

APPROVED

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
VILLAGE HALL - COMMITTEE ROOM
801 BURLINGTON AVENUE

August 16, 2017, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Davenport called the August 16, 2017 meeting of the Architectural Design Review Board to order at 7:03 p.m. and asked for a roll call:

PRESENT: Chairman Davenport, Ms. Acks, Ms. Chalberg, Ms. Hollweck, Mr. Larson

ABSENT: Mr. Lerner, Mr. Riemer

STAFF: Senior Planner Rebecca Leitschuh

VISITORS: Sara Pemberton, 4737 Montgomery Ave., Downers Grove; Amy Gassen, 5320 Benton Ave., Downers Grove; Rich Kulovany with Friends of the Edwards House, 6825 Camden, Downers Grove; Kathy Nybo, 5253 Blodgett, Downers Grove; Charlotte and Byron Holtzen, 5226 Carpenter, Downers Grove

APPROVAL OF May 17, 2017 MINUTES

Two changes were noted on page 2: to correct the spelling of Fairmount to insert a “u” and to correct the address to read 5325 Fairmount. **MOTION BY MR. LARSON, SECONDED BY MS. HOLLWECK TO APPROVE THE MAY 17, 2017 MINUTES, AS CORRECTED. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 5-0.**

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Davenport opened the public hearing and swore in those individuals that would be speaking on the following public hearing.

A. **17-ADR-0005: A petition seeking a Historic Landmark Designation for the property commonly known as 4714 Oakwood Avenue, Downers Grove, IL (PIN 09-07-203-003). The property is located on the west side of Oakwood Avenue, approximately 75 feet south of Chicago Avenue. John and Ruth Wander, Petitioner and Owner.** Senior Planner Rebecca Leitschuh noted the location of this 1893 Queen Anne home. Petitioners were seeking landmark designation for two reasons: because the home was owned by persons of historical significance to the community and representation of distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style. The current plat of survey was referenced. Staff pointed out that it sits on an oversized parcel in the E.H. Prince and Company subdivision, this being the home actually built by E.H. Prince and his family.

Ms. Leitschuh reported that the American Queen Anne architectural style was a popular style in the village constructed, with this home constructed in the prime of the Victorian era. Details of its style followed including: wood clapboard and wood shingle siding, stone

APPROVED

foundation, ornamental and eclectic elements (e.g., three types of roof dormers, one with rounded corners and round windows with decorative framing, one a hipped roof dormer, and one a high gable dormer), a wrap-around porch, dentil molding trim that wraps around the roofline, a two-story turret popout, third story balustrade with coffered arches, and the original front door.

The home was built for Earl H. Prince and his family who first arrived in DG in 1890 and formed E.H.Prince and Company along with Emerson Foote and Fannie Linscott. The company created the E.H.Prince subdivision north of the train tracks, and had a major role in the rapid growth experienced during the 1890s when the population more than doubled. The subdivision encouraged further northward expansion. Prince moved westward in 1893, the same year his family moved into the home. His wife remained in the home, an active member of the Downers Grove community, until her death in 1946.

Staff recommended approval of the landmark request, noting the home was constructed in 1893, it was constructed and owned by a person of historical significance, and it embodies the characteristics of the American Queen Anne style home.

No questions from the board members. Two board members expressed their appreciation of the landscaping and the remaining brick street. The chairman invited the petitioner to speak.

Staff played a video prepared by Cindy Zaeske, 1130 Franklin, on behalf of the petitioners. She introduced herself said it was a pleasure researching the property and working with the owners, the Wanders.

The chairman invited the public to speak.

Mr. Rich Kulovany, 6825 Camden, Downers Grove, was pleased to see that the home was preserved stating developers were interested in demolishing the home since it sat on 6 lots.

Ms. Kathy Nybo, 5253 Blodgett, Downers Grove, said the home had the “wow factor.”

Ms. Irene Hogstrom, 1232 Gilbert, Downers Grove, said it was a gem and thanked for preserving.

Ms. Amy Gassen, 5320 Benton, Downers Grove, recognized the architecture and property as a good site to preserve, and also shared that the home is part of the Historical Society’s Historic Homes program.

Ms. Shannon Tully, 5413 Main, Downers Grove, thanked Cindy Zaeske for her help researching and preparing the petition.

Hearing no further comments, the chairman closed the public hearing and entertained a motion.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE 17-ADR-005, MR. LARSON MADE A MOTION THAT THE ADRB FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL TO RECOMMEND HISTORICAL LANDMARK DESIGNATION FOR THE PROPERTY AT 4714 OAKWOOD AVENUE IN DOWNERS GROVE.

APPROVED

MS. CHALBERG SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL CALL:

**AYE: MR. LARSON, MS. CHALBERG, MS. ACKS, MS. HOLLWECK,
CHAIRPERSON DAVENPORT**

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 5-0

B. 17-ADR-0006: A petition seeking to amend Sections 12.200 and 12.301 within Chapter 12 of the Municipal Code to create a process to revise and add to a local landmark designation. Village of Downers Grove, Petitioner. Senior Planner Rebecca Leitschuh said staff prepared the proposed ordinance revision in response to new information presented to staff by a resident who has already successfully landmarked the family home. Staff identified that the existing landmark could not be added to without revisiting the entire landmark nomination process. Staff discussed the ordinance with the State of Illinois Historic Preservation Agency who confirmed that the existing ordinance language would require a landmarked or nominated property to go through the entire designation procedure a second time. The State suggested creating a simplified process through a Supplementary Listing Record, similar to the National Register of Historic Places for simple revisions. No formal public hearing would be required.

Ms. Leitschuh reported that the revised process would be as follows: applicant meets with staff to talk through new/revised information, completes the Supplementary Listing Record with supporting documentation, staff prepares a memo to the ADRB, the ADRB holds a public meeting (not hearing), the ADRB makes its final decision, and staff updates Council.

Staff read the language of the proposed ordinance changes (12.200 Definitions and 12.301.D Landmark Designation Procedures). Staff clarified that this would allow for a property in the nomination process or already landmarked to amend or add to the designation through the Supplementary Listing Record. The proposed amendment would appear on the next regularly scheduled ADRB meeting, at which time the board shall review the designation criteria. Any proposed rescinding of a partial or complete landmark property would still require going through the entire public hearing process. Staff then shared the proposed Supplementary Listing Record form.

The board members expressed their support in creating a solution to make the process simpler for residents to continue to add to the story of Downers Grove by providing more information as it becomes available.

The chairman invited the public to speak.

Ms. Chuck Holtzen and Mr. Byron Holtzen, 5226 Carpenter, Downers Grove, said they thought they had already previously met the criteria, and that they were the reason the amendment was being proposed. They asked how the updated landmark status would be recorded at the county, to which staff replied that the ordinance recorded at the county is more general, and does not specifically identify the criteria from the Historic Preservation Ordinance.

Ms. Amy Gassen, 5320 Benton, Downers Grove, said she thought the amendment created an opportunity for additional information and history to be brought forth.

APPROVED

Mr. Rich Kulovany, 6825 Camden, Downers Grove, hoped the amendment would help bring forth information meeting criteria beyond the architectural style.

Hearing no further comments, the chairman closed the public hearing. Mr. Larson said that this would help the Village be recipients of great information and research, and that future examples of persons of significance may be identified in Downers Grove homes. Chairperson Davenport said the ordinance as currently written discourages the addition of new information and supported the proposed change. The chairperson entertained a motion.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE 17-ADR-006, MR. LARSON MADE A MOTION THAT THE ADRB FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL TO RECOMMEND AMENDING SECTIONS 12.200 AND 12.301 WITHIN CHAPTER 12 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE.

MS. ACKS SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL CALL:

**AYE: MR. LARSON, MS. ACKS, MS. CHALBERG, MS. HOLLWECK,
CHAIRPERSON DAVENPORT**

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 5-0

OLD BUSINESS

A. Staff updated the ADRB about the Sears brochure (CLG brochure #3) and downtown tour brochure (CLG brochure #4). The Sears brochure, with minor edits, will be sent to print. Copies of the architectural styles brochure (CLG brochure #2) are available after the meeting should anyone like copies, with one copy being mailed to every featured home in the brochure.

B. Incentive Strategies – ADRB Ad-Hoc Report and Recommendations to Council (2015) – Chair Davenport recalled he had asked the board to review the Ad-Hoc report a while back, specifically as it relates to increasing the fees on the demolition side to not only offset the cost of reducing/eliminating fees for historic preservation applicants but also as a way to assist applicants financially. He asked for input.

Ms. Chalberg presented the information she had gathered. Specifically that no communities had a specific budget line for historic preservation, with the exception of Hinsdale (\$10,000 line item). Most municipalities she contacted are planners, not historic preservationists; most have application fees unlike Downers Grove; none had an additional demolition fee towards historic preservation. She said Downers Grove was pretty far ahead of the curve (excluding Geneva and Hinsdale). She said it seemed like the fee structure is a “blank canvas.”

Ms. Leitschuh presented the information she had researched regarding demolition numbers and fees. She shared that between January 1, 2015 and May 18, 2017, 143 single family homes were demolished (including five stormwater acquisitions), averaging 4.8/month. She cited that existing housing units were 20,683 per the Census, with demolitions representing 0.28 percent of housing units per year. (Later, Mr. Rich Kulovany clarified that the housing units staff

APPROVED

cited represented all housing units, not just single family homes). Staff then shared that the Village demolition fee is \$592, which goes into the general fund. She shared numbers from surrounding communities and found that Downers Grove is close to the median, with Hinsdale and Westmont on the high end.

Discussion followed that the ADRB would like to know the frequency of demolitions in other communities for comparison, and whether a specific geographic area in the Village is “targeted” more for demolitions like the historic areas. Ms. Chalberg said some communities required a wait time after submitting for demolition, and she questioned whether the Village could require additional research to be submitted by the owner/applicant in the wait time. Discussion of the potential conflict between someone’s rights to demolish while requiring additional research ensued.

Discussion of financial incentives followed with a suggestion to tack on a demolition fee to use for historic preservation / restoration, or to offset waiving future permit fees for an applicant restoring a historic home. The monies were discussed to be considered for use by local historic preservation groups as grants.

The chairman raised two issues he thought the Board needed to define. One, how to raise funds and the amount. And two, what should the generated fees be used for. He mentioned Hinsdale’s approach with a line item in the budget. Mr. Larson said he thought the Board should one, identify what they would like to promote in 2018, two, attain some funds to accomplish this, and three, list tasks to attain their goal (e.g., education, celebrate heritage, preservation).

NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Chalberg expressed concern that the landmarked Drew House had received hate mail published on social media in regards to the work as part of the COA.

The chairman suggested that staff prepare a memo verifying that work performed on landmarked properties complies with the COA. Ms. Leitschuh explained that staff pays very close attention to reviewing permits for COAs, and that the inspectors in the field verify that buildings are built accordingly at regular inspections. Ms. Acks said in hindsight it would have been beneficial to “take the public on the process” for the first COA as an education tool.

Mr. Larson recognized an upcoming award from Landmarks Illinois to be given to The Friends of the Edwards House.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Charlotte Holtzen, 5226 Carpenter St., Downers Grove, said she knew people were unkind to the owners of the Drew House and she was concerned others would not landmark if they feared negative feedback. She was concerned about the number of tear downs in her area, with nine of the homes torn down from the original 22 in Carpenter Subdivision. She said the community has to buy into preservation to “make it roll.” She suggested submitting pictures and floor plans with demolition permits to archive.

APPROVED

Ms. Amy Gassen, 5320 Benton Ave., Downers Grove, said that historic preservation education saves the homes. She also updated the Board on the American Foursquare initiative and inventory map on the Historical Society's website.

Mr. Rich Kulovany, 6825 Camden, Downers Grove, said education is important. He suggested that money could be used to perform additional building surveys, on education, and brochures. He ran through upcoming events including the Mayor's reception for landmark properties.

Ms. Chalberg shared that the Historical Society was holding its first public membership meeting in a long time.

ADJOURNMENT

MR. LARSON MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:30 P.M. MS. HOLLWECK SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 5-0.

/s/ Rebecca Leitschuh

APPROVED

**VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 20, 2017 MEETING**

Chairman Davenport called the September 20, 2017 meeting of the Architectural Design Review Board to order at 7:01 PM and requested a roll call:

PRESENT: Ms. Acks, Ms. Chalberg, Mr. Riemer, Ch. Davenport

ABSENT: Ms. Hollweck, Mr. Larson, Mr. Lerner

STAFF: Sr.Planner Rebecca Leitschuh

VISITORS: Charlotte & Byron Holtzen, 5226 Carpenter St.; Amy Gassen, 5320 Benton Ave.; Rich Kulovany, FOEH, 6825 Camden Rd.

APPROVAL OF AUGUST 16, 2017 MINUTES

Ms. Chalberg moved, seconded by Ms. Acks, to accept the minutes of the August 16, 2017 meeting as presented.

All in favor. The Motion passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

Historic Preservation Brochure #4- Downtown Tour

Chairman Davenport commented that this was a good document and he was caught up in the reading.

Senior Planner said there are a total of four brochures including Architectural Styles, Sears Catalog Homes tour, Downtown Tour.

Ms. Leitschuh said that the language for the brochure was a collaborative effort with the Historical Society volunteers attempting to get the history down on paper. The acknowledgement page will contain more information on the Society's involvement, and explaining how this was a joint brochure. About 90% of the photographs are from the Historical Society's archives, which will be referenced in the brochure as well. Much of the language comes from Heritage Sites descriptive information. She said there was no defined scope of focus when this brochure was first envisioned. Once they began working with the Museum and volunteers, much more information was found on existing buildings, as well as predecessor buildings in the downtown area. It was suggested to focus on architectural references, but they learned a lot about existing buildings, such as Emmett's, which was greatly embellished over the years.

Chairman Davenport said the question that was raised regarding Emmett's building is what to call it, since its history is very mixed.

Ms. Leitschuh also noted that they have to determine what they want to call the

APPROVED

brochure, and whether it specifies architecture, Downers Grove tours, etc.

