr. Fera** responded that the one-way direction would, again, create similar issues as Alternate No. 1 with no southbound access to 55<sup>th</sup> Street, and that Alternative 3 would address all of the issues and the accessibility to the neighborhood. **Dir. Newlon** also agreed that with Alternative No. 1, most of the neighbors already avoided the Webster and 55<sup>th</sup> Street intersection and travelled northbound to avoid same. Making the street one-way would force the residents on that street to go through 55<sup>th</sup> Street and they would not have the option of going to Webster from the north. One-way streets are very difficult to control as far as vehicles not seeing the restrictive signs and causing head-on collisions.

**Mr. Saricks** asked if the commission's decision to approve an alternative affected the county's future plans and whether this matter could be revisited, wherein **Mr. Fera** stated the Commission could always revisit the intersection, during design preparations and even after the county's improvements are done.

**Mr. Wrobel** invited commissioners to consider Alternate No. 4, given there was a lane restriction on Claremont as one comes off of Fairview, along with a physical barrier. **Mr. Saricks** noted that Alternative 3, however was basically Alternative 4 without the physical barrier and county-approval was necessary for No. 3 while the village had no money for the physical barrier of Alternative No. 4.

A motion was entertained by Mr. Schiller:

**MR. CRONIN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE STAFF'S ALTERNATIVE NO. 3, AS PRESENTED. THE VILLAGE WILL COORDINATE WITH THE DUPAGE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERING STUDY AND SHOULD BETTER IMPROVEMENTS BE MADE AVAILABLE BY THE COUNTY, THE VILLAGE WILL REVISIT THIS LOCATION TO DISCUSS OPTIONS IN THE FUTURE.**

**SECONDED BY MS. VLCEK.**

**ROLL CALL FOLLOWED:**

**AYE: MR. SCHILLER, MR. SARICKS, MR. CRONIN, MS. VLCEK**

**NAY: NONE**

**ABSTAIN: MR. WROBEL**

**MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 4-0-1**

It was suggested to **Mr. Fera** that staff from the village's Public Works Department meet, informally with other adjoining villages to find out the successes or failures of such closures and that staff forward a memo to the commissioners on the topic. **Dir. Newlon** also commended **Mr. Ruta** and his neighbors for the work that went into their petition and she hoped the recommendation made was a good resolution for the neighbors.

**2. File # 11-11. Follow-up Traffic Performance - 2010 Traffic Study.** **Mr. Fera** reported on overhead slides that a follow-up traffic study was performed on 17 locations (out of 28) where traffic changes were made to see how they were performing. Highlights to discuss included traffic speeds, traffic volumes, and additional right turns using Main and Maple versus 55<sup>th</sup> at Washington.

In addressing driver habits and the streets they used, **Mr. Fera** explained that some adjustments were made by the traffic consultant to balance the travel directions taken by drivers. As a result, travel speeds appeared to be stabilized or diminished. Details followed.

A review of traffic volumes followed, with **Mr. Fera** explaining that volumes have changed with increases seen in Fairmount and Park Avenue but decreases were seen in north Fairmount, Maple and Blodgett (south of Hill Avenue). While he stated the volume figures were not perfect, they were spread out over most of the streets where staff expected them to be.

Regarding the right turns, due to the changes made at Main and 55<sup>th</sup> Streets, **Mr. Fera** stated that the right-turn volume had increased by 120-130 vehicles turning at Maple. When turning at

Washington, slight turn increases eastbound resulted, but with a considerable amount of traffic heading northbound. He believed the change at 55<sup>th</sup> and Main was a positive by keeping traffic out of the neighborhood.

**Mr. Schiller** asked, based on the experience of Public Works, whether the changes would be long lasting or would drivers fall back to their previous driving patterns. **Mr. Fera** said he could not assure that due to the configuration of the streets being changed. He explained that staff's objective was to make all the streets equally desirable and equally difficult to navigate. **Dir. Newlon**, however, did not foresee any issues with this change, as she cited her own village's changes in the City of Naperville.

Asked whether there was any anecdotal data regarding traffic around Whittier School, **Mr. Fera** stated he had no traffic data, but in speaking with the afternoon traffic guard at Hill/Blodgett she was pleased with the installed stop signs and was seeing better control with drivers and pedestrians.

**Mr. Schiller** opened up the meeting to public comments:

**Mr. Paul Simms**, 5210 Blodgett, who resides across from the school, stated he has seen a marginal improvement with the stop signs. He stated that while it was a good first step, there has been no improvement in speed and the drivers were speeding to make up lost time with the stop signs. He was concerned that the KLOA engineering study did not address the original problem, which was a left-turn bypass of traffic off of Maple from Blodgett to 55<sup>th</sup> Street. He had issues with the fact that the physical barriers for this location were approved by the commission and the village council but there was no money, yet there was enough money for a consultant traffic study. He, again, reiterated his anger about having no speed bumps and the fact that the area collected all traffic from northbound Blodgett, westbound Hill, and the small area between Hill and Randall. Also, he said enforcement was not occurring and more work needed to be done on Blodgett.

