

CITY OF WARRENVILLE
PLAN COMMISSION ROUTE 59/ROUTE 56 SUBAREA PLANNING
PUBLIC INFORMATION AND INPUT MEETING

Minutes of Special Meeting
Held on Tuesday, March 18, 2008
At the Warrenville City Hall
28 W 701 Stafford Place

I. CALL TO ORDER

Plan Commission Chairman John Davis called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Plan Commission Present: John Davis, Tim Cosgrove, June Nelson, Steven Gregory, Leah Goodman, Jeffrey Deniger, Roland Laurin, Mike Mulcahy

Plan Commission Excused: Joseph Rossi

Also Present: Mayor David Brummel, Consulting Engineer James Darnell, Community Development Director Ronald Mentzer, Senior Planner Natalia Domolessova, Recording Secretary Debra Johnson

III. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS

Ch. Davis welcomed all present and asked Dir. Mentzer to provide a presentation to the assembly on the subarea.

IV. BUSINESS OF MEETING

A. Introductions and Project Status Summary.

Dir. Mentzer thanked the members of the audience for their attendance and participation in the input meeting. He explained that tonight's meeting would be a continuation of the City's ongoing process to develop a detailed plan for the Route 59/Route 56 subarea, which includes 240 acres of land around such intersection, roughly 100 acres of which are vacant and available for development, thereby inevitably effecting change in the area. The purpose of the project is to update the 1984 Comprehensive Plan for this particular subarea, and represent an up-to-date guidance document that the City can use to make future policy decisions, especially in the event that the City must legally defend its decisions on development proposals for this area. Additionally, the subarea plan would reflect the community's current expectations for the area, reveal the real estate development market realities, and strengthen and enhance the City's economic base. The goal of the project is to provide clear policy direction on future land use expectations, vehicular parking and circulation improvements, pedestrian and bicycle circulation improvements, public infrastructure improvements regarding extension of utilities, urban design issues, environmental protection concerns regarding floodplain and wetlands, and protection/preservation/enhancement of residential areas. Dir. Mentzer stated that the main focus of tonight's meeting is to (i) review input from the previous meeting, and (ii) review and provide input on alternate land use scenarios and key infrastructure issues.

B. Summary of December 4, 2007, Public/Plan Commission Information and Input Meeting.

Dir. Mentzer summarized the general themes derived from the December 4, 2007, meeting:

1. Development Character
 - High quality, coordinated PUD
 - Property assemblage/consolidation
 - Architectural continuity/consistency
 - “Gateway” development
 - Streetscape/landscape improvements
2. Transitions
 - Land uses
 - Stormwater management for buffers between dissimilar uses
 - Landscaping
 - Adjacent property spillover traffic
3. Roadway/Infrastructure Improvements
 - Strategic but comprehensive extension of sanitary sewer and water improvements to avoid piecemeal development
 - Southerly extension of Barkley Avenue through southwest quadrant of subarea and linking to Rt. 59
 - New traffic signals:
 - Barkley/Route 56
 - Kleinman property/Route 59
4. Pedestrian/Trail Improvements
 - Coordinated and interconnected “system” of pedestrian/bike/trail improvements
 - Interconnect with Prairie Path
5. Stormwater Management/Environmentally Sensitive Areas
 - Insure new development acknowledges/coordinates with existing drainage constraints
 - Stormwater management with a purpose to enhance quality of projects
6. Land Uses
 - Desirable uses:
 - Strong emphasis on new commercial/retail uses not currently available in community
 - Other commercial:
 - Hotel
 - Large scale retail
 - Sit-down restaurant
 - Medical/professional offices
 - Coordinated mixed use (office/residential above commercial)

- Residential:
 - High quality
 - Serve a purpose
 - Integrated component of mixed use
- Discouraged uses:
 - Motor service/repair
 - “Strip malls”
 - Fast food
 - Stand alone apartment developments

C. Presentation of Alternate Land Use Scenarios and Key Infrastructure Issues.

Dir. Mentzer then summarized input derived from the December 4, 2007, meeting by sections, and presented the alternative land use diagrams staff prepared for each area, as follows:

1. **Area 1 – NW Quadrant of Rt. 59/Rt. 56:**

- Shared Priorities/Issues/Concerns:
 - Stoplight at Barkley Avenue
 - Transitions to existing residential neighborhood to north
 - Stormwater management/drainage
- Land Use Preferences
 - Upscale retail commercial or mixed use PUD
 - Sit-down restaurants
 - Avoid typical suburban arterial highway auto-oriented “strip” commercial development
- **Alternative 1(A)** – This primarily consists of a retail commercial development on the corner, with a small narrow section of multi-family housing such as town homes or row homes that would be placed along the north property line to transition back to the single-family residential neighborhood to the north, and consolidated stormwater management and wetland mitigation areas.
- **Alternative 1(B)** – Almost identical to Alternative A, this scenario eliminates the multi-family transition on the north and incorporates high-quality landscape buffering for the transition to the existing residential neighborhood to the north, with a larger, more coordinated and thus higher quality, commercial development.

Upon Com. Deniger’s inquiry regarding the Rt. 56 frontage road, Dir. Mentzer replied that at the March 18, 2008, public hearing, IDOT’s Phase I design drawings did not clearly identify the plan for the frontage road, but implied that it would be eliminated. He requested that each table provide input on whether they feel such road should be retained. Dir. Mentzer envisioned that if IDOT elected to retain such frontage road, it would be designed as a one-way boulevard with landscaping between Butterfield Road and the local access one-way lane running parallel, similar to the design in the Old Town/Civic Center subarea plan presented for Butterfield Road immediately west of Batavia Road.