Ms. Chalberg said that they have a lot of information on architecture. She doesn't think it is just architecture without history. She described a trip she recently took in Wyoming and old museums there. The walking tour she took included numbered vacant lots with photographs of buildings that existed at one time, and the descriptive data was based on address, including multiple addresses and business names at that location.

Ch. Davenport said when he applies for permits for projects he wants to call the project by his client's name; however, in terms of Village records the permit is recorded by the address.

Ms. Chalberg said Emmett's is a great example of a location that has had numerous businesses and architectural designs over the years. That building would be recorded by the address with narrative explaining all the history and businesses over the years.

Ms. Leitschuh said she is content with using the addresses, and providing additional information in the brochure.

Ms. Chalberg said in the Wyoming tour most of the properties used the address, with detailed explanations where necessary.

Ch. Davenport said he thought they should use the address, and when there is a clear identifier it should be listed with the address.

Ms. Acks said she thought the clear identifier could be what the building was originally known as, and that the building may still be known for.

Ms. Leitschuh said this is why she is bringing this to the Board because there are so many ways the properties can be shown and described.

Ms. Chalberg said there might be varying opinions from people who were born and raised her and may disagree with the description. She thinks if they start to name everything according to a specific generation, it can become complicated.

Ch. Davenport suggested leaving it at Rebecca's discretion, and they can look at the locations that are questionable later for further identification. He thinks each one of the locations will need to have something at the site to correspond with the brochure and to make it work. They would have to be sure that the owner approves of the information that is provided, and they will have to find some funding to provide for the corresponding identification on the properties. The identifier on the site is extremely important for someone who may not have a copy of the brochure for the walking tour.

Ms. Chalberg said the walking tour she mentioned was probably a bit more elaborate, but she thinks they will need to have at least a correlating number so people in town can identify the location as part of a walking tour.

It was also noted that not every property owner may want to have some type of plaque or identifier on their building.

APPROVED

Ms. Leitschuh then asked about the title. She is concerned that if they refer to it as a walking tour of important building in the downtown, there might be people upset because they have an important building that is not included.

Ch. Davenport agreed with that point because this is not going to be a static document. He noted that this Board was in complete agreement that education is a major goal of what they were doing. This is a most effective way to increase the interest in landmarking and historic interest. If people are upset that they were not included, then the goal at educating has been accomplished.

Ms. Chalberg said she understands that Staff is always faced with deadlines. If this were to be sent to the Downtown Management Board she is sure they would find or recommend additional sites that could be included. She asked whether this brochure has been designated for a certain size, and Ms. Leitschuh said it is already several pages beyond what was initially scoped for the project. They were trying to find buildings that looked like they would fit the research conducted. A big part of the preparation included meeting with the Staff at the Historical Society and have them help curate some of the properties to incorporate. She said she hoped to have this to the designer for final editing within a week. The brochure before the Board does not have current photographs of the building. They have had a photographer take updated photos. Reporting to the State for the grant is what is driving the deadline.

Ms. Chalberg said that from a title standpoint, there are certainly some buildings that would be wonderful to add to the brochure. It could be called Historic Downers Grove Walking Tour.

Ch. Davenport suggested The 2017 Downtown Downers Grove Historic Walking Tour, which fits with the present brochure.

Ms. Chalberg said that the Founders and Merchants Bank is undergoing another renovation. Ms. Leitschuh said that is important, since the building is already vastly different than what it was originally.

Ch. Davenport asked whether there was still time to get the Bank information into the brochure, and Ms. Leitschuh said she would have to remove something else from the brochure. Ch. Davenport asked if it would be Emmett's, and there was also discussion about the property formerly known as DG National Bank or the Paragon Purvis Theater. There was also another building known as the Weiher theater building, which was never actually a theater.

Ms. Acks said the Henry Carpenter house is a house, although it was a post office. Ms. Chalberg said if it is to be a historic tour they can remove a Tudor style building out of it.

Ms. Leitschuh suggested the Board look at the Table of Contents to get a better idea of how the brochure will be laid out. She said it would only be 24 pages in length. Ch. Davenport asked if any buildings have two pages devoted to them, and she replied the Tivoli Theater and the Main Street Train Station had two pages each. Ch. Davenport suggested condensing one of those down to one page so another item could be included. Mr. Larson said he thinks that would work. Ms. Leitschuh said she could also

APPROVED

combine Bank Financial and the Main Street Cemetery into one page. She said she tried to include the First United Methodist Church in the brochure, but didn't want to have to choose one church over another.

Ms. Chalberg said that for right now, considering they may add more at a later time, they can consider it a work in progress. Ch. Davenport disagreed, saying there should be some identifier from the beginning that doesn't have to be too expensive. Future updates may not even be done in printed form, but could be done electronically.

Ms. Chalberg said that a lot is included in the brochure that other walking tours would not have. Ms. Leitschuh said her next step would be to determine the descriptions and whether they should be in sentence-structure or bulleted points. She plans to condense what they presently have, send it to the Board members for their comments and final changes, and then make final changes.

Ms. Acks asked whether there would be more information available on line as well as in the brochure. Ms. Leitschuh said it would be on line as well. Their intern Nora commented that they should have a walking tour app. Ms. Chalberg said that there would be a cemetery app launched by the end of the year. She said she thought they might be able to use that platform for other things as well.

Ch. Davenport asked that the Board members contact Rebecca with any additional comments or corrections that should be made before it goes in for final publication.

Revising the ADRB Ad Hoc Report and Recommendations to Council

Ms. Leitschuh said the map that was in the Board's packet showed demolitions for twelve months ending in August of 2017. In the past year 63 single-family homes were demolished, averaging 5.25 homes per month.

Ch. Davenport said his first question was whether this is a typical year, and Ms. Leitschuh said it is fairly typical for the past two years. The Chairman said the Village is losing a lot, although some of those demolished should have been. He said this is a trend that is going on and will continue as long as the property values make it profitable.

Ch. Davenport then looked at the information provided by Ken Lerner, which will be shared with the Board. In summary, his suggestion referred to Commissioner Barnett's comments to the Council about what an incentive program might look like. It included research done about Plainfield, Urbana, Blue Island, Bloomington and what other communities have been doing and researched. Ch. Davenport said that there were some companies charging a lot for demolitions. The money collected right now goes into the General Fund. He asked the justification for charging a demolition fee to begin with, and how they arrive at that amount.

Ms. Leitschuh replied that in 2012 the Community Development Department did an analysis of the permit fees and compared them to fees in the general Chicago area to determine whether the Village was in line with other communities. For the most part they found that the Village met the industry norm. Ch. Davenport said as a result of that study, building permit fees were increased substantially. He said he thought the amount being charged for demolition is based on what others are charging. Part of his thought

APPROVED

process was rather than looking at raising the fees, the Village should be getting a chunk of the fees that exist. They should be able to say what those dollars will be used for. In the demolition there is a cost to the community. He loves some of the incentive ideas that have been suggested, such as markers for the building tour, or publication of the brochures that are items that will need to be updated and ongoing. He thinks that the group should make a strong argument as to 1) why this group should be a line item in the budget with funds allocated for their activities, and 2) the Board should provide helpful suggestions as to how the Village might help fund those activities.

Ms. Chalberg commented that it might be helpful for the Board to agree on a list of ten things that they would be using the money for as the ADRB. She asked if the goal for the money is to increase the volume of landmarked properties, or to educate the public as to the value of historic architecture.

The goal should be established.

Ch. Davenport replied that those things are the goals of the Board. He said that the Village, in its creation of the ADRB and the Ad Hoc Committee decided there was a need for greater awareness in the Village. By causing a study of the Historic Preservation Ordinance, they rewrote the Ordinance with the goal of streamlining the process and simplifying the procedure. He sees one of the goals of the Village to increase awareness so that more things would be preserved. The Board has previously discussed the importance of education in achieving those goals. That is why the brochures are being produced, and why Friends of the Edwards House and other groups have invested time to increase awareness. It has to be an ongoing thing. In the past there were times when the ADRB didn't even meet, and he does not want to see that happen again because too much work has been achieved.

One way to perpetuate the goals is to determine what the Board can do with the funds. He thinks they need to put a proposal to the Council with a budget and how those funds will be spent over the year. He thinks demolition fees would fall within their purview to get their goals accomplished. He would love to see them expand their surveys, and study other areas in town that can be addressed by the incentive program suggested.

Ms. Chalberg asked what behavior they are referencing with incentives. Ch. Davenport replied it would be landmarking and creation of districts. That was the goal of rewriting the ordinance. They are against forcing people to do these things. They want instead to educate people by providing incentives to landmark their properties. Ms. Chalberg said that when she thinks of the word incentive it has a dollar-sign in front of it, and she doesn't think that is where they are headed. They haven't had to pay anyone to landmark their homes so far. Ch. Davenport responded that they are not sharing the definition of the word "incentive." There are other ways to incentivize people such as through recognition for participation, recognizing rehabbing of a building, publicizing a project, etc. It doesn't mean only handouts. He wants to see them doing things that have cost money and he wants to continue doing that.

Ms. Chalberg said that it appears to be more of a promotion program. She has no objection to using the word "incentive" as long as it's well defined. Ch. Davenport said he appreciates her perspective, and her reaction to the use of the word "incentive" as other people might have that same reaction. Ms.

Chalberg said the goals have to be set clearly, and groups organized to define the goals.

APPROVED

Ms. Acks said that she has a list of exiting goals from 2015. They include: identify and preserve architecturally significant buildings, neighborhoods and sites throughout the Village; develop public outreach and education for historic preservation; become a CLG, maintain our certification; provide grants to local business owners to undertake historically significant rehabilitation on existing downtown buildings; other goals in conjunction with the Comprehensive Plan to preserve and enhance distinguishing features of residential neighborhoods. They established these things in 2015 and have completed some of these goals. She reviewed the minutes from 2015 as well, as much of what they are talking about are in those minutes.

Ms. Chalberg said when she hears that list she sees a dedicated Staff person who has a full-time job. Ch. Davenport said that they would probably have to add another person. Ms. Chalberg said some of the things in that list are formalized, structured, staff-oriented program development.

Mr. Riemer said the goal was to make it easier to landmark, and reduce the cost and the restrictions. That's been accomplished. He thinks if they want to continue in that direction they would need more resources to take the next step.

Ms. Chalberg said she doesn't think they would have had the level of participation of landmarking without the Friends of Edwards House and other organizations that wanted promotion of landmarking. She asked how they can make this happen since they have to have a workable budget.

Ch. Davenport said that the question appears to be what is the focus of the group, and whether these are things the ADRB should be doing or not. They have seriously had these discussions before, and at one point they were really just a reactionary group. That has changed over the last few years. A decision was made that the Board needed to be more than just reactionary, and he sees that as the result of the Edwards House being torn down, and people seeing what happens when the Village is not proactive in certain areas. There is a limit as to how much outreach they can do, but it certainly is within their range to educate, offer incentives to accomplish goals, etc. There are costs associated with all of these goals, and funds to support them have to be presented. He would like to see a line item in the budget, and if a fee is waived the dollars will come out of that budget. If they don't have dollars associated with the things they hope to achieve, those things won't get done.

Ms. Chalberg said she agrees totally, but they have a chicken-and-the-egg situation. It's hard to say, "give us the money" because the Council is going to want them to be very specific. Ch. Davenport said they can be specific because they've already created things that have cost money in terms of the brochures, research, etc.

Ms. Acks said that it appears they are saying they want demolition fees to go to the ADRB. As to how it will be spent it could include updated brochures, perhaps best research work done for scholarship money to high school students, or award programs for best rehabilitation projects, etc. She asked if they should prepare a list of things that could be considered for the use of the funds.

Ms. Leitschuh suggested that prior to the next meeting the Board members think of it as

APPROVED

"what is the problem they are trying to solve?" With all boards there is a parameter established with certain responsibilities, expectations and rules under which they can operate. Within those rules, what is the problem that the Board members think they are trying to fix? Landmarks at this point in time are considered to be successful, as they have had 17 applicants. Is there a need to financially incentivize that? She thinks they have to identify the problem.

Ch. Davenport said he wants to see them continue to be able to do what they are doing. Ms. Acks asked if that is the Board's responsibility or the responsibility of other historic organizations within the community. She wants to know where the line is drawn.

Ms. Chalberg said she feels as though they want to act like an independent contributor that has been chartered to get these goals accomplished. If they are asked to promote a program, she sees them having to go back to Staff for that. They all know what they would like to see done. Some organizations have staff people dedicated to preservation, education, etc., and they are budgeted for those things with job descriptions. Right now the Board has a great deal of enthusiasm and energy occurring, but they are a government Commission. She wants to know if it is their job to do the work or to direct it.

Mr. Riemer suggested that before the next meeting they obtain information from Staff as to the costs involved in completing some of the goals. They would report to the Council what has been done and what the Council wants them to do moving forward. They can then inform the Council what they would need financially to complete some of the projects such as the brochures, etc.

Ch. Davenport said he liked that idea, as did Ms. Acks and Ms. Chalberg.

Ms. Chalberg asked what happens if Council likes everything that's been done, and will they have more direction for the Board.

Ch. Davenport said he would like to see a situation created by which if the Board were to stop what they are now doing, that the Council would have a thoughtful purposeful discussion about it, rather than having the Board just disappear.

Ms. Chalberg asked if they could open this up for discussion because there are people present who have been instrumental in getting the last 14 landmarks approved. Ch. Davenport suggested they continue the conversation to the next meeting, as there are three members absent from this discussion.

Mr. Riemer asked that Staff provide the Board with costs for the items completed to this point.

Ch. Davenport asked that the notes Ms. Acks read earlier be distributed to the Board members before the next meeting. Ms. Acks said it was from notes from the June 17, 2015 agenda.

Ms. Chalberg said it would be great at some point to have an historic timeline that identifies the changes that were made, what triggered them, and where they are headed at this time.