**Ms. Vleck** asked if it would be feasible to have a flashing school-activated warning light at Blodgett and Elmwood to slow down traffic, wherein **Mr. Fera** indicated there was an official crossing at Hill and Blodgett and a stop sign on Elmwood at Randall. He noted that the increase in traffic on Blodgett, south of Randall, was coming from drivers using Elmwood. He believed that traffic speeds should now be more stabilized.

**Dir. Newlon** commented that there were already flashing lights and school crossing warnings, indicating that a school zone existed. **Mr. Fera** also added that it was important to speak with the District 58 and Whittier School first on the matter. Because he had not heard from either, he believed the changes were being used effectively. It was pointed out by **Dir. Newlon** that there was a radar feedback sign used on Blodgett with good results. She stated the village had a grant from the Illinois Safe Route To School program to receive more radar feedback signs, which she felt were very effective with drivers.

**Mr. Kurt Harper**, 5204 Elmwood, asked staff for clarification of a stop sign to which **Mr. Fera** confirmed a stop sign was to be placed on Randall at Elmwood but there was no need for an All-Way stop sign there. As for collecting data, **Mr. Harper** commented that there was really no traffic volume measurement for Hill Avenue since it was one way during school hours. He asked to consider that in staff's traffic volumes. As to the flashing light and solar powered speed indicators, he preferred to have speed bumps.

**Mr. Roy McGinty**, 5205 Blodgett, was delighted to see the new signage installed and its effects. Regarding northbound traffic, however, he stated some drivers still rolled through the stop signs



only slower. He believed, however, that further action needed to be addressed at southbound Blodgett from Maple because traffic speed had increased. He supported a speed bump or a stop sign.

On a prior matter, **Mr. Tom Barrett**, 5423 Washington Street, asked if there was flexibility in the signage for left turners southbound on Washington at 55<sup>th</sup> Street. **Mr. Fera** explained the Washington St. intersection recommendations are part of the mid-term improvements, which are in progress and not yet completed. Details followed. **Mr. Barrett** voiced his concern about any obstruction being installed there or having a no left-turn permanently. He supported No Left Turns for peak hours only. He also did not envision drivers purposely disobeying signs. **Dir. Newlon** reassured him that the village had no immediate plans to install any barriers at the intersection.

Returning to the stop signs issues, **Mr. Schiller** asked staff if it would be fine to add a stop sign on southbound Blodgett at the intersection of Elmwood to break up the two-block straight-thru section, wherein **Mr. Fera** replied that staff was not officially completed with that specific intersection and it would be addressed in the future.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

**Mr. Fera** delayed discussing the November Status Report in order to have the full Commission in attendance. He stated much time was spent in preparing the report, which includes the year's previous actions, and upcoming tasks. A separate Traffic Calming Measures summary was provided in the packet, which describes the latest effectiveness of traffic calming measures and their costs. The report comes from the September, 2011 ITE Journal.

Regarding the sidewalk matrix, **Dir. Newlon** reported that commissioners, at their last meeting, voted on the matrix, which was to be forwarded to the village council in December. As a heads up, she noted that through the budget process, the Village Council voted to add additional funds to the new sidewalk construction program for 2012. Six sidewalk segments were originally approved for construction in 2012, but now that figure was revised to 14 segments, at a cost of \$600,000. Staff would begin scheduling the neighborhood meetings for this program at the end of November 2011. Per **Mr. Cronin's** question, dialog followed as to where the funds came from.

**Mr. Cronin** voiced concern that there were no funds considered for the Transportation and Parking Commission to address traffic calming issues. However, **Mr. Fera** stated there was a neighborhood meeting last night and one of the items the Village proposed was to include traffic calming designs for four street segments in the Knottingham subdivision. The plans are being prepared now, and the streets will be reconstructed in 2012. **Mr. Fera** added some further updates regarding that meeting.

**Mr. Cronin** asked who was pushing the funding for the sidewalk matrix, to which **Dir. Newlon** explained that residents who supported it, such as the one who spoke at the last meeting. **Dir. Newlon** also stated that the Village Council was supportive of the sidewalk program and wanted to speed it up. **Mr. Wrobel** added that he spoke at the Village Council's budget meetings as a resident asking for more funding for traffic calming.

**Mr. Cronin** recalled at the last meeting the commission voted to not have the sidewalk matrix presented at its meetings, since the commission had no control or say to the sidewalk matrix. **Dir. Newlon** concurred, noting that the matrix was being done now at the staff level and not as a Transportation and Parking meeting. It was more of an information meeting for the residents.

Comments followed that it was not really necessary to discuss the matrix at the Commission level, while other commissioners thought it was good information to have.