APPROVED

NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Leitschuh said two landmark petitions will come to the Board in October. She said there are three different levels of COA's (Certificates of Appropriateness). The first is so minor it does not require a COA. The second is "minor" which the Community Development Director may approve. She said the Ordinance says you can substitute like-for-like under this category, such as windows, siding, etc. Based on inquiries made of Staff, she anticipates receiving some of these requests for minor amendments. Nothing has come in as yet.

Ch. Davenport said they have had some conversation about what is happening at the Drew House. He thinks it is appropriate to review these changes if they are minor, without affecting the historic value of the structure.

Ms. Leitschuh said that Staff has been purposely conservative. The COA coming in October reflects what was originally there, but the type of change is not defined as a "minor COA" therefore Staff forwarded it the Board to review.

Ms. Acks said that even if they receive minor requests, it would be good for Staff to make a report on them so it is recorded. It is part of the process.

Ms. Chalberg said she spoke to someone in Geneva who said they have COA's coming through all the time.

Ms. Leitschuh said there would be an October meeting with three requests coming in. The hope is that December will be an open month. Landmark applicants tend to be fairly flexible.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

1. Charlotte Holtzen of 5226 Carpenter Street said she was in Lexington last month where they have an awesome historic area. These are done by the name of the building, with the address as well. She would go with the address and the name of the building. The name could be for the first person there, or the most prominent person there. She then asked why the Board doesn't ask for volunteers in the community who would be willing to come and do some of the work involved. She does a lot of genealogy with many States in the east working with volunteers. She said that at a panel discussion last week they discussed the economic affect historic districts have for a community. The Lexington area has seen a huge economic boost from the historic districts. She then questioned what the definition of "thematic district" was, and how homes would be landmarked.

Ms. Leitschuh said an example of thematic could be the Sears' Homes.

Ms. Holtzen asked if homes under a thematic district fall under the same restrictions/regulations as other landmarked homes. These are questions that arise and they want to know how they should be answered.

Ms. Leitschuh explained that every homeowner in a thematic district must agree. To be

APPROVED

in a contiguous landmarked district you have to have at least 51% of the homeowners agree. The protections are the same.

Ch. Davenport said if they had a group of several properties landmarked that wanted to be a "district" he would think they would move it from individual landmarking to a thematic district. That would essentially still be making individual landmarks, and every property would be a landmarked member of the thematic district.

Ms. Leitschuh said the main concern is that there is a defining element in creating a thematic district.

Ch. Davenport said that establishing a thematic district needs to be strong.

2. Amy Gassen of 5320 Benton Avenue thanked Staff and everyone who has worked to put the brochures together. She agreed that using the name with the address would be useful as well. Ms. Gassen commented on the demolition map saying it seemed that there were not as many in the E.H. Prince area as there were in Lester. She suggested that more surveys would be great to fund because they need to be working on education and awareness among homeowners. She made a list including surveys, plaques, thematic districts, rehab credit for exterior work, building permit fee waivers, and award programs. She thinks they should be partnering with other preservation organizations to determine other fundraising efforts.

Ms. Gassen said with regard to COA's that the Ad Hoc Subcommittee felt if work being done did not require a building permit a COA was not necessary. There is one coming in October of her in-laws' home where they are removing something that was not original. The important thing is to specify that something not original to the home should not need special approval to be removed from the home. As for thematic districts, she said this would allow homes not eligible for landmarking to be protected. There might be homes that fit in both the 4-square district or the Sears home district. One place she is aware of with thematic districts is Elgin and their bungalow district. It was an extensive project of education awareness. They have about 2,000 bungalows in Elgin.

Ms. Leitschuh said in a geographic contiguous district you can have significant, contributing and non-contributing structures. Ms. Gassen then read the definition of a thematic district as specified in the Ordinance. She said once a thematic district has been established, others could join.

3. Rich Kulovany of 6825 Camden Road said Friends of Edwards House is conducting their "Landmarking Your Historic Property" event on September 26 and there are about six seats left. He said that several members canvassed about 240 homes and selected the remaining 41 that were significant. In addition, they added a Sears House to the canvas. One unique thing was having the eye of Staff in looking to determine whether there was too much change to a home to qualify as a historic building. They wonder whether the bar will get lower as to the number of properties that can be landmarked. He thinks funds for surveys would be beneficial.

Mr. Kulovany said he has Ken Lerner's memo, Commissioner Barnett's recommendation in 2015, and he noted that Mayor Tully said he supports impact fees.

APPROVED

As to the amount of the fees, he doesn't know what the number would be and would ask Staff to find that out. He noted that the question many homeowners ask is "why should I landmark my home," or "what's in it for me?" Local incentives could be beneficial to homeowners. He also said he liked the sound of "building permit waiver fees." Mr. Kulovany mentioned that they went to Plainfield last year, and they have a good grant program. He suggested reaching out to that program.

Ms. Leitschuh mentioned the people at the Historical Society who put in so much time discussing the history of the area, what to include, scanning of photographs, etc. She expressed her gratitude to them for the hours of work they dedicated to the program, and noted that there will be a page crediting them for the work they've volunteered to the program. She also noted that Friends of the Edwards House have sent Staff photographs of properties for consideration based on their surveys. It is important to preserve the value and integrity of those properties that have already been landmarked.

Ms. Acks said that if a landmarked land is sold, how do they know about the COA's etc. Ms. Leitschuh said they learn that from performing a standard title search at the County. The sellers often also list their property as a landmarked property. Also, the landmarked properties appear on the official zoning map. She referenced the cost of the plaques at \$250, and the concern is that if an owner moves they would take the plaque with them. There is nothing they can do about that. It's important that realtors are also educated as to landmarked properties.

There being no further discussion, Ch. Davenport called for a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Riemer moved, seconded by Ms. Acks to adjourn the meeting. The Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Chairman Davenport adjourned the meeting at 9:12 PM.

/s/ Tonie Harrington

**Village of Downers Grove
Community Events Commission
Committee Room
Downers Grove Village Hall
August 10, 2017**

PRESENT: Mr. Mike Kubes, Mr. Scott Jacaway, Ms. Andrea Knudsen, Ms. Linda Kunze, Mr. John Aguzino, Ms. Nicole Szydlowski

STAFF: Ms. Mary Pratt, Mr. Daniel Carlsen

ABSENT: Mr. Dave Humphreys, Ms. Susan Carroll

GUESTS: None

Ms. Pratt called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. and noted who was in attendance.

I. APPROVAL OF MAY 11, 2017 MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Kubes moved to approve the minutes, the motion was seconded by Ms. Knudsen. Minutes were approved unanimously.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

III. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Ms. Pratt started with the review of the two community events that have been held since the last meeting: The Fourth of July Parade and GroveFest. In respect to Grove Fest, there was some issues with the street closing at the start of the event and the street cleanup at the end of the event. Increased security measures were implemented to ensure that the event operated in a safe environment. Ms. Pratt is working on setting up a meeting to review the event with the GroveFest planning team to see if they can come up with solutions. Mr. Kubes stated that he heard from residents that food vendors seemed low compared to previous years. Ms. Pratt noted that they had full food vendor capacity, but they are looking to still expand on that for future events. Construction in the downtown area did not affect parking or event operations. Ms. Pratt went on to say that fees will be included in future event contracts to ensure that event closure and removal of all equipment is completed on time, and traffic can operate without impediments.

Ms. Pratt then opened up discussion to review the Fourth of July Parade. The parade was a larger event than usual and the setup and execution was generally successful. Mr. Jacaway noted that the southbound lane of Highland at Grant was accidentally barricaded, forcing eastbound traffic to turn right into the Parade participant dropoff lane. Ms. Pratt will work with the Police Department to rectify the situation. Mr. Aguzino stated that it would benefit the volunteers to have a "popup tent" for volunteers to rest and have refreshments throughout the day. Mr. Jacaway said utilizing the golf carts to lead cars to the parade sections will help movement of traffic. Ms. Knudsen observed that children were still going into the street to pick up candy, a practice that the event planners worked to avoid. Mr. Kubes noted that the tradition of throwing candy has been going on for 50 years, making it difficult to establish a change. Ms. Pratt met with members in the parade prior to the event to instruct them to walk along the curbs to hand candy to children on the sidewalk. The goal will be to give multiple reminders to members of the parade to make sure all members of the parade know the rules and safety regulations, and it will be discussed for the next Fourth of July Parade. Ms. Szydlowski suggested that volunteers should be assigned to walk the parade route to determine if members of the parade violate any safety protocols for the parade. Mr. Jacaway suggested to improve communications to parade attendees so the public is aware of safety regulations. Ms. Szydlowski asked how frequent groups do not show up to the event, and said she observed some groups going into the wrong sections of the parade. Ms. Pratt said that if groups are out of order, volunteers should let them know that the event is organized and staged according to each group's number, and any changes could disrupt the overall organization of the parade. The absence of a performer in the parade was due to a parade member becoming sick and a parade car breaking down. Overall, no negative feedback heard from the Community Events Committee.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

One application is being presented at tonight's Community Events Commission. The item being presented on the agenda is the Downtown Management Fine Art Festival to be held on September 9th and 10th of 2017. The Festival is opened from 10:00am to 5:00pm on both days. This is an annual event.

A. Downtown Management Fine Art Festival

Ms. Pratt stated that the Festival will have vendors at Main and Curtiss going south to Grove Street. The setup and implementation of the Fine Art Festival will be similar to previous years, except the setup will now be done on Saturday morning instead of Friday night to mitigate impact to Friday night events in Downers Grove. Ms. Kunze has been working with Downers Grove Public Works to ensure the setup is taken care of. Mr. Jacaway stated that seating was a problem in previous years, and questioned whether anything has been done to address that. Ms. Kunze stated that more seating areas have been added to accommodate the need. Mr. Jacaway made a motion to approve the motion as presented. Mr. Kubes seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

B. Upcoming Community Events Commission Meeting

The plan will be to meet in October to review the events that have occurred and to focus attention on upcoming winter events.

V. OLD BUSINESS

None

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Jacaway made a motion to adjourn, Ms. Knudsen seconded the motion. Motion to adjourn unanimously approved, meeting adjourned the meeting at 6:24 p.m.

**DOWNERS GROVE PUBLIC LIBRARY
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING
SEPTEMBER 27, 2017, 7:30 PM
LIBRARY MEETING ROOM**

MINUTES

1. **Call to Order.** President Greene called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.
2. **Roll Call.** Members present: Trustee Ed Earl, Trustee Susan Eblen, Trustee Jonathan Graber, Trustee David Humphreys, President Wendee Greene. Absent: None.

Also present: Director Julie Milavec, Assistant Director for Support Services Sue O'Brien, Assistant Director for Public Services Bonnie Reid, Executive Assistant Katelyn Vabalaitis, Public Relations Manager Melissa Fischer, Dennis Walsh of Klein, Thorpe, and Jenkins, and 40 members of the community.

3. **Welcome to Visitors.** President Greene welcomed visitors and thanked them for their interest in the library.
4. **Approval of Minutes.**
 - a. August 23, 2017 Committee of the Whole Meeting. It was moved by Earl and seconded by Graber THAT the Minutes of the August 23, 2017 Committee of the Whole Meeting be approved as published. Motion passed by voice vote.
 - b. August 23, 2017 Regular Monthly Meeting. It was moved by Earl and seconded by Graber THAT the Minutes of the August 23, 2017 Regular Monthly Meeting be approved as published. Motion passed by voice vote.
 - c. August 23, 2017 Executive Session. It was moved by Earl and seconded by Graber THAT the Minutes of the August 23, 2017 Executive Session be approved as published. Motion passed by voice vote.
5. **Financial Matters.** *This item was moved up in the agenda by President Greene.*
 - a. August 2017 Financial Report. Milavec presented the report, noting that revenues and expenditures are on track for the year.
 - b. September 2017 Invoices. It was moved by Graber and seconded by Eblen THAT the payment of September 2017 invoices totaling \$164,257.16, the acceptance of September 2017 credit memos totaling \$1,160.86, and the ratification of August 2017 payrolls totaling \$220,883.53 be approved. Roll call: Ayes: Earl, Eblen, Graber, Humphreys, Greene. Nays: None. Abstentions: None.
6. **Unfinished Business – Tabled Items.**
 - a. Strategic Plan 2017-2020 – Action Item Temporarily Removed in August. It was moved by Humphreys and seconded by Eblen THAT the action item temporarily

removed at the August 2017 meeting, stating, “Incorporate inclusive practices into library services,” be inserted back in to the Strategic Plan 2017-2020. Motion passed by voice vote.

7. Public Comment on Agenda Items.

President Greene invited Dennis Walsh of Klein, Thorpe, and Jenkins to make his remarks before public comments began. Walsh clarified the Library Board’s ability to deal with the removal of a Library Trustee. The Board’s authority and power comes specifically from the Illinois Constitution and the Illinois Local Library Act. Any action taken by the Board contrary to either document is void. Section 4.2 of the Illinois Local Library Act allows the Village Council to appoint members to the Board. There is no section in the Local Library Act for this Library Board to remove any particular trustee or declare a vacancy, with the exception of delinquent taxes, misdemeanors, and the like.

President Greene reminded the audience that each comment will be limited to five minutes per person and the Board will not be able to engage in a question and answer session regarding these comments.

Leslie Sadowski-Fugitt, a resident of Downers Grove for almost five years, wanted to state that she works for Lincoln Park Zoo but any comments made here are her own. She has experience with youth and young people of all backgrounds. The one thing she has learned is that it is crucial to have people at bat for them that are welcoming, kind, and open and willing to listen to all experiences. She has learned something from each student and has become a better person as a result. She grew up in Ohio in a neighborhood that was not very diverse and it has changed her view of the world to see what other people experience. It is crucial to experience diversity and inclusion training. Every person you interact with is going to give you a new experience. She has had diversity training in many capacities and believes it is so important that the library ensures they are doing everything they can to bring every youth in and make them feel welcome. She is very glad that the diversity and inclusion effort has been brought back into the Strategic Plan and hopes that we continue to do that every year.

Arthur Jaros expressed his thought that what has happened to him as a library trustee reflects a failure of our public system to instill fundamental American values in our citizens. He said those values include fair play, kind and courteous treatment of others, even when there are disagreements, and due process. When the local chapter of the League of Woman Voters published on their website after this Board’s August 23 meeting, how many Downers Grove residents contacted him personally to ask him if he had made the statements attributed to him? The answer is not one. Did the League of Woman Voters observer contact him to confirm his statements? The answer is no. Did the members of the Village Council bother to inquire of him as to his position on what was said after the August 23 meeting? No. Why did so many residents who attended the Village Council meeting on September 5 buy into the League of Woman Voters observer’s report? Was it because they investigated the truth content of the report by contacting him, other library trustees, and staff members who were in attendance at the August 23 meeting? No. Might it be that they were all too eager to accept the untruths

and inaccuracies contained in the observer's report because it fit their own biased, preconceived, and intolerant notions and agenda? Perhaps the Board of Trustees and Library Director should emphasize through choice the concepts of civil discourse, the importance of truth telling, and the scope of constitutionally protected rights to freedom of speech. He is now personally exercising his own civil rights by calling upon the courts to determine if the Village Council has the power to remove sitting library trustees at its will, whether one or more Americans have the legal and moral right to defame another person by falsely accusing them of racial comments, and whether members of the Village Council have the right to use governmental processes to retaliate against a member of the Library Board for alleged comments made by that member during an official meeting. He will resist the attempts of others to undermine the American way of life that is rooted in core principles.

Jenny Levine has been a resident for 11 years and wanted to say thank you for including diverse materials and making the library a welcoming place.

David Haugen, a resident of Downers Grove since 1975, has served on district school boards and is familiar with these kinds of proceedings. He had a question regarding the motion that passed earlier in this meeting related to the Strategic Plan. It was unclear to him if what was approved tonight was a goal, objective, action, or multiple actions and hopes to get an answer from library staff at a later time. He read in the Board packet that there is going to be a rearrangement of the Information Desk and Circulation Desk and he would like to learn more about that and provide suggestions. He also read that there is a plan to remodel or upgrade bathrooms and he has some suggestions for that as well.

Tom Sleeter, a 29 year resident of Downers Grove, wanted to commend the Library Board for starting to record its meetings and thinks that will be a good idea going forward. His wife was president of the Park District a number of years ago, instituted the same procedure, and found that there was an increase in civility and a reduction of misunderstandings after meetings. He believes this will serve the Library Board well.

Robin Tryloff, a resident of Downers Grove, wanted to echo previous comments about inclusion and diversity. She thinks they are important for our community and is delighted to see the library taking a leadership role in that. She understands the library to be a 501(c)3 organization and not a governmental body. Julie Milavec clarified that there is a separate entity, The Downers Grove Public Library Foundation, that is a 501(c)3 organization with an independent board that operates independently. Their purpose is to raise funds for the library.

President Greene thanked the audience for their comments and civility.

8. **Public Comment on Other Library Business.** *This item was combined with the previous public comment section.*

9. **New Business.**

It was moved by Earl and seconded by Graber THAT the items under Agenda Item 9 New Business be tabled for the October meeting. Motion passed by voice vote.

The below items will be revisited at the October 25, 2017 meeting of the Library Board of Trustees:

Circulation Policy – Section 6.3 Fines and Charges

Requested Action: Approval

Architectural Services Proposal for 2018 Projects

Requested Action: Approval

2018 Wage and Salary Schedule

Requested Action: Approval

10. **Unfinished Business.**

- a. 2018 Budget Draft. Milavec presented the draft of the 2018 budget. There were two versions circulated, the first with a 2.5% cost of living increase for staff and the second with a 3% cost of living increase as requested by a Board member. There are no other differences between the two. Milavec reminded the meeting attendees and the Board that the library is 96% property tax funded and while it is most dependent on property tax, it makes up about 3% of a resident's property tax bill.

Milavec went through the proposed budget detailing specific changes. There will be no increase in insurance premiums for 2018, so it is a flat renewal. Salaries and benefits make up 70% of the budget and any non-staff changes have a relatively small impact on the bottom line. There is an explanation of all proposed changes written out in the Board packet.

Earl inquired as to why the estimated revenue for fines is decreasing and Milavec explained that the new automatic renewal service is reducing the amount of revenue collected for fines.

The Board discussed long-range budget concerns and now that the Facilities Assessment has been received, Milavec hopes to have a long-range budget completed by the end of the calendar year. The Village of Downers Grove requested the library submit an estimated budget by October 25. The final budget and levy is due to the Village by November 29. The Board discussed which version of the budget should be submitted as the estimate.

- b. Schedule Budget Workshop. The Board discussed the need for a budget workshop and Board member availability. The final budget needs to be passed at the November 15 meeting.

It was moved by Graber and seconded by Earl THAT the Board provide the Village with an estimated budget that includes the 2.5% cost of living increase. Eblen commented that difference between the two is minimal and would prefer to use the budget that includes the 3% cost of living increase for staff. Graber clarified that the Board is just providing the Village with an estimated bottom line figure and not yet breaking the number down into individual budget lines. Earl commented that

providing a 2.5% cost of living increase would be in line with what Village staff will be receiving and it sends a good message to be following the same process.

Roll call: Ayes: Earl, Eblen, Graber, Humphreys, Greene. Nays: None. Abstentions: None.

The Board will provide an estimated budget to the Village using the 2.5% cost of living increase and will not have a separate budget workshop. The October 25 Board meeting will be used to look at the proposed budget in greater detail to work towards a final budget.

11. **Executive Session.** There was no executive session.

12. **Library Director's Report** (attached). Milavec presented the report. The last six weeks were challenging personally and she thanked the Board for their support and understanding. The library is moving forward with the Strategic Plan and Facilities Assessment and is ready to dive into the long-range budget planning process. Milavec recognized previous Library Director Christopher Bowen for his many detailed spreadsheets that will be helpful in the long-range budget process. The new telephone system has been installed and everyone's extensions have changed.

13. **Board Member comments and requests for information.**

Humphreys thanked the members of the community who came this evening to show an interest in how we provide library services.

Greene thanked everyone for the opportunity to be president the last two years. Since her term has expired, she will be resigning as president at the beginning of the next meeting.

Humphreys thanked President Greene for helping the Board through the last couple of years and specifically the last three weeks. He also thanked Library Director Milavec for being very helpful to the Board and community.

14. **Adjournment.** President Greene adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

**DOWNERS GROVE PUBLIC LIBRARY
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
SEPTEMBER 27, 2017**

AGENDA ITEM 12

Library Director's Report

The follow up from the August Board meeting, subsequent Village Council action, and resulting lawsuit have been the focus of my work in the past month. Between that and my bereavement leave in September, no progress was made on the next big items on my to do list such as the Long Range Budget.

We pushed back the launch of our new staff intranet drive, from September to October.

APPROVED MINUTES

**VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING**

MINUTES FOR AUGUST 28, 2017

Chairman Rickard called the August 28, 2017 meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:01 p.m. and led in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Chairman Rickard, Ms. Gassen, Ms. Hogstrom, Ms. Johnson,
Mr. Kulovany, Mr. Maurer

ABSENT: Mr. Boyle, Mr. Quirk, Ms. Rollins, Ex. Officio members Davenport,
Livorsi & Menninga

STAFF: Director of Community Development Stan Popovich
Village Sr. Planner Rebecca Leitschuh

VISITORS: Scott Richards, 1130 Warren Avenue, Downers Grove

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: August 7, 2017 meeting

Ms. Gassen moved, seconded by Mr. Kulovany to approve the minutes for the August 7, 2017 meeting.

Chairman Rickard noted in the last paragraph on page 2, the EIFS acronym should be corrected. In the fifth paragraph on page 3, a reference is made to a 25' drive-through "land," which should read "lane."

AYES: Ms. Gassen, Mr. Kulovany, Ms. Hogstrom, Ms. Johnson, Mr. Maurer,
Ch. Rickard

NAYS: None

The Motion to approve the minutes as corrected passed 6:0.

Chairman Rickard explained that the Public Hearing on this Agenda is a continuation from the June 26, 2017 and August 7, 2017 meetings to consider updates to the Downtown development regulations.

PUBLIC HEARING

FILE 16-PLC 0019 (Continued from June 26, 2017 and August 7, 2017): The purpose of this request is to consider updates to the downtown development regulations. Village of Downers Grove, Petitioner.

Community Development Director Stan Popovich noted that the Plan Commission's last meeting on this topic was held on August 7, 2017. He indicated that the intention of this meeting is to
Plan Commission Meeting August 28, 2017

APPROVED MINUTES

finalize the Plan Commission's recommendations and report, and make its recommendation to the Village Council. He pointed out that in Staff's Memo to the Commission he summarized the Plan Commission's discussion in the previous meetings regarding bulk regulations, and historic preservation. He noted that two items require additional discussion so as to provide the Council with a clearer direction from the Plan Commission. The first concerns the density allowances in DE-1 and DE-2. In the Comprehensive Plan it is noted that these areas should have greater residential density to support the Core. He then displayed maps depicting both the DE-1 and DE-2 areas under consideration. As established in the Zoning Ordinance, a lower square footage equals a higher density. For example, allowing one unit per 800 square feet results in 54 units in a one-acre area. He requested discussion by the Commission as to what figure they would consider for the Core area in their recommendation. He referred to information provided in the Commissioners' packets showing the various developments in the general downtown area and the density of those developments.

Ms. Gassen noticed that in some of the communities Mr. Popovich referenced for comparison there is no density requirement. Mr. Popovich explained that some other communities measure density in different ways, such as floor area ratio, which refers to the size of the building and how many units are planned for that building. For example, with a 10,000 square foot lot and a floor area ratio of 2.5, a 25,000 square foot building could be constructed. The number of apartments in that building would be up to the developer.

Chairman Rickard said that regardless of what numbers are established for lot areas and densities, there may be other things that prevent reaching a specific number of units. Staff's opinion was that 800 was a good number for the Core with the logic that the edge areas would be where the bulk of the density occurred. Chairman Rickard said he thought a good number for all three areas would be to call the Core area 900, Edge-1 700, and Edge-2 800. That would average the 800 figure throughout the three zones.

Ms. Hogstrom said she likes those numbers as proposed because the 800 figure is ideal, as they want higher density in the downtown edge. The 3,000 square feet would decrease that and that is not the direction they want to go.

Ms. Gassen said since they are lowering the height in the buildings in the Core area it would result in a lower density than exists now. Mr. Popovich agreed saying that lowering the heights limits the available number of units for that area.

Chairman Rickard said that the 900 square feet equates to 48 units per acre, with Edge-1 at 62 units per acre at 700 square feet, and Edge-2 at 54 units per acre based on 800 square feet.

Mr. Kulovany said he likes what Naperville, Glen Ellyn and Wheaton have done. Downtown Naperville on a weekend evening is really vibrant. What the Village is trying to accomplish is to increase the number of people who want to walk to the downtown restaurants and shops. He thought the idea was to increase density, particularly in Edge-1. So he would go either with no density standards, or close to the Chairman's recommendations. He sees that as a reasonable compromise.

APPROVED MINUTES

Mr. Maurer said he would also agree with keeping it at 800 or above. There are a lot of units coming on line, and there will be a big difference when three of the buildings currently under constructions are completed and filled.

Mr. Popovich reviewed Chairman Rickard's proposed figures, with the Core area at 900 square feet per unit, Edge-1 at 700 square feet per unit, and Edge-2 at 800 square feet per unit. In response to Chairman Rickard, Mr. Popovich said that the Transition Area is handled through a floor area ratio of 2.5, and not square footage per unit.

There was consensus by the Commission members to the figures proposed by Chairman Rickard.

Mr. Popovich moved the discussion to the Design Guidelines and the Plan Commission's Recommendations. He asked for clarification as to the issues they are attempting to address in reviewing the Design Guidelines.

Mr. Kulovany recalled two issues, one being not enough citizen input early in the process, and the second whether the Village has the proper tools if a developer chooses to follow the Building Code rather than the Design Guidelines. Mr. Kulovany reiterated his thoughts expressed at the last meeting that he didn't think this should be a Plan Commission decision, but should rest with the elected Village Council. He thinks it is a more serious policy issue that should be determined by the elected officials.

Regarding insufficient citizen input, Mr. Popovich asked whether that referred to the development of the Design Guidelines or the implementation of the Design Guidelines. Mr. Kulovany said he thinks it refers to both, and he noted the amount of frustration that's been expressed about Main and Maple. People have expressed that they never hear about these developments until it's "too late." Meetings of the Plan Commission are published about important issues and only a few people attend. He said he also thinks that developers would like to have more input early on as he thinks they would like to be welcomed by the community. He thinks they have to at least consider providing a format that would allow earlier input. He is recommending that there be public discussion, and not to decide in advance what the foregone conclusion would be.

Mr. Popovich replied that what he is hearing is public participation, but asked if it is about the building design, regulations and appearance, or are they trying to get more public involved when a project is coming forward so they can comment on it. Design Guidelines tend to be very material oriented. Are they trying to get more people actively involved to see what is changing, or actively involved in designing buildings?

Mr. Kulovany responded it's actually more to review a mechanism where there is a review process earlier on that could be opened to the public before a developer invests a lot of money in plans at the schematic stage. He referenced the amount of frustration by the community about what Walgreens is proposing at 63rd and Woodward, and the Village and Staff had no tools to say "wait, if you could take your durable materials a little higher up we think that would be better for the Village." He noted that even the Village Council had nothing they could say about it as it was really up to Walgreens. Mr. Kulovany said his feeling is that the Staff and even the Village Council need more tools to be able to go back to a developer with guidelines that have more teeth in them, or some type of design review.

APPROVED MINUTES

Mr. Popovich asked are whether he was referring specifically to the downtown area or Village-wide. Mr. Kulovany said he's referring mostly to the downtown area and to catalyst sites.