**Dir. Newlon** added that the commission could talk about the sidewalk program at a future meeting, probably about a year away, if it was updated.

**COMMUNICATIONS** - See packet

**ADJOURN**

**MR. SARICKS MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:55 P.M. MR. CRONIN SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 5-0.**

Respectfully submitted,

Celeste Weilandt,  
Recording Secretary  
(as transcribed by MP3 digital recording)

DRAFT

**TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION  
Minutes**

October 5, 2011, 7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers - Village Hall  
801 Burlington Avenue, Downers Grove

Chairman Stuebner called to order the October 5, 2011 meeting of the Transportation and Parking Commission at 7:00 p.m.

The chairman led the commissioners and the public in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

A review of the meeting's protocol followed. Chairman Stuebner reminded the public that the commission was a recommending body to the Village Council and stated the minutes were being recorded on village-owned equipment for transcription purposes.

Roll call followed and a quorum was established.

**ROLL CALL:**

Present: Chairman Stuebner, Commissioners Mr. Cronin, Mr. Schiller, Ms. Van Anne, Ms. Vlcek, Mr. Wrobel, Student Representative Ms. Celeste Aguzino (arrives 7:03 p.m.)

Absent: Mr. Saricks

Staff Present: Public Works Dir. Nan Newlon, Traffic Manager Dorin Fera; Office Tim Sembach, Downers Grove Police Dept.

Visitors: Ms. Sharon Falesch, 1650 Janet Street, Downers Grove; Mr. Paul Giagnoria, 994 Warren Avenue, Downers Grove; Mr. Tony Andina, 4250 Lacey Road, Downers Grove; Mr. Lawrence Gress, 1125 61<sup>st</sup> Street, Downers Grove; Mr. Stephen and Mrs. Sharon Laisch, 1734 Janet Street; Downers Grove; Mr. Ernest and Mrs. Donna Anderson, 1723 Janet St., Downers Grove; Ms. Darlene Chesky, 1731 Janet St., Downers Grove; Mr. Rich and Mrs. Bobbie Jawske, 1739 Janet St., Downers Grove; Mr. Bob Flint and Bob Flint, Jr., 4330 Lacey Rd., Downers Grove; Ms. Linda Kunze, Downtown Management Corp, 4801 Montgomery, Downers Grove; Ms. Chris Fregeau, 1918 Elmore, Downers Grove

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

July 13, 2011 Transportation and Parking Commission Minutes  
August 10, 2011 Transportation and Parking Commission Minutes  
September 14, 2011 Transportation and Parking Commission Minutes

Mr. Schiller moved to accept the above three (3) sets of minutes, as presented. Ms. Van Anne seconded the motion. Motion carried: 6-0-1. (Ms. Vlcek abstains)

**PUBLIC COMMENTS** - None

A change in the order of the agenda followed:

**2. File # 10-11. Truck Restrictions – Lacey Road and Janet Street.** Mr. Fera mentioned that this matter has been moving through the Public Works Department and the Police Department for some time. The residents along Janet Avenue and some along Lacey Road expressed concern about the truck traffic flowing down their streets, due to them being residential in nature. Photos, as submitted by the residents, were referenced. In reviewing the

area, **Mr. Fera** stated that staff agreed the streets should not be a truck route and preferred that the trucking operations be restricted to Lacey Road and Ogden Avenue.

For police enforcement purposes, staff determined that a six-ton limit restriction be placed on the roads which would allow for other, smaller trucks to travel through the area. The restriction is as follows: along Janet Street to Bell Aire and then north of Janet Street on Lacey Road so that trucks could travel in and out of their businesses but not travel up Lacey Road.

As to the south side of Janet Street, a question was raised whether other land-locked businesses (for parking) were using the side streets in the neighborhood, wherein **Mr. Fera** explained he was not sure but that they could be coming from Ogden Ave also. Looking at the photos, **Mr. Fera** believed that several types of trucking operations were using the area.

Asked what the village's regular load limit was for residential streets without posted signage, **Mr. Fera** explained that certain streets in the village were truck restricted streets (local streets) and those streets not designated in the village could have trucks heavier than six tons travel down them. **Chairman Stuebner** believed it made sense for the village to have an ordinance restricting weight limits on trucks, since it would help in the maintenance of the streets, to which staff agreed and believed coordinating efforts with the police department would be in order for enforcement.

**Mr. Wrobel** stated he rode through the neighborhood and noted two properties appeared to be affected: 1747 Janet Street and 4225 Lacey. He stated that the nearby excavating company had not dedicated route from Ogden Ave to follow, which was an unusual situation. He believed the issue was that the trucks were using Janet St. and that restricting the exit from the excavating company to Lacey Rd, while installing some form of physical barrier for the residents would prohibit trucks from going to the north or east.

As to the cost of the fine to be issued, **Officer Sembach** explained the fine depended upon the weight of the truck, but that it would probably be about \$200.00 minimum.