Chairman Rickard said he sees several themes that people are concerned about in the downtown area. He said one of the complaints is lack of public input. People come to public hearings when developments are in the final engineering phase, and people feel as though everything is locked in and it is much more difficult to suggest changes at that point. People are trying to digest and consume a large, complicated proposal when they are often hearing about it for the first time. They are trying to understand the situation, don't have time to get their thoughts and questions together, and it often results in them getting aggravated. He also agrees that it would be nice to get some input, or at least get a look at a proposal earlier on, except he thinks another idea to consider is, instead of coming to the Plan Commission at the final engineering phase, there instead be an intermediate step. He said he wasn't recommending another committee or design review, but something similar to the Village Council's First Reading or Workshop sessions. A developer could come in with their application and preliminary site plans, floor plans, etc. They would not as yet have spent money for studies for traffic, civil engineering, stormwater, etc. That would introduce everybody to the project, and the public would start to get a wide view of it, similar to First Readings. It would give the developer some type of assurance moving forward once they obtain everyone's thoughts and comments on the concept, and there would not be any major bumps down the road. If there were comments, the developer would better be able to incorporate them at that level. He doesn't think it would add additional time to the petitioner, as it would be during their normal course of work. He thinks that is worth considering and would give everyone more time to get their heads around these proposals as well.

Mr. Popovich said that Staff has the ability to provide for neighborhood meetings. He asked if this is something the Plan Commission would want to consider in terms of mandating neighborhood meetings either prior to or after submittal to Staff to encourage public participation. Chairman Rickard said that would be helpful, but he is looking to find something that would allow the Commission members the ability to look at the proposal earlier as well. It would also give the petitioner a better opportunity to address the comments before completing their projects. This would be especially beneficial to the Commission for larger projects that are difficult to digest in the 72 hours they have to review a petitioner's proposal.

Ms. Johnson asked if the Chairman felt these sessions would be delivered by size of the project, and if so, what size is he considering.

Ms. Gassen agreed that Main and Maple was a lot to digest. She asked how much detail they are supposed to determine tonight, in terms of what projects should have early input. Mr. Popovich replied he wasn't looking for that, but just wanted to understand the issue brought forward. Ms. Gassen noted that she agreed that the issue of public input is one of the biggest complaints they are receiving, because the public generally sees the projects for the first time when they are pretty much finished. Often it's shocking to the public, and she thinks if they saw the proposals earlier it might help solve the problem.

Chairman Rickard said with regard to the actual Design Guidelines, he reviewed them and made several comments on them. When he finished, he realized how minor his comments were. He wasn't suggesting changes as much as further clarifying some items. He didn't find anything

Plan Commission Meeting August 28, 2017

APPROVED MINUTES

wrong with the Design Guidelines themselves. People seem to complain more about issues such as bulk, rather than the design itself. His comments were geared more toward base materials, durability, etc.

Ms. Gassen agreed that for the most part Design Guidelines are sufficient. They could review them to create different Guidelines for specific areas. She said that the Plan Commission doesn't typically refer to them and it might be useful if they referred to them more.

Mr. Kulovany said that almost every petitioner refers to the Comprehensive Plan and takes its direction from that. He's not sure that the Design Guidelines have the same depth and breadth to them. A document from 2008-2009 should be reviewed again. More specifically, he said there was a huge uproar about the Main and Maple building, specifically concerns about having 70' at the curb. Trammell Crow put one setback in. He said another later recommendation to the developer came from the Plan Commission for another setback, and the developer replied not when it comes up at the eleventh hour, because by the time the project comes to the Plan Commission, they already have \$115,000 invested. If this request for an additional setback came earlier on in the process, it would have been positively considered. The developer said that Glenview has many public meetings and input. He thinks this is up to the Village Council to determine whether this should be studied in more detail.

Mr. Maurer commented that he likes the way many of the Design Guidelines are written. The photographs show recognizable historic structures from Downers Grove and suggest that is the direction they want to go; however, there is nothing in the language that specifically calls out a style they must meet. He thinks they are dancing a fine line between what is planning and what is architectural design review. He cares greatly about both of those issues, but tends to think that their focus is less on the direct aesthetics than it is on how big and how much.

Mr. Kulovany agreed that it speaks more to the form than the architecture. He's not suggesting that they get in the business of architecture, because in some ways it might preclude some other great ideas from architects and developers. He thinks the Village has been fortunate in that it has had cooperative developers who want to be good neighbors. But there is also the scenario of the developer who doesn't particularly care about the Village's Guidelines, and constructs what they want. That is why he thinks these considerations should be looked at.

Mr. Popovich then referred to Mr. Kulovany's comment as to whether the Village and Staff have the proper tools at their disposal to enforce specific standards. Mr. Kulovany said that the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Historic Preservation took some time for thoughtful people to really discuss and examine the issue of historic preservation. He thinks that the Village is at a threshold with the opportunity to do that for possible downtown design through an Ad Hoc Committee.

Chairman Rickard agrees with that idea. He is comfortable with the Design Guidelines with some minor updates and leaving the process with Staff reviewing and interpreting the Guidelines. He thinks having another committee study whether it makes sense to get into binding architectural design is a big discussion and needs to happen. At this time he is comfortable with the process as it is.

Mr. Kulovany said the differential is that what happens downtown in the next 8-12 years will impact the way this Village looks for the next 50-100 years.

APPROVED MINUTES

Mr. Maurer agreed because they are talking about the big developments that will be there for a very long time.

Mr. Popovich then asked if the recommendation is to have someone study the Guidelines closer.

Chairman Rickard said for the Design Guidelines, he thinks where it talks about the base segment of the building design on page 7, he would add something like “base level building materials should be durable, requiring little maintenance, and withstand street level pedestrian traffic and abuse.”

Mr. Maurer added that maybe they can include a term such as “of a higher quality material” in addition to durable.

Mr. Popovich said he didn’t think they would be getting into specifics regarding the Guidelines, but instead asked the question as to whether it’s the application of the Guidelines or the Guidelines themselves. That is the primary question. They can always tweak the Guidelines. He asked whether the recommendation of the Commission is to review all the Design Guidelines, or the potential application of the Design Guidelines, or both, or neither.

Mr. Kulovany said he thinks the recommendation is both. The consensus seems to be that the Guidelines are good, but may need some tweaking. The overall issue of the kind of Village input, the tools available to Staff—he believes those issues require more study and perhaps an Ad Hoc Committee if the Village Council deems it wants to develop such a study.

Ms. Gassen asked whether Staff wanted specific recommendations on the Guidelines, and Mr. Popovich said those could be taken off line.

Chairman Rickard commented that suggestions made at the last meeting were to further explore the dynamics of regulations versus guidelines. He said what he is hearing is a consensus to stay with the Guidelines and not create any new regulations that are binding and might trigger some additional process. All Commission members agreed.

As for Historic Preservation, Mr. Popovich said that one comment was to provide more links to historic preservation tax credits on the website. He asked if there were any additional comments on any other items discussed at previous meetings.

Chairman Rickard said he had no further comments. The remainder of the Commission had no further comments.

Chairman Rickard then called upon anyone in the audience who wished to speak on the topic. He then swore the audience member in.

1.Scott Richards of 1130 Warren Avenue, Downers Grove (Oak Tree Towers) said he has lived in the Village for about fifteen years, and lived in Lombard prior to that. He said that a good point was raised in terms of trying to reach the citizens. Many times when he attends meetings the information is over his head. He mentioned living in Lombard because they are in a different type of governing with Districts, and the public being represented by the Trustee elected for their Plan Commission Meeting

August 28, 2017

APPROVED MINUTES

specific District. He felt it worked much better than the system in Downers Grove because people thought they were part of the process and could participate better. He thinks the citizens of Downers Grove don't attend because it's a done deal, or the Village is going to do what it wants to do and will not listen to the public input.

Mr. Richards said he feels as though Downers Grove's downtown is in jeopardy with all of the huge projects that are going on right now. It doesn't seem as though anyone really cares about protecting what the Village has or in trying to capitalize on what the Village has in terms of its historic heritage. It is an old town that has an interesting downtown with some stores that are worth going to. One town that excels is Geneva in that it has a variety of well-maintained stores, with a feeling of universal connection in appearance. He thinks Glen Ellyn and Hinsdale have those same qualities, while Downers Grove does not have that feeling. There is not much in Downers Grove's downtown to draw people in. There are gyms opening up, realtors opening up next door to each other taking up viable space that should be going for stores. Those businesses could be anywhere in a strip mall in town and they would do fine.

He says one example of his feelings of losing the downtown is the monster at Main and Maple and people are still asking how that got through. It overwhelms the downtown, and he can't believe the two buildings got passed. Another aspect in town is parking which is ridiculous anymore. He often gives up after going around the block several times to find a parking space. Most people moving into the new buildings will probably have two cars. It's frustrating, and yet they keep building, building and building big. He is not against development but doesn't understand the direction the Village is going with massive development in a three-block downtown area. He never sees enough attention paid to traffic impact on these projects. He doesn't understand why nobody in this town seems to worry about traffic generated by these buildings. Mr. Richards said he feels as though the developer is in the driver's seat in Downers Grove, and they are telling the Village what to do. He thinks that is wrong. This is their home and as residents they have a right to some input as to what is and what is not allowed. If a developer chooses to go somewhere else that's fine because the Village does not have to take the first thing that comes in for consideration. Other towns stand their ground. He would like to see our downtown saved. There is some architectural interest in the buildings. He believes a developer should work with the town and not against it. Developers leave once the money is in their pocket and residents live with what they've left behind. Tax dollars are important but should not be the only thing that decisions are based upon. The Village needs to be in the driver's seat again.

There being no further comments, Chairman Rickard closed the public hearing.

.....

Ms. Gassen moved with respect to 16-PLC-0019 that the Plan Commission forward the recommendations from Staff's Memo dated August 28, 2017, and include the new density figures and other suggestions noted at this meeting. Ms. Hogstrom seconded the Motion. All in favor. The Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Rickard noted that this might be Ms. Hogstrom's last meeting and he thanked her for her volunteer work for the Village. He wished her the best of luck.

APPROVED MINUTES

**Ms. Hogstrom moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Maurer.
The Motion passed unanimously.**

Chairman Rickard adjourned the meeting at 8:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Tonie Harrington,
Recording Secretary

TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION Minutes

April 26, 2017, 7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers - Village Hall
801 Burlington Avenue, Downers Grove

Chairwoman Dunne called to order the April 26, 2017 meeting of the Transportation and Parking Commission at 7:00 p.m. and led the meeting with the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll call followed and a quorum was established.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chairwoman Dunne; Commissioners Carter, Saricks, Wilkinson, Wrobel

Absent: Commissioner Schiller

Staff Present: Public Works Traffic Engineer Will Lorton

Others: Aaron AND Raegan Cates, 2531 Indianapolis Ave.; Lauren and Anders Singdahlson, 2529 Indianapolis Ave.; Phil Albert, 4839 Cross St.; Sue Zid, 4528 Cross St.; Bill and Nalen Hollison, 4852 Fransisco Ave.; Tony and Irma Tran, 4708 Cross St.; Robert Bartos, 4750 Cross St.; Donna & Mark Samiec, 4615 Drendel Rd.; Karen Samiec, 4613 Drendel Rd.; Judith Davenport, 4617 Cross St.; Scott Rogers, 4504 Drendel Rd.; Adam & Beth Curey, 4524 Cross St.; Michael Hendron, 4823 Cross St.; Jackie Olkiewicz, 4506 Drendel Rd.; Guy Thacher, 4521 Cross St.; Dan & Miriam Fife, 4516 Cross St.; David Growdy, 4801 Cross St.; Jeff Mont, 4605 Cross St.; Wayne Hoppendorf, 4512 Cross St.; Kurt Schaefer, 4510 Drendel Rd.; Garry Horak, 4507 Drendel Rd.; Katie Novosel, 236 Indianapolis Ave.

Chairwoman Dunne explained the protocol for the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – FEBRUARY 8, 2017

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 8, 2017 MEETING WERE APPROVED ON MOTION BY MR. SCHILLER, SECONDED BY MR. CARTER. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 4-0-1 (MR. WROBEL ABSTAINS).

PUBLIC COMMENT (on non-Agenda items) – None.

File #6-17 Lester School – Indianapolis Ave. – Parking Revisions: Traffic Engineer Will Lorton summarized that this matter was raised by Lester School which was experiencing circulation issues with a change in the dismissal bell. Apparently parking restrictions were in place along Lincoln to coincide with the dismissal of the school but the parking restrictions on Indianapolis were not changed. During an on-site visit, staff observed vehicles parking earlier (2:45 PM) which was prohibited. With vehicles parking on both sides of the street, it made it difficult for two-way traffic to travel and circulation issues existed.

Staff was proposing to revise the parking restriction to match the dismissal bell to provide better circulation for the school. A map reflecting same followed. Mr. Lorton summarized that the hours on Lincoln Avenue had been modified previously and the restriction was tied into a one-way operation, i.e., one direction from 2:30 PM to 3:30 PM, reflecting the dismissal of the 2:55 PM bell. Mr. Lorton could not provide an estimate of how many vehicles parked on the south side of the street but stated that 2 to 3 vehicles would impede traffic for about 10 minutes. Responding to the chairwoman's question of whether staff had a history of the No Parking Any Time restriction on the south side of Florence, Mr. Lorton said he did not have that information. He also added that there were no concerns of discrepancy along Indianapolis Avenue.

DRAFT - Transportation and Parking Commission

April 26, 2017

Asked if staff saw any benefit to revising the current afternoon restriction on Lincoln Avenue (2:00 PM to 3:00 PM) to the same restriction on Indianapolis Avenue (2:30 to 3:30 PM) for consistency purposes in the area, Mr. Lorton indicated he did not see a benefit because, based on his observation, there was no disruption on Lincoln during the PM peak time.

Hearing no further comments, the chairwoman invited the public to speak.

No public comment was received. Mr. Lorton added that he received an email from a resident requesting that all parking restrictions be removed.

Public comment was closed.