A question followed as to the zoning of the D&M Corvette company on Ogden Ave, wherein **Dir. Newlon** explained the site was part of a settlement agreement with the county. Clarification followed as to where the restrictive signage would be posted. Asked if there was any village requirements for street cleaning for this area, **Dir. Newlon** stated staff could check with the planning officials working on the case. Should the request be approved, **Mr. Fera** stated the businesses would be notified of the restriction. He confirmed they were invited to tonight's meeting.

The chairman opened up the meeting to public comment.

**Mr. Ernest Anderson**, 1723 Janet Street, stated he was one of the observers of the truck traffic in the residential area and submitted much of the information. He stated that after the sidewalks were installed, the trucks continued to travel over them at the corners of Lee and Janet Streets and at Lee and Lacey Streets. The easements were being torn up. While he understood the six-ton weight limit, he also suggested that the commissioners consider the empty weight of the trucks. Mr. Anderson spoke about an unpleasant truck incident which occurred about 4 years ago regarding a disabled truck in a residential area. He voiced safety concerns for the children. As for a village wide restriction, **Mr. Anderson** seemed to understand from the village's web site that posting sign restrictions were on a request basis from the residents.

**Mr. Richard Janske**, 1739 W. Janet Street, stated only one truck business was the issue, which was Donegal, and whose owner did not care about the village. **Mr. Janske** stated the

business was a seven-day operation starting at 4:30 a.m. and was noisy. He did not believe restrictive signage would be the answer and the trucks had to leave the neighborhood. He stated he read the village's ordinance regarding outside repair work on trucks and said the owner has a make-shift barn where trucks are repaired and power washed all hours of the day or night. **Mr. Janske** stated D&M Corvette was a great neighbor because the owner cared about the neighborhood. Other concerns were voiced by **Mr. Janske**.

**Chairman Stuebner** sympathized and summarized that the village was trying to address the issue with a weight restriction on the street, citations, and fines. Noise and air pollution, which **Mr. Janske** was citing, are not issues to be addressed by this commission.

**Ms. Van Anne** asked staff whether Donegal was subject to the noise restrictions of the village, wherein **Dir. Newlon** stated the matter was being worked on through the Village Attorney's office and Community Development department.

**Ms. Sharon Laisch**, 1734 Janet Street, asked to have no trucks on her street. She recalled when trucks were not allowed to park on her Street. In response, **Chairman Stuebner** stated it would put the owner out of business. Other commissioners commented that the restriction was too broad. **Ms. Laisch** supported having a barrier at the end of Janet and Lacey but the commissioners pointed out the various issues with emergency vehicle access.

**Mr. Tony Andina**, 4250 Lacey Road, discussed when he purchased his business and how he received compliments from the neighbors. He discussed his proximity to the Donegal company and that almost every day he has to get his car washed. He commented about a ticket he received from the police a few years back for being overweight and other violations that he was called on from his neighbors, who he believed were going "overboard". He discussed the fast speed of some of the trucks and the issues with them.

Again, **Chairman Stuebner** said the Commission was addressing this issue and said it was a first step.

**Ms. Donna Anderson**, 1723 Janet St., voiced concern about the fast speed of the trucks coming down Janet St. and the children's safety.

Comments followed whether the six-ton restriction was fine, wherein **Mr. Fera** stated it was.

**Mr. Ernest Anderson**, 1723 Janet St., asked how staff came to designate the six-ton restriction, wherein **Mr. Fera** explained that the village ordinance had two options --five or six ton -- and due to the streets under discussion, having heavy commercial use, the larger, six-ton restriction is appropriate. **Mr. Anderson** asked staff to research what the standard empty weight was for the types of trucks under discussion. **Chairman Stuebner** noted it was a matter of the combined weight -- truck and trailer. Clarification of the signs' locations followed. **Mr. Anderson** asked if there could be consideration for the signs to be placed north of Ogden Avenue on Belle Aire Ln. and north of Ogden Ave at Downers Dr.

A motion was entertained:

**MR. SCHILLER MADE A MOTION TO DESIGNATE A 6-TON WEIGHT LIMIT ON LACEY ROAD BETWEEN NORTH OF JANET STREET AND VIRGINIA STREET; AND DESIGNATE A 6-TON WEIGHT LIMIT ON JANET STREET, BETWEEN LACEY ROAD AND BELLE AIRE LANE.**

**SECONDED BY MS. VLCEK.**

**ROLL CALL FOLLOWED:**

**AYE: MR. WROBEL, MS. VLCEK, MR. SCHILLER, MR. STUEBNER, MR. CRONIN, MS. VAN ANNE, MS. AGUZINO.**

**NAY: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 7-0**

### **3. File # 08-11. Downtown Parking Study – Final Report.**

**Dir. Newlon** introduced consultant **Mr. Dave Burr**, from Rich and Associates, to make the Draft Final presentation of the Downtown Parking Study. She also announced that the audio portion of the September 14, 2011 meeting along with the PowerPoint presentation of the study, were posted on the Village's web site for the public to follow along.

**Mr. Dave Burr** summarized the scope of work again for this project, as discussed at last month's presentation. A review of each of the 13 areas were reviewed, along with the findings and recommendations for each area. Addressing the finding that the village was actually providing 910 parking spaces in all of the commuter lots versus the Metra-required 825 spaces, **Mr. Burr** clarified that the surplus could be converted to shopper parking. Asked if it would make sense to use some of the outlying parking available for free employee parking, **Mr. Burr** responded that whether those spaces would be used for commuter parking or employee parking, was up to the village. **Mr. Burr**, in reviewing the handicapped/accessible parking requirements, added that, in addition to the village's shortage of handicap spaces for the commuter lots, there is a new federal guideline being proposed which would also require on-street handicap spaces. When the guidelines are adopted, **Mr. Burr** stated that a diagram from the government agency would detail how such parking would be laid out, whether diagonal or parallel.

**Mr. Burr** continued his presentation, discussing the findings and recommendations for timed parking, parking around the library, and possibly converting a couple of current spaces to 15-minute parking spaces around the library for drop-offs. A question came up if the street direction the library drop box was located on could be reversed, as it did not make sense currently, to free up parking spaces. **Mr. Burr** reported that it would be up to the village to determine where it wanted to locate those 15-minute parking spaces along various blocks. **Dir. Newlon**, however, raised the fact that signage becomes an issue when businesses change or move out. **Mr. Burr** stated that as best practices go, those short-term spaces would be located at the end of a block.

A question was raised that if another future residential development comes to the downtown area, would parking be required as part of the zoning, to which **Dir. Newlon** stated yes, and that the Planning Manager and staff will be reviewing the zoning code in 2012 as it relates to the parking requirements for downtown development.

Other recommendations mentioned by **Mr. Burr** addressed the Village's valet spaces, so that they have clearer parking signage, and also adjusting the Parking Deck rates. Commissioner comments included looking at an annual increase to the parking permit versus increasing it every few years and to consider offering a higher parking rate, similar to Naperville, since Downers Grove offered more non-stops trains to Chicago. The extra revenue could then be returned back into the village's parking program. **Mr. Schiller** agreed with the higher rate also, noting that Downers Grove's parking was in its downtown area, whereas, Naperville's spaces were not near its downtown. Additionally, he stated there was an existing demand in Downers Grove that was not offered in other communities. Other commissioners concurred.

Another commissioner suggestion raised was to offer lower parking rates at the Belmont station, thereby directing some of the non-Village residents out of the downtown parking spaces and moving them to the Belmont station, since it was noted that many non-village commuters did not patronize the village's downtown businesses anyway. **Dir. Newlon** stated the option could be considered in the Village's pricing strategy but there were aspects of the agreement with Metra and BNSF to not discriminate between residents and non-residents. **Chairman Stuebner** said it would be interesting to offer a pilot program on that point and see what the results would be. A dialog ensued. In response, **Dir. Newlon** pointed out that the parking operations group was working on promoting the additional parking located at the Fairview Ave Metra station to the occasional and mid-day users. She also believed it was an educational component.

**Mr. Burr** continued his discussion by stating that daily fee rates could be applied to handicap accessible permits, which currently are free. **Chairman Stuebner** believed that in specific areas for overnight parking there could be a restriction that vehicles leave by a certain time of day.

In closing, **Mr. Burr** reviewed the Implementation Schedule for the commissioners. First off, staff could have discussions with the private property owners to open up their spaces; speak to Metra about reducing the excess commuter parking spaces to shopper parking; re-assign spaces at Lot B; change the daily fee; add handicap accessibility spaces in lots; and charge a fee for the overnight parking. He reminded the commissioners that the aforementioned steps were low cost and would help the parking situation. Short-term recommendations included implementing the 15-minute spaces at the end of the blocks; changing the time limits in the library lot; implementing enforcement changes; conducting a parking lot condition audit; marketing the changes, obtaining a signage consultant; reviewing the loading zones and conducting an annual utilization count.

Discussion followed by **Dir. Newlon** that the village already over-sold the lots, but that a more comprehensive look at how the parking was being utilized, as suggested by the consultant, be done. **Mr. Burr** suggested that the review be done annually and to look at weekend or weekday parking to cover an entire day.

The long-range implementation schedule included, as cited by **Mr. Burr**, to add a new parking garage on the north side of the village since not much vacant land existed and any existing parking was already limited.

Regarding the suggestion of a parking garage on the north side of the tracks, **Chairman Stuebner** stated he did not know how the businesses were going to change there and if a parking garage were to be constructed, would it attract people going to the south side of the tracks? **Mr. Burr** explained that the proposed north parking garage was a matter of parking efficiency and if the village wanted to encourage additional new development to the north, a parking garage would most likely be required, possibly with a private/public partnership.