Chairwoman Dunne stated staff's recommendation was valid and was an improvement. Mr. Saricks also added that it was based on what the school had requested.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE #6-17, MR. WROBEL MADE A MOTION THAT THE TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL TO REVISE THE ORDINANCE FOR INDIANAPOLIS AVENUE, ON THE SOUTH SIDE, BETWEEN FAIRVIEW AVENUE AND FLORENCE AVENUE, TO BE BETWEEN 7:00 AM AND 9:00 AM AND 2:30 PM AND 3:30 PM.

SECONDED BY MR. WILKINSON.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 5-0.

Traffic Engr. Lorton premised the next three cases with the reminder that Neighborhood Study Nos. 5, 1, 2, and 4 were performed by KLOA Consultants, contracted by the village, for the studies. He reminded commissioners that this study was bounded by Ogden, Walnut, Burlington and Belmont and it included traffic counts, geometric review, safety review and the neighborhood as a whole.

File #7-17 Neighborhood Study – Traffic Control Revisions: In this study, it was pointed out there were a number of uncontrolled intersections within the neighborhood study area. Traffic counts were conducted in the fall of 2016. Review of all-way stop controls were reviewed based on the MUTCD warrants; two-way and one-way stops were based on the Illinois Vehicle Code; and the terminating leg required a stop similar to what was brought to the commission's attention previously. Per Mr. Lorton, there were recommended improvements near the Metra station that staff wanted to investigate in the future due to impacts on the overall parking.

Mr. Lorton noted there were 16 proposed changes to two-way and one-way stops and one location to become an all-way stop. A detailed map followed. Staff was asking to go forward with the recommendation from the neighborhood study and implement all of the stop control locations with the exception of the Metra station.

Chairwoman Dunne asked whether staff supported KLOA's recommendation on Cross Street regarding the S-curve because she believed it differed from the purpose of an uncontrolled intersection.

In response, Mr. Michael Worthman with KLOA, explained that with the S-curve the recommendation was to stop the traffic because it was a narrow section of road and it was difficult for two vehicles to pass each other. It also allowed a stopped vehicle to see the other vehicle and allow it to pass. Further explanation followed.

DRAFT - Transportation and Parking Commission

April 26, 2017

Mr. Saricks, calling attention to the intersection of Edward and Haddow, asked whether the recommendation for a four-way was based on traffic volumes on Edward approaching Haddow or as a way to stop traffic from speeding up going east and west on Haddow. Mr. Worthman explained it was a combination of the volume as well as a high pedestrian safety reason.

Mr. Wilkinson asked if there was consideration of parking off of Ogden and Drendel with the strip mall and Hertz, due to it being an avenue off of Ogden and the fact that parking takes place on both sides in that area. Mr. Worthman explained he did not review shopping centers nor did he receive any response from the neighborhood on the matter. He did not notice anything when traveling in the field but said it did not mean that it did not happen. Mr. Wilkinson recalled this matter was raised by the neighbors because again, when vehicles parked on both sides of the street, the street became narrower. Mr. Worthman offered to review it again and follow up with the commissioners.

In addition, Mr. Wilkinson inquired about the two streets that back up to the park and whether there was any activity in the park that would cause traffic to park in the neighborhood, i.e., development of a soccer field. Mr. Worthman stated he heard that the field was under consideration but that currently the park did have a parking lot that was sufficient, from his observation but, again, did not visit the site on the weekends when the fields were being used. He heard no neighbor complaints.

Per the chairwoman's question, Mr. Lorton stated there was minimal crash history for the S-curve of Cross Street, noting there were no crashes for the past five years.

Chairwoman Dunne invited public comment.

Mr. Robert Bartos, 4750 Cross Street, stated there no crashes on the S-curve. However, his concerns included that traffic from both ends of the street was being stopped and a bus and/or truck could not make the turn while staying in its own lane when coming around the S curve and coming from the north, due to the telephone pole and the tree blocking the other stop sign. He discussed the difficulty of vehicles traveling during the winter months and trying to get traction. He did not support the stop signs for that location.

Mr. Wayne Anderson, 4805 Cross Street, asked for the cost of the traffic study (\$14,000). Regarding the S-curve, he raised the fact that sidewalks were not being addressed at this time and could change the things on the corner, i.e., trees and bushes may have to be cut down to improve visibility. However, when traveling north on Cross Street at the S-curve, he surmised a stop sign at that location would keep the vehicles from traveling into Mr. Bartos's yard.

Mr. Dave Grandi, 4801 Cross Street, supported Mr. Anderson's comments regarding the locations of sidewalks. He could not envision stop signs at the south end nor at the north end of the S-curve because it was a tight and pasture-like setting. He has not seen any accidents, believes drivers will see the S-curve and slow down naturally.

Ms. Karen Samiec, 4613 Drendel, said she had never seen a crash at the S-curve and believed the stop sign would not improve anything. As far as the other two stop signs on Indianapolis, she stated not enough traffic warranted them. However, she did have parking concerns at the Hertz location because parking occurred on both sides and overnight parking took place. There was no enforcement. She distributed photos of the Hertz dealership reflecting how the road's shoulder had been expanded through illegal dumping of gravel to make a parking lot. The gravel now blocked drainage and the street flooded. She stated that emergency vehicles or a snow plow could not get through and safety was a concern. She wished the village could address the issue.

Mr. Garry Horak, 4507 Drendel Road, acknowledged the infringement of parking that Hertz was doing and, in previous years, called the village to see who was cleaning up the area due to litter,

DRAFT - Transportation and Parking Commission

April 26, 2017

lawn cutting, etc. Mr. Horak further explained that signs would get knocked over and not picked up. However, he did believe stop signs installed at the S-curve would prevent accidents. As for the topics of sidewalks, curbs, sewers, etc. he believed it was an agenda based around the recreation center that was being constructed. He believed none of the residents wanted the proposed changes and suggested they be surveyed first.

Mr. Mark Samiec, 4615 Drendel, reported that the Hertz company came in on a Saturday night, dumped gravel and made their own parking lot and no one followed up. (The chairwoman appreciated the comments and believed someone at the village should know about it.)

Mr. Garry Horak, 4507 Drendel Road, returned and said there is no enforcement regarding the Hertz parking. Also, there was confusion as to who owned the nearby land which was supposed to be protected prairie. It was a traffic safety hazard since cars coming off of Ogden did not expect to see the Hertz parked cars.

Mr. Lorton offered to have staff find out who owned the parcel and follow up.

Mr. Robert Bartos, 4715 Cross St., voiced the challenges of traffic near Puffer School and the extensive vehicle line that extends into Belmont making it difficult to make a left turn off of Belmont coming northbound onto Haddow in one's own lane to go past the traffic. Today, he saw 10 cars parked by the soccer field which were commuters.

Chairwoman Dunne closed public comment and invited comments from the commissioners.

The chairwoman, again, voiced concern about the two-way stop for Cross Street.

Chairwoman Dunne re-opened the public comment.

Mr. Wayne Hoppenrath, 4512 Cross Street, noted the village installed three stop signs in Klein Estates to slow down traffic but it just inconvenienced the residents there. No enforcement existed.

The chairwoman closed public comment and again stated the neighbors on Cross Street were not supportive of the stop signs and compliance would not be good. The safety issue, based on experience, either did not exist or would not be a problem fixed with the stop signs. She proposed to amend the recommendation to not include the two-way stops on Cross Street. Mr. Carter concurred, given the comments received from the Cross Street residents; other commissioners concurred.

Mr. Carter inquired of KLOA staff whether any widening of the S-curve could be done, wherein Mr. Lorton explained this particular location was one of the locations where a half right-of-way existed and the east/west portion across did not have 60 feet but, instead, had 35 feet of right-of-way so not enough room existed to widen the road significantly and there would be an impact to vegetation. As for the proposed stop sign (east ramp) for Warren Avenue, Mr. Lorton explained that particular location would have to be reviewed further, given there would be removal of additional parking spaces, a change in the curb line, and a future crosswalk. The chair concurred, asking the motion to reflect that Warren Avenue is open to further study. Regarding the Edward and Haddow location, Mr. Worthman confirmed for the chairwoman the reasoning for the control was to provide for safer pedestrian crossing. It was located mid-block and was the main entrance to the golf course.

Mr. Wilkinson asked whether the inclusion of the No Parking restrictions on Drendel, raised earlier, should be included in the motion, wherein the chair believed the focus should be on the traffic control revisions signs but to direct staff to consider the concerns raised by the residents.

DRAFT - Transportation and Parking Commission

April 26, 2017

WITH RESPECT TO FILE #7-17, MR. SARICKS MADE A MOTION THAT THE TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL TO REVISE THE ORDINANCE FOR THE PROPOSED STOP SIGNS SHOWN IN FIGURE 9, WITH THE FOLLOWING EXCEPTIONS:

- THE EASTBOUND WARREN AVENUE STOP SIGN AT THE METRA STATION; AND
- THE TWO NEW PROPOSED STOP SIGNS ON THE CROSS STREET/PRAIRIE AVENUE CURVE AREA

SECONDED BY MR. CARTER.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 5-0.

File #8-17 Neighborhood Study – Pavement Marking and Sign Revisions: Traffic Engr. Lorton reported that KLOA has also recommended in this study to revise all cross walks to include high visibility ladder-style cross walks to draw attention to drivers for safety and use of an S-11 with plaque on Haddow for eastbound traffic near the school, again, to catch drivers' attention and let them be aware of students crossing. Lastly, he said there was a recommendation to install sharrows to allow bike ride sharing at Cross Street, Burlington and Warren Streets. Staff preferred to defer that recommendation pending any demand with future improvements. Another recommendation was to include a crosswalk at the Metra station but due to impacts, staff would hold off to a later date for further investigation. Another recommendation was to install a pedestrian refuge island on Belmont Road to allow persons traveling east/west to Puffer School to cross half way and allow the cross time to be shortened but it required county coordination. Due to impacts and construction, staff believed it should be considered in the future during improvements. Map details followed.

Dialog followed on whether the village intended to install a crosswalk in the concrete sidewalks at the one-way drop-off for Puffer School as well as at the entrance to the golf club, seeing there were crosswalks going through private driveways. Mr. Worthman explained there would be no need for pavement markings across the driveways. In response, the chairwoman recommended modifying Figure 10 noting the proposed crosswalks on the north leg of the parking lots are currently private driveways with sidewalks through them and would not need an additional crosswalk marking.

In addition, she raised dialog about the distance of the crosswalk and stop sign to the intersection of **Rose and Western ??** and if there were concerns about it, wherein Mr. Lorton stated that they would meet the minimum requirements of the MUTCD and if there was need for realignment, he would "work through that."

Chairwoman Dunne opened up the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Wayne Anderson, 4805 Cross Street, inquired about calming striping near the golf course and why the bike route did not continue on Burlington to Walnut, thereby removing the bikes from Cross Street, and then route them onto Walnut to Ogden to view the parks there. He suggested spending more money on marking the lanes in the village and skipping the bike lines. Lastly, he asked staff for clarification of how the holding island in the middle of the street (for Puffer School students) would work, to which Mr. Lorton explained but said it would not be implemented at this time due to county coordination and costs. Mr. Anderson expressed safety concerns and did not support it.

DRAFT - Transportation and Parking Commission

April 26, 2017

Ms. Lauren Singdahlsen, 2529 Indianapolis Ave., supported the village moving pedestrians and anything that was not vehicle traffic off of the Cross S-curve and onto Franciso, which was a dead-end street.

Mr. Wayne Hoppenrath, 4512 Cross Street, referring to the above comment, indicated that there was an 8 to 10 foot elevation difference between Cross and Franciso and it would get slippery when it was icy and there were many coyotes in the area.

Regarding the above comments about the bike route, Mr. Lorton stated the area was identified previously but not updated in the plan. It was not being proposed at this time.

Mr. Mark Samiec, 4615 Drendel, referring to the intersection of Haddow and Belmont, discussed the visibility challenges of marking a right turn off of Haddow onto Belmont due to landscaping in front of the school. Adding any traffic control to push a driver back further from the street would create difficulty.

Mr. Robert Bartos, 4715 Cross St., asked if this meeting would cover any road resurfacing in the area of Puffer School or would it be discussed at a different meeting to which Mr. Worthman, of KLOA, responded it was a different subject and related to an overall look at the next agenda item.

The chairwoman closed public comment and invited commissioner discussion.

Overall, the commissioners supported the recommendations with Mr. Saricks pointing out that the changes being made basically followed the "Safe Routes to Schools" program.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE #8-17, MR. CARTER MADE A MOTION THAT THE TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL IMPLEMENT THE FOLLOWING:

- **IMPLEMENT PROPOSED CROSSWALKS WITH EXCEPTION TO THE PROPOSED CROSSWALK THAT CROSSES WARREN AVENUE.**
- **IMPLEMENT PROPOSED S1-1 SIGN ON HADDOW AVENUE.**

SECONDED BY MR. SARICKS

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 5-0.

File #9-17 Neighborhood Study – Sidewalk Installation: Traffic Engr. Lorton reviewed a history of the former sidewalk matrix program. He explained the new sidewalk study recommended a sidewalk on at least one side of the roadways within the neighborhood with improvement on pedestrian safety and improving separation of pedestrians and vehicles. Mr. Lorton shared the discussion from the neighborhood meeting in February 2017. Details followed regarding the physical installation of the sidewalks and the fact that a tree survey would be completed prior to installation of a sidewalk. Installation would cut through driveways with temporary access provided and the parkway would be restored when completed.

Mr. Lorton emphasized the design was not finalized and tonight's discussion would only focus on whether sidewalks should be implemented and to receive feedback from the neighborhood. Further details followed on the steps that would be taken if sidewalks were desired and the fact that more discussion would take place. Mr. Lorton explained that the location of the sidewalks will be based on the least impact of the trees, drainage, overall costs, driveways, and neighborhood feedback.

Chairwoman Dunne invited public comment.