**Chairman Stuebner** opened up the meeting to public comments.

**Mr. Paul Giagnorio**, 994 Warren Avenue, owner of Scarletti's Italian Kitchen, discussed his long-term plan to stay in Downers Grove, was pleased to see the parking study being done, and agreed parking was an issue. Regarding the 15-minute parking spaces, he supported them, as he had a carry-out business besides the sit-down portion. He appreciated the village's effort to address the parking issues.

**Ms. Linda Kunze**, Downtown Management Corp., stated her board has worked with **Dir. Newlon** and the consultant and were pleased with the parking recommendations being discussed. Her board supported the study and she thanked the consultant for presenting figures and recommendations. She was surprised, as **Chairman Stuebner** was, that more businesses did not attend this meeting, as she did inform them prior. **Chairman Stuebner** concurred, as he would have preferred to hear their feedback via email or have them attend a meeting. **Ms. Kunze** did note, however, that if there were concerns from the merchants, the merchants did meet in her office, and those that could not meet, the consultant took phone surveys and spoke to them. **Mr. Wrobel** recalled that some of the owners attended the council meetings to voice their concerns and did not necessarily know the meeting process.

Other commissioner questions included whether there was consideration to reconfigure parking on Main Street to diagonal parking, to which **Mr. Burr** indicated it was not part of the study. Asked if there was consideration to have the downtown as pedestrian only, **Mr. Burr** indicated that this was not considered. And, as to purchasing private property for the public near the library, **Dir. Newlon** recalled the topic had been discussed but explained that the economics for surface lots did not work due to the value of the property to what is charged for surface lot, which was why a vertical structure was mentioned and would probably be driven by development and other factors. Lastly, asked if there was a study done on the percentage drop when inclement weather occurs, **Dir. Newlon** explained that the snow is hauled out of the downtown after it reaches a certain height.

**Chairman Stuebner** entertained a motion.

**MS. VAN ANNE MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE PARKING STUDY AS PRESENTED, INCLUDING COMMISSIONER COMMENTS.**

**SECONDED BY MR. CRONIN.**

**MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 7-0.**

**1. File #09-11. 2012 Sidewalk Construction Program and Matrix Update.** **Dir. Newlon** briefly summarized the sidewalk matrix program for new commissioners and reported on some of the challenges with the seven miles of sidewalks remaining. No major changes were being proposed at this time.

**Mr. Tom Topor**, Project Engineer for the Public Works Department, discussed that the sidewalk proposals for 2012 were based on certain scores and other village projects and that a few of the sidewalk projects would be shifted to ensure that future village projects, such as drainage or stormwater projects, would not be impacted. For 2012, he said staff was recommending a number of streets in two neighborhoods: the first was Hobson Triangle (on Leonard from Hobson to 63<sup>rd</sup> St.) and the second area was Burlington Highlands (Carol Street, from Lacey to Northcott and Virginia, from Lacey to Northcott). The high score factors for both neighborhoods were explained.



**Mr. Topor** agreed that the sidewalk matrix should be reviewed annually so as not to impact other construction schedules and to be cost efficient. **Dir. Newlon** added that today it was just announced that there would be a proposal to reconstruct roadways in the Valley View Subdivision in 2012 with two sidewalk projects (already included in the matrix) that would be included in that reconstruct. (Wall Place and Foster Place). As a noted point, **Dir. Newlon** added that in 2012 staff would be reviewing traffic calming measures that could be implemented as street reconstruction takes place in some of these areas.

Asked if the Village Council expands the budget for sidewalks, would it also expand the sidewalk matrix, **Dir. Newlon** responded that yes it would, and staff would review the next list of sidewalk projects. **Chairman Stuebner** added that he personally hoped the Village Council would provide traffic calming money before additional money was spent on the sidewalk program.

**Mr. Schiller** asked for clarification on what the commission was approving tonight, i.e., the construction program for next year and the new priorities in the matrix. **Dir. Newlon** agreed and explained it was an option for the commissioners to consider. She also continued to explain how staff generally holds three meetings with the residents to discuss the sidewalk program and receive input from them. She further explained that it had been expressed to her by some of the Commissioners that this Transportation and Parking Commission was not in the position to make certain policy decisions with the residents, and that these types of questions would be better addressed by Public Works staff. She asked for input on the matter.

**Mr. Cronin** and other commissioners believed this Commission was a sounding board for the residents and that this commission cannot do or commit to anything, but continue to hear residents' concerns being raised on other issues besides sidewalks. **Dir. Newlon** agreed that staff would be fine in conducting those meetings.

**Chairman Stuebner** opened up the meeting to public input.

**Ms. Christine Fregeau**, 1918 Elmore, reminded the commissioners she has been addressing the sidewalk program for the past 20 years and has been working with staff collaboratively on this matter. She also asked the commissioners to remind residents that the village has bonded out millions of dollars for the priorities, \$25 million in stormwater, and looking at an excess of \$25 million in road construction next year. To her point, the Village was now looking at less than 1% of that amount for sidewalks so that residents were not competing with vehicles in the streets. She emphasized the importance of safety and hope a fatality on the street would not be the motivator to have a sidewalk installed. Safety was emphasized for both the residents who walked and for the drivers. **Ms. Fregeau** expressed the positive comments she received from neighbors who initially did not want sidewalks but, once installed, were pleased to meet neighbors they never knew.

Regarding the last 57 segments of the sidewalk matrix, she voiced concerns on how the matrix was being done and reminded the commissioners that the document was fluid. **Ms. Fregeau** believed that sidewalks should not be installed only to be ripped up. To undermine what she felt were valid major and minor factors and just because the village was going to be in the neighborhood, did not make sense for reprioritizing the entire matrix and taking up staff time.

**Chairman Stuebner**, in response, took exception, and clarified that it was the dollars that were being prioritized and how they would be spent the most effectively. A dialog followed. **Ms. Fregeau** emphasized that it was a major policy change and it was changing the spirit and integrity of the matrix. She voiced concern that **Chairman Stuebner** suggested taking money

out of the matrix and place it into traffic calming. **Chairman Stuebner**, again reiterated his statement, and agreed there was as much safety issues with traffic calming and as many residents appeared before the Village Council asking for money for same, only to be told there was no money.

From a citizen's perspective, **Mr. Schiller** discussed his own experience regarding sidewalks and safety. He stated that streets had been identified in the Village which have excessive speeds on them and that, if for one year, in a bad economy, not as many sidewalks were constructed, enhancing the safety of the village was far more important than adding additional sidewalks. However, **Ms. Fregeau** reminded the commissioners that it was the policy and intent of the Village Ordinance to keep the village safe.

**Dir. Newlon** closed by explaining that what was being proposed would probably address both sidewalk and traffic calming issues, i.e. the street reconstruction and would include a couple of sidewalks. And it would not be at the expense of other projects listed on the matrix. Regarding the Clyde Estates neighborhood, she explained that the project was planned to be to be done with some work to address drainage issues. **Dir. Newlon** emphasized that staff was not trying to push off Clyde Estates but when combined with drainage, it was a larger project and had to be done when there was enough available funding. As to having the same sidewalk contractors in Valley View, Dir. Newlon expected them to be the same contractor. As to Clyde Estates, she would have to review whether there would be one or two contractors working side by side.

(**Ms. Van Anne** leaves meeting, 9:25 p.m.)

**Mr. Wrobel** encouraged commissioners to attend upcoming budget meetings to address funding for traffic calming measures or email their concerns to the Village Council.

A motion was entertained.

**MR. WROBEL MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE UPDATED SIDEWALK MATRIX, AS PRESENTED BY STAFF.**

**SECONDED BY MR. SCHILLER. ROLL CALL:**

**AYE: MR. WROBEL, MS. VLCEK, MR. SCHILLER, MR. STUEBNER, MR. CRONIN, MS. AGUZINO.**

**NAY: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 6-0**

**OLD BUSINESS** - None

**COMMUNICATIONS** - None

**ADJOURN**

**MS. VLCEK MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:30 P.M. MR. CRONIN SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 6-0.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Celeste Weilandt,  
Recording Secretary (as transcribed by digital recording)

**APPROVED 3/5/2012**

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE  
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING  
PUBLIC HEARING

February 6, 2012, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Jirik called the February 6, 2012 meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and asked for a roll call:

**PRESENT:** Chairman Jirik, Mr. Beggs, Mr. Cozzo, Mr. Hose, Mr. Matejczyk, Mrs. Rabatah, Mr. Waechtler and Mr. Webster

**ABSENT:** Mr. Quirk

**STAFF PRESENT:** Community Development Director Tom Dabareiner, Planning Manager Jeff O'Brien; Planners Damir Latinovic and Stan Popovich

**VISITORS:** Jennifer Oko, 1525 Thornwood Drive, David S. Silverman, Ancel Glink Diamond Bush DiCianni & Krafthefer, P.C., Dan Bolin, Ancel Glink Diamond Bush DiCianni & Krafthefer, P.C.

Chairman Jirik led the Plan Commissioners in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance and directed the public's attention to the available informational packets.

**APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 9, 2012 MINUTES**

Chairman Jirik pointed out that Mr. Hose provided some suggested changes to the minutes. The proposed changes were on the dias for Commissioners' review. He asked if any members of the Commission had any comments regarding the changes. There being none, Chairman Jirik invited a motion to approve the minutes with the changes proposed by commissioner Hose.