Ms. Karen Semiec, 4613 Drendel Road, stated there were much more severe problems than kids walking to the bus stop since the area was served by school buses. No children were walking from her area to the school so there was no need for sidewalks. However, she proposed that the location of the sidewalk be on the opposite side of where the children lived and direct the walkway to the bus stop. She stated the drainage in her area was made “awful” by the village by it allowing high density housing. The roads were in terrible shape and proposed sidewalks would sink due to the area’s drainage issues. She suggested spending money on other improvements. (Ms. Semiec provided photos to Mr. Lorton.)

Mr. Garry Horack, 4507 Drendel, asked for an explanation of staff’s comment about a 50/50 chance of not running into infrastructure and how staff proposed to do that.

To the chairwoman’s question about funding sources to pay for the sidewalks, Mr. Lorton was not sure about the funding sources, but offered to say that costs would probably be broken into a two or three-year phase. Mr. Worthman stated that would be a village council discussion/decision.

Mr. Dan Fife, 4516 Cross St., expressed concern about the logic of the entire study, commenting that it was basically delaying the resurfacing/refinishing of a road that the village neglected.

A resident returned, recalling he saw a sidewalk study that was done last year reflecting the estimated costs broken down by block. He estimated it was about \$200,000 for sidewalks and suggested reviewing the Public Works records.

To Mr. Saricks’ question regarding the installation of the sidewalks where drainage was an issue, Mr. Lorton explained an ongoing engineering study was taking place where drainage and topography were being reviewed for possible solutions. Should sidewalks be installed, the drainage would be designed to handle the additional impervious area. Should they not be installed, an issue could arise in the future. Mr. Worthman added that was the reason why they were looking at the neighborhood holistically, commenting that the village did not want to resurface streets only to have to rip them up a few years later to install storm sewers to improve drainage.

Mr. Robert Bartos, 4715 Cross Street, shared concerns about a water main existing under Cross Street on his side of the street and how it would affect the appearance and condition of the sidewalk when the village had to access the older water main. He did support sidewalks.

Ms. Mary Fife, 4516 Cross, supported sidewalks if the road was not going to be widened. She expressed that there were safety concerns for her children when walking on the current narrow roads, especially when it snowed. If the roads were going to be widened she would not support sidewalks. She discussed the amount of vehicle and pedestrian traffic she sees going to the train station and supported sidewalks. Recalling last year’s petition she spoke with many of the neighbors and recalled many of the neighbors on the west side of Cross Street supported sidewalks. Per a question, she stated that the right-of-way along the rear of the golf course was used by the residents/students walking to the school. And in the winter, it could get icy.

Ms. Donna Samiec, 4615 Drendel Road, reiterated that the village cannot install sidewalks on her road because it is a dead-end street due to the slope and drainage. She discussed the amount of water that accumulated during a past storm. She noted no sidewalks should be installed unless the drainage issue was addressed first. Lastly, she said if sidewalks were installed they were the responsibility of the residents to shovel them which she stated she could not do at this time. She

DRAFT - Transportation and Parking Commission

April 26, 2017

discussed the issues she and her husband have faced when the village snow plows during the winter. She did not support sidewalks currently.

Ms. Karen Samiec, 4613 Drendel Road reminded commissioners this area was covered by bus service for the school. Sidewalks were “a luxury” and drainage had to be addressed which caused flooding due to high density housing.

Chairwoman Dunne reminded the public to keep their comments to the sidewalks.

Ms. Judy Davenport, 4617 Cross Street, attended all of these meetings and recalled that only 19 families signed the petition for sidewalks in the area under discussion. She did not want sidewalks and did not want 19 households controlling the entire area. She asked if there was a process to vote on the matter.

Ms. Raegan Cates, 2537 Indianapolis, recalled there were 19 families that signed the petition for sidewalks but she started the petition. The roads were narrow and not improved properly. She noted that students were bused and she lived .55 miles from Puffer school, which she found unacceptable. Students could not walk because they could not do it safely. Money could be saved by not having to bus children when they could walk to school. She believed that if the drainage issues were addressed it could change her neighbors’ opinions. Regarding the shoveling, she agreed it was a safety concern for those shoveling as well as the students trying to get to school. She asked staff whether there was an ordinance requiring that residents have to shovel their snow. (Staff could not confirm.) She supported sidewalks due to their positive health and social benefits.

Ms. Lauren Singdahlson, 2529 Indianapolis Ave., explained it was not a matter of 19 families wanting sidewalks. She supported the sidewalks and described how she and others obtained the signatures required for the petition. She shared the importance of walking and stated that kids are bussed because it is considered “hazardous” for them to walk less than a half mile to school. She noted the sidewalk map located a variety of locations that the residents could walk to besides the school and link them together. As to the comment that sidewalks are “a luxury”, Ms. Singdahlson stated they were a luxury and as a resident she should have that luxury and have them at least on one side of the road and to be able to walk safely. Regarding costs, she understood the village was researching the costs and that some of the sidewalk costs could be covered by a “Safe Routes to School” grant. She supported sidewalks.

Mr. Scott Rogers, 4504 Drendel, supported sidewalks and was concerned about safety, as he did have small children. He shared the challenges students have to face walking to the bus stops during the winter. He shared the safety concerns for those commuters who walk home in the evening during the winter months.

Mr. Jeff Mahn, 4605 Cross Street, asked if the commissioners have physically seen the area under discussion. He suggested tabling the motion until the other studies arrived and then return to the sidewalk topic after that.

In response, Mr. Worthman explained that sidewalks were important to address now because ditch drainage currently existed along with a need for some storm pipes. Design details with, and without sidewalks, were explained.

Mr. Richard Mackie, 4613 Cross Street, did not support sidewalks and noted that generations of kids had grown up in the area without sidewalks. While he knew of the drainage issues, he was not affected by them. He supported widening the streets.

DRAFT - Transportation and Parking Commission

April 26, 2017

Mr. Garry Horak, 4507 Drendel Road suggested holding off on improvements and was against the sidewalks.

Mr. Wayne Hoppenrath, 4512 Cross Street, stated he was told the only reason there were school buses was because there were no sidewalks. In later years, he noticed the amount of coyotes in the area and expressed concerns about the safety of children. He did not support sidewalks.

Mr. Dan Fife, 4516 Cross Street walks to/from the train station and when he arrives home it is dark. He said there has been one or more occasions where he has almost been hit by a driver. He supported sidewalks.

Mr. Anderson Dalson, 2529 Indianapolis, discussing the line of cars picking up/dropping off students, explained that having sidewalks would help alleviate that problem. He discussed the positives of walking and currently walked in the street. He supported sidewalks.

Mr. Aaron Cates, 2537 Indianapolis Ave., discussed the increase in children over the past 10 years and the fact that there was the possibility of accidents increasing with them. It was beneficial to have a safe passage to the school. He supported sidewalks and appreciated discussing the drainage issues in the area.

Mr. Adam Kerry, 4524 Cross St., supported sidewalks. Buses dropped off students but they also walked three-quarters of a block, in the street. A sidewalk for that short distance would be a positive.

Ms. Marianne Fife, 4516 Cross Street, referring to those residents who lived in the neighborhood for many years and did not support sidewalks, recalled hearing that in the last 15 years the golf course has become more popular and a number of locations have increased in population, making it an entirely different neighborhood than 30 to 40 years ago. She agreed the neighborhood is turning over with more small children than there were 10 years ago.

Ms. Beth Kerry, 4524 Cross St., agreed with many of the comments being made, commenting she and her husband have a young son and want to ensure he has a safe place to play and walk to school.

Mr. Dimitri Goloff, 4904 Western, supported sidewalks and was not even aware there was a petition and he did not sign it. He believed if it went door to door, it probably would have received more signatures. Currently, he and his wife walk much. He agreed there were drainage issues but said even if the sidewalks were not installed now, they should be planned for the future.

Ms. Jackie Okowitz, 4506 Drendel, supported sidewalks since she has small children and it was a safety issue. She wanted to be connected to her neighborhood. She currently walks with her dog. She believed the village had to look at the issues holistically, especially concerning the drainage issues. Her backyard also flooded.

Ms. Raegan Cates, 2537 Indianapolis Ave., acknowledged the overall increase in pedestrian traffic over the years and stated when she moved into her home initially, it was not incorporated, as were her neighbors' homes. However, without her knowledge, she became incorporated and was fine with it. However, she felt if 95% of the village had sidewalks and amenities that she paid high taxes for, then the residents should receive the benefits of sidewalks.

Ms. Amanda Vernderholm, 4505 Drendel, has resided in the village less than year but she would like sidewalks since she has young children. Connection was important, as was walking in the community, and getting the children to move outside.

Mr. Mark Samiec, 4615 Drendel, did not support sidewalks since he lived on the southern end of Drendel, which was a dead-end street with very little foot traffic. He did not know if there was any pedestrian study on who uses the street but it sounded like Cross Street received more pedestrian traffic versus Drendel.

Per Mr. Sarick's question on the actual location of the sidewalk, Mr. Lorton explained that typically installation takes place near the right of way line but he would have to review the area to determine where exactly the sidewalk would be installed.

Another resident returned and asked whether the dead-end of Drendel would be considered under the Safe Routes to School grant program since it did not connect anywhere and the fact that the residents in that location indicated there was low pedestrian traffic in that location. Wherein Mr. Lorton believed that issue would have to be up for discussion in design because it could tie into Indianapolis. Details followed.

Susan ____, 4528 Cross Street, supported sidewalks. She asked who decides what infrastructure gets installed at Indianapolis Avenue between Cross and Drendel due to the drainage issues there.

Another resident returned and inquired as to who would be responsible for installing the sidewalks on Ogden Avenue, off of Drendel, to the recreational center, or those areas where the car dealerships were located. This resident voiced concern that if sidewalks were installed for the residents, where would they lead to and would there be pathways leading to empty lots? He voiced concern that the plan did not include everything – streets, sidewalks, sewers, etc.

A resident recalled that the village was going to come up with a comprehensive plan that addressed traffic, street repair, widening, sidewalks, drainage, and safety but that it was "back to piecemeal again." He voiced his frustrations.

Another resident spoke and acknowledged that there were residents who supported sidewalks and those that did not and the neighborhood continued to change. People who were moving into the neighborhood were younger with children of their own. This resident believed the trend would continue to grow and if changes were going to be made it would be a disservice to not include sidewalks from the master plan.

Chairwoman Dunne closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

Mr. Lorton shared that prior to tonight's meeting there was one phone call against sidewalks; three emails received by staff with two against sidewalks and one against sidewalks on both sides of the street.

Ms. Karen Samiec, 4613 Drendel Rd., stated she tried to send an email to the village but the letter that was sent out had the wrong email address so staff did not receive comments that it would have.

The chairwoman closed the public comment portion again.

Chairwoman Dunne pointed out from the testimony that this was a safety issue, demographics were changing, pedestrian traffic had increased, and the area was incorporated. There were young children in the area and it was a disgrace that children living close to the school had to be bussed. Main reasons against sidewalks appeared to be construction or drainage which would be addressed as the design moved forward. Installing sidewalks, to her, was not making conditions worse. She supported sidewalks in this neighborhood.

DRAFT - Transportation and Parking Commission

April 26, 2017

Mr. Saricks asked for clarification of what it was approving tonight, understanding that it was basically to approve a comprehensive design and not necessarily the exact location of where sidewalks would be placed, wherein Mr. Lorton stated the recommendation was to include sidewalks with the design. Mr. Carter supported sidewalks, seeing the village was going through an expansion with the schools, etc. and bussing within a half mile of a school was an issue. Mr. Wrobel asked if there was a construction ordinance requiring sidewalks to be added to new construction wherein Mr. Lorton stated there was not. Dialog followed that the Nelson Meadow development was having sidewalks installed because it was part of the agreement with the developer.

Asked who else would be involved in the design of the master plan for the area, Mr. Lorton stated the Public Works engineering department would be involved. Tonight's vote would influence their plan and overall assessment of the area. Further discussion followed on how the process would move forward once approved by the village council, noting that additional neighborhood input would be received.

Mr. Wilkinson asked if it was feasible to have at the next neighborhood meeting a plan with sidewalks and a plan without sidewalks with minimal cost? However the chairwoman disagreed to move in that direction due to the excellent reasons for or against sidewalks as voiced by the residents. Mr. Wrobel pointed out that the village's master plan discussed having sidewalks on at least one side of the roadway throughout the entire village. He shared his observations at prior meetings on this topic. He agreed there were changes in demographics, there was connectivity with sidewalks and people were moving more.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE #9-17, MR. WILKINSON MADE A MOTION THAT THE TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL TO IMPLEMENT SIDEWALKS IN CONJUNCTION WITH PROPOSED DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS AS PROPOSED BY STAFF.

SECONDED BY MR. CARTER.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 5-0.

OLD BUSINESS: None.

COMMUNICATIONS – Refer to commissioners' packets.

ADJOURN

HEARING NO FURTHER DISCUSSION, THE CHAIRWOMAN ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 9:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Celeste Weilandt
Recording Secretary
(transcribed from MP3 recording)

TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION
Minutes

May 10, 2017, 7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers - Village Hall
801 Burlington Avenue, Downers Grove

Chairwoman Dunne called to order the May 10, 2017 meeting of the Transportation and Parking Commission at 7:00 p.m. and led the meeting with the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll call followed and a quorum was established.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chairwoman Dunne; Commissioners Carter, Saricks, Schiller

Absent: Commissioner Wrobel, Wilkinson

Staff Present: Public Works Traffic Engineer Will Lorton

Others: John and Barbara Staehle, 3540 Pomeroy Ct., Downers Grove; Robert Svoboda, 3550 Pomeroy Ct., Downers Grove; Mark Cronin, 1117 Jefferson, Downers Grove; John Schofield, 1125 Jefferson, Downers Grove

Chairwoman Dunne explained the protocol for the meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT (on non-Agenda items) – None.

Traffic Engineer Will Lorton explained that the following items fall within what has been approved, conditionally, by the commission to eliminate uncontrolled intersections, focusing on the four-leg intersections. Per Mr. Lorton, the first three cases fell within the first mini-study that was discussed in February 2017 and the latter two cases were resident-initiated.