**MR. COZZO MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES WITH THE CHANGES SUGGESTED BY MR. HOSE. SECONDED BY MR. HOSE.**

**MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 8-0.**

Chairman Jirik reviewed the purpose and procedures for the meeting.

**File PC-07-12** A petition seeking final plat of subdivision approval to consolidate two existing lots into one lot. The property is located on the south side of Thornwood Drive approximately 106 feet east of Plymouth Street, commonly known as 1525 Thornwood Drive, Downers Grove, IL (PINs 09-18-205-003 and 09-18-205-004) Timothy and Jennifer Oko, Petitioners/Owners.

Chairman Jirik swore in those individuals who would be speaking on this matter.

Planner Damir Latinovic informed the commissioners that Michael Davenport, the architect for the petitioner emailed him a letter of support for the petition late last week and that the copy of the letter was placed on the dais for review. He explained the petition was for a final plat of subdivision

**APPROVED 3/5/2012**

to consolidate two separate parcels (both 50 feet wide by 175 feet deep lots) into one lot at 1525 Thornwood Drive. The property was zoned R-4 Single Family Residential. A single family home and a detached garage are currently located on the property. The petitioner is planning to construct an approximately 500-sq. ft. addition to the existing single-family home. The zoning ordinance requires consolidation of the lots. The property is similar to other adjacent single-family lots. The new lot would be 100 feet wide by 175 feet deep and meet all minimum dimension requirements.

Mr. Latinovic indicated staff has not received the plans for the home addition, but that the addition will have to meet all bulk requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. The petitioner is awaiting the decision of the Village Council to apply for the building permit. He went on to explain staff believes the proposal is consistent with the Village's Comprehensive Plan and complies with the Village's Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Ordinance. Mr. Latinovic explained new easements along the side and rear lot lines would be platted.

Mr. Latinovic indicated public notice was provided according to Village requirements, and staff had not received any public comments on the proposal. Mr. Latinovic stated staff recommended the Plan Commission forward a positive recommendation to the Village Council subject to staff's one condition listed in its staff report.

Per question by Mr. Waechtler, Mr. Latinovic confirmed there is a detached garage on the property.

The Plan Commission briefly discussed how the zoning requirements for the addition related to the approval of the lot consolidation.

There being no further comments for staff, Chairman Jirik invited the petitioner to the podium.

Petitioner and owner, Mrs. Jennifer Oko, 1525 Thornwood Drive, Downers Grove, IL 60516, stated their intention was to construct an addition to the existing home to modernize it and her understanding is that per the Zoning Ordinance the lot consolidation is required.

Per a question from Mr. Waechtler, Mrs. Oko clarified that the addition will be constructed on the front side of the building to fill in the void by the old attached garage.

No further questions were directed to the petitioner. Chairman Jirik opened up the meeting to public comment. None received. The public comment portion was closed.

Chairman Jirik asked for additional comments or deliberation from the Commission. There being none, Chairman Jirik asked for a motion.

**MR. WAECHTLER MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL REGARDING FILE NUMBER PC 07-12 SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION:**

- 1. THE FINAL PLAT OF SUBDIVISION SHALL SUBSTANTIALLY CONFORM TO OKO'S RE-SUBDIVISION PLAT PREPARED BY NELSON SURVEYORS, LLC. DATED DECEMBER 30, 2011, EXCEPT AS SUCH PLAT MAY BE MODIFIED TO CONFORM TO THE VILLAGE CODES AND ORDINANCES.**

**APPROVED 3/5/2012**

**SECONDED BY MR. HOSE, ROLL CALL:**

**AYE: MR. WAECHTLER, MR. HOSE, MR. BEGGS, MR. COZZO, MR. MATEJCZYK,  
MRS. RABATAH, MR. WEBSTER, CHAIRMAN JIRIK**

**NAY: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 8-0**

Community Development Director Tom Dabareiner introduced David S. Silverman and Dan Bolin of Ancel Glink Diamond Bush DiCianni and Drafthefer, P.C. Mr. Silverman and Mr. Bolin presented the information on Illinois planning and zoning law and procedures. Information about Illinois ethics rules was also provided. Mr. Silverman and Mr. Bolin provided a hand-out - *Plan Commission Workshop: Law and Ethics* – for the Commission to review during the presentation..

Following the presentation, Mr. O'Brien reminded the commissioners to complete the required Open Meeting Act and FOIA certification training. He stated a copy of the Village's new Zoning Map was provided to the commissioners which reflects the areas recently annexed by the Village. Mr. O'Brien updated the commissioners on next month's agenda. He clarified that the February 27 meeting date has been canceled, but that there will be a meeting on March 5.

Commissioner Waechtler thanked the staff for the quality of staff reports and especially the area maps, which makes it very easy to identify and visit project sites.

**THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:29 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. WEBSTER,  
SECONDED BY MR. HOSE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE  
OF 8-0.**

Respectfully submitted,

Damir Latinovic, AICP  
Planner