File #10-17 35th Street at Pomeroy Court – Traffic Control Revisions: Mr. Lorton summarized the directional and dimensions for 35th Street and Pomeroy Court. Currently there were no posted restrictions on the north/south or west legs of the intersection. The east leg of the intersection allowed parking on the south side of the road only. There was no history of crashes. Staff recommended control for the north/south legs of Pomeroy Court/Pomeroy Road due to lower traffic volumes. Traffic volumes did not warrant an all-way stop. One voicemail and one email were received by staff regarding this case and both emails recommended no control at all.

Asked if 35th Street, classified as a local street, acted more like an arterial in the area under discussion, Mr. Lorton stated it would act like a collector street. Regarding the email received by staff, Mr. Lorton said the email discussed that there was no crash history.

Mr. Saricks and the chairwoman recalled that crash history was not one of the main reasons the village was moving forward with such approach.

Chairwoman Dunne opened up the meeting to public comment.

Ms. Barbara Staehle, 3540 Pomeroy Court, was “startled” when she heard stop signs were going to be installed on Pomeroy Court and Pomeroy Road. She noted that if one travels west on 35th Street and passes Pomeroy Court, it becomes a dead-end street, and three dead-end streets exist with a handful of homes. Since her move into the area in 1981, she has never seen or heard a crash and stated that vehicular and pedestrian traffic were low. However, Ms. Staehle stated there was traffic safety concerns on 35th Street at Saratoga. She suggested installing yield signs instead.

DRAFT - Transportation and Parking Commission

May 10, 2017

Per Mr. Saricks' query whether there was the expectation of future development in the area that could increase future traffic volumes, Mr. Lorton did not believe so. A brief dialog followed regarding the two-way stop at Saratoga and 35th Street.

Ms. Barbara Staehle, 3540 Pomeroy Court, added that when driving north on Saratoga there was a hill and if one stops where one is supposed to, one cannot see anything coming toward you from the east on 35th Street, which requires a driver to pull up further to get a better view. When a driver heads south on Saratoga to 35th Street, vehicles are usually turning east to get to Highland Avenue and sometime the trees/shrubs make it difficult to see. Drivers are expecting a four-way stop if unfamiliar with the neighborhood. She preferred the village "do something" at Saratoga and 35th Street, such as yield signs on Pomeroy Court/Pomeroy Road.

Mr. Lorton added that between Venard and Saratoga there were townhomes that were recently constructed.

Mr. Robert Svoboda, 3550 Pomeroy Court, said if he has one car that comes from his left (on 35th Street) as he heads right onto 35th Street, it was "a lot of traffic." He suggested having a yield street. He also said he does have to pull about a quarter into the intersection to make a left off of Saratoga onto 35th Street in order to see traffic coming from Highland Avenue, which was dangerous. He reiterated Saratoga and 35th was a very dangerous intersection, citing he saw squad cars on 35th Street near Saratoga. He did not understand why Pomeroy Court/Pomeroy Road were "dangerous intersections" when no thru traffic existed.

Mr. John Staehle, 3540 Pomeroy Court noted the village's data indicated there are no crashes. In other words, there was no real need for a stop sign at Pomeroy Court and it was more of a nuisance than a safety issue for him and the residents.

Per Mr. Schiller's question regarding the southbound traffic on Pomeroy that turns eastbound on 35th, Mr. Staehle stated he rarely sees traffic coming towards him on those occasions where he is leaving. He suggested staff obtain a vehicular count going south on Pomeroy Road. He and many of his neighbors turn right to go towards Highland or Saratoga.

Chairwoman Dunne closed the public hearing portion.

Mr. Schiller found the stop sign unnecessary on the south side of 35th Street if only five or six homeowners were being stopped before making a right turn and questioned whether the stop sign proposed for the north side of the leg would be justified for drivers coming down and making a full stop before making a left, which may make it easier for drivers coming in and out of the court. But a stop sign on the south side appeared to "not serve much purpose." Mr. Saricks also pointed out a previous recommendation made for 61st Street several meetings ago where the commission's recommendation did not include one of the two stop signs recommended, which was similar to this case.

After discussing the matter further and asking if there was something that could be generating additional traffic southbound on Pomeroy, such as cut-through issues or whether sight line issues existed, Mr. Lorton indicated there was not. Mr. Lorton further explained the village's policy for uncontrolled intersections becoming controlled.

Chairwoman Dunne also reminded the commissioners and public that while there may be some situations where the signs seem unnecessary, for the purposes of consistency, and because drivers may come to expect controlled intersections and coming to a random intersection that was not controlled, could become a safety issue if the driver was expecting someone to stop regardless.

DRAFT - Transportation and Parking Commission

May 10, 2017

She believed the commission stay firm with its decision to install stop signs at uncontrolled intersection regardless of low traffic volumes or low crash history.

Mr. Saricks reiterated his concern about sight line issues existing at 35th and Saratoga stating drivers will continue to travel through the intersection even though it was a two-way stop. He asked staff about the logic of not installing a stop sign for westbound 35th Street at Saratoga. Mr. Lorton suggested that the residents fill out an intersection control petition and have a separate follow-up study. However, he added that staff will have to pay attention to the traffic volume at 35th and Saratoga, otherwise crash history will have to be reviewed.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE #10-17, MR. SCHILLER MADE A MOTION THAT THE TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL TO INSTALL A STOP SIGN ON THE NORTH AND SOUTH LEGS OF POMEROY COURT AND POMEROY ROAD.

SECONDED BY MR. SARICKS.

Mr. Saricks reiterated his concerns but also recognized the village's policy.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 4-0.

File #11-17 Oak Hill /Court at Venard Road– Traffic Control Revisions: Mr. Lorton provided an overview of this case, summarizing that Oak Hill Road/Court is an east-west roadway classified as a local street 30 feet wide. Venard is a north-south roadway classified as a local street also 30 feet wide. No posted parking restrictions existed and the intersection was uncontrolled. Between 2005 and 2015, there was only one crash at the intersection. Staff recommended that the east and west legs have the stop control. One email was received by staff which was in opposition of the stop sign even though there was an accident referenced due to a failure to yield. The resident did, however, support yield signs.

Chairwoman Dunne opened up the matter to the public. None followed.

Per a question, Mr. Lorton believed the one car accident was from the east leg of Oak Hill Court but he would have to confirm. The issue of the roadway being used by cut-through traffic was raised by Mr. Saricks. The chairwoman also believed this case was similar to the one above.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE #11-17, MR. CARTER MADE A MOTION THAT THE TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL TO INSTALL A STOP SIGN ON THE EAST AND WEST LEGS OF OAK HILL COURT AND OAK HILL ROAD.

SECONDED BY MR. SCHILLER.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 4-0.

File #12-17 39th Street and Williams Street – Traffic Control Revisions: Traffic Engr. Lorton reported that 39th Street is an east-west roadway classified as a local street 30 feet wide. Williams Street was a north-south roadway classified as a local street also 30 feet wide. No posted parking restrictions existed with the exception of 39th Street having a No Overnight Parking sign restriction. Mr. Lorton clarified this intersection was incorrectly identified as a four-leg uncontrolled intersection; however, the intersection of 39th Street at Williams was currently under a Yield control (by York

DRAFT - Transportation and Parking Commission

May 10, 2017

Township) for the north leg only with a sign not maintained by the village but was within village right-of-way. There was a one-vehicle crash at the intersection with the vehicle running into a snow bank with no injuries.

Staff recommended replacing the north leg yield sign and placing the stop signs on the north and south legs.

Chairwoman Dunne opened up the meeting to public comment. No public spoke.

Staff reported there were two emails received – one in favor of the stop signs; the other more concerned about speeding on 39th Street. Mr. Saricks commented that 39th Street is treated as a through route to many of its drivers which would make it difficult because if you start imposing stop signs drivers may not be ready for them. He believed the signs were necessary for the cross traffic. Dialog followed as to what traffic volume warrants a four-way stop, that much of the traffic from 39th Street is cut-through traffic; and that installing stop signs in the area could increase traffic on 39th Street. Mr. Lorton mentioned this case will fall within the Neighborhood Study 6 and the area will be reviewed holistically. Mr. Carter mentioned he had no issues approving this request since it would also be reviewed in Neighborhood Study 6.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE #12-17, MR. SARICKS MADE A MOTION THAT THE TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL TO INSTALL A STOP SIGN ON THE NORTH AND SOUTH LEGS OF WILLIAMS STREET.

SECONDED BY MR. CARTER.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 4-0.

File #13-17 Jefferson Avenue at Brookbank Road – Traffic Control Revisions: Traffic Engr. Lorton noted this request was initiated by a resident. The intersection is new with no control currently. The resident requested a stop sign and a high visibility crosswalk on the east leg of the intersection. Jefferson Avenue is an east-west roadway classified as a local street 20 feet wide. Brookbank is a north-south roadway classified as a local street 30 feet wide. There are no posted parking restrictions within the intersection and no related crashes. Staff recommended installing a stop sign for the north leg and stripe a high visibility crosswalk on the east leg of Jefferson Avenue.

Two emails were received by staff – the first email supported the stop sign but not the crosswalk; the second email was from the developer supporting the stop signs but making reference to sight line issues on the north leg with landscaping concerns at the northwest corner.

An explanation followed on how the intersection was “new” and the fact that the development will be generating new traffic westbound on Jefferson in the future. Regarding the crosswalk on the east leg, Mr. Lorton explained the opposition indicated the crosswalk was not necessary due to it being in a quiet neighborhood, and while traffic would increase with the new Brookbank extension southbound to Jefferson, a stop sign was sufficient.

Mr. Saricks pointed out that if the current sidewalks were combined with the Safe Routes to School program, then a crosswalk would be needed to which Mr. Lorton concurred. The developer would provide the crosswalk.

Chairwoman Dunne opened up the meeting to the public.

DRAFT - Transportation and Parking Commission

May 10, 2017

Mr. John Skofield (phonetic), 1125 Jefferson, supported both requests yet did not know how much traffic would be generated. He agreed with the developer that the sight lines were an issue and just like the developer's letter alluded to, there was much traffic traveling north and south coming from 59th Street south and traversing Brookbank Road to the north. Mr. Skofield discussed that a lot of pedestrian and bicycle traffic was currently taking place in the area because the path existed; however, he suspected that when the road is added, there will be the potential for more conflict between pedestrian and vehicles. He supported the crosswalk for not only the school children but for all pedestrians and cyclists.

Mr. Skofield explained that parts of the Brookbank path to 59th Street are difficult to traverse and he has tried to get the village manager to add it to the ADA list of necessities but, to date, the manager has refused. Details followed with Mr. Skofield confirming that the path is highly used.

Mr. Mark Cronin, 1117 Jefferson, thanked the TAP for their volunteerism and their unappreciated hard work. Discussing this section of Jefferson, Mr. Cronin stated it was about two blocks long with much activity and younger kids on it. He supported the crosswalk and sign but believed drivers see the crosswalk first over a stop sign and expect to slow down because people are in the area.

Mr. Gene Davies, 1203 Jefferson, resides directly south of where the stop sign will be installed and discussed the challenges of pulling out of his driveway, and so he supported both the proposed stop sign and crosswalk.

Mr. Schiller asked whether a stop sign should be installed on the opposite side of Brookbank to stop drivers traveling westbound on Jefferson and to protect the crosswalk, since there was the expectation that the extension of Jefferson would create more traffic over time. Mr. Lorton cited a similar situation at Blanchard and Middaugh where a two-way stop exists and the crosswalk crosses both Blanchard and Middaugh but only Middaugh traffic was being stopped. He offered to take traffic counts once the development was occupied, and if necessary, add the additional sign. Mr. Lorton stated a warning sign that a crosswalk was approaching could also be added.

Further dialog followed on various warning alternatives for the crosswalk, considering that future development could be expected.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE #13-17, MR. SCHILLER MADE A MOTION THAT THE TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL TO 1) INSTALL A STOP SIGN ON THE NORTH LEG OF BROOKBANK ROAD; 2) STRIPE A HIGH VISIBILITY CROSSWALK ON THE EAST LEG OF JEFFERSON AVENUE; AND 3) INSTALL A PEDESTRIAN CROSSING WARNING SIGN (ON BOTH SIDES) TO NOTIFY DRIVERS THAT A CROSSWALK IS AHEAD.

SECONDED BY MR. CARTER.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 4-0.

File #14-17 Branding Lane at Scheldrup Street & Frontage Road at Oak Grove Drive – Traffic Control Revisions: Traffic Engr. Lorton stated this request was from a resident's concern. The area of concern is near Butterfield, Findley and Downers Roads. Each of them are three-leg intersections that are not controlled. A review of the crash information followed by Mr. Lorton. Staff is proposing to add stop control on the terminating leg as depicted on the overhead and as supported by traffic volumes at the location. Staff recommended installing a stop sign on the east leg of Frontage Road at Oak Grove Drive and a stop sign on the north leg of Scheldrup Street at Branding Lane.

DRAFT - Transportation and Parking Commission

May 10, 2017

Chairwoman Dunne agreed the area was quite busy and by adding signs would be a safety feature for the area. Mr. Schiller shared his personal experience in the area and agreed anything breaking up the traffic flow was a positive.

No public comment followed.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE #14-17, MR. SCHILLER MADE A MOTION THAT THE TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL TO INSTALL A STOP SIGN ON THE EAST LEG OF FRONTAGE ROAD AND INSTALL A STOP SIGN ON THE NORTH LEG OF SCHEDLRUP STREET.

SECONDED BY MR. SARICKS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 4-0.

OLD BUSINESS: None.

COMMUNICATIONS – Refer to commissioners' packets.

ADJOURN

HEARING NO FURTHER DISCUSSION, MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:53 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. SARICKS. SECONDED BY MR. SCHILLER. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE 4-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Celeste Weilandt
Recording Secretary
(transcribed from MP3 recording)