Following a facilitated small table breakout session, tables reported their findings on Area 1 as follows:

Table 1:

- Stressed importance of stoplight
- Frontage road is necessary for circulation off of Barkley Avenue for property navigation
- Mixed multi-family use is preferable as transition to Summerlakes subdivision
- Mixed multi-family use is preferable as image building incentive for the City
- With property landscape buffer, solely commercial could also work
- Maintain prior infrastructure and environmental criteria

Table 3:

- Alternative B is preferable due to larger assemblage of property for developers
- Alternative B is preferable for ongoing tax derived from retail versus multi-family use
- Alternative B's buffer to north is preferable
- Frontage road is necessary traffic calming measure for entry into development
- Encourage aesthetic implementation of detention area

Table 4:

- Alternative B is favored due to its ample landscaping
- Situate water feature in closer proximity to corner for aesthetic purposes
- Stressed importance of stoplight because access is critically important
- Multi-use development is preferred, in a minimum of three stories
- Frontage road is necessary for access to development

Table 5:

- Alternative B is favored as it maximizes commercial development potential and minimizes impact on City services by eliminating residential component
- Alternative B's larger commercial element would allow more room for a high-quality landscape buffer for residential area to the north
- Acknowledging that IDOT would likely allow a limited number of curb cuts along Route 59 and Butterfield Road, a preferred alternative to the frontage road would be to create an internal circle and encourage development around it in a town center fashion

Table 2:

- Alternative B is favored, due to the likelihood that larger, national lease-type tenants would tend to be stronger occupants, and such layout would be more preferable to developers
- Frontage road is necessary for proper circulation
- Suggest the following uses: bookstore, restaurant, grocery store

2. **Area 2 – NE Quadrant of Rt. 59/Rt. 56:**

- Shared Priorities/Issues/Concerns:
 - Transitions to existing residential neighborhood to north
 - Stormwater management/drainage issues
- Land Use Preferences
 - Townhouses/row houses, becoming a transition on the back/east side of the quadrant
 - Office (to the north) and/or low intensity commercial uses along Rt. 59 frontage

- **Alternative 2(A)** – This alternative primarily consists of rear-loaded townhouses along the east side of the quadrant, stormwater detention in the center separating the townhouse project from non-residential development along Rt. 59 and providing open space, and a flood plain at the northwest corner to provide an open park area. Along Rt. 59 frontage, the frontage road would become an internal one-way local access street, with buildings located within close proximity, and their parking areas located in the rear. Depending on the depth, two rows of buildings may exist, with parking situated between such rows. Uses would include office/office residential quadplexes with quality architecture in scale appropriate to that of Rt. 59.
- **Alternative 2(B)** – Similar to the townhouses of Alternative A, this scenario proposes consolidation of large blocks of property that would be developed in a high-quality coordinated manner. Such design would provide for two right-in/right-out turns, with the corner reflecting a commercial orientation, and office uses to the north. A likely use would be that of a strip center development with an outlot or bank use. With the expansion of Rt. 56, a 10-foot multi-use trail would extend from Barkley Avenue to the forest preserve. New pedestrian improvements would be found along the dotted lines of the rendering.

Dir. Mentzer noted that a large portion of this quadrant is unincorporated and would require annexation into the City. It is currently on septic and well, and utilities would have to be extended to accommodate potential development. Currently, a water main exists along the north side of Rt. 56 to the industrial park, while sewer runs along the south side of Rt. 56 to Mr. Jim's.

Following a facilitated small table breakout session, tables reported their findings on Area 2 as follows:

Table 4:

- A combination of Alternatives A and B would work well
- Commercial office space for lease or development of office condominiums would be ideal for this quadrant
- Town homes on the east portion of this quadrant would be an acceptable use, along with a park and open space
- In Alternative B, if all of the site west of the detention pond would be an office use, access is crucial, and could be accomplished by (i) extending the frontage road along the north side of Rt. 56, and (ii) utilizing Prairie Avenue. This could be achieved by having a private road/driveway on the east side of the three-acre office and three-acre commercial development, thus providing two access points to the development. A right-in/right-out may also be provided on Rt. 59 toward the north end of the quadrant. Such internal north-south road would allow for a more unencumbered flow of traffic.
- This area would not be conducive to apartments due to its somewhat noisy atmosphere

Table 5:

- Alternative A would make the most sense, as it is devoid of access difficulties, commercial use on the hard corners would not be viable, and commercial in this quadrant would compete with the high-quality commercial on the west side of Rt. 59
- This area would not be appropriate for apartments
- Two-story office condominiums would be an appropriate use for this area

- Favored wrapping the frontage road around to the west side of the site, along the east side of Rt. 59, terminating at a right-in/right-out access on Rt. 59
- Favored townhouses providing a buffer to the single-family detached homes to the east
- A small park may not be useable; rather, such space should be redistributed surrounding the detention area in a walking path, benefiting the townhouses and providing a wider buffer area of native landscaping to improve water quality of the detention area

Table 2:

- A combination of Alternatives A and B would work well
- Favored Alternative A's extension of a service road to access the hard corner
- Favored Alternative B's right-in/right-out access points
- An access road between the detention and commercial office use would be essential to permit flow to the parcel on the western edge of the area
- Given its high visibility, the hard corner would be a viable commercial opportunity
- Heading northward, office, office clusters, or two-story office extending to Prairie Avenue would be favored
- Assemblage for town homes would be difficult, but if done, rear access would be desirable, and homes should not run concurrently in a block, but should be broken up in no more than five to six-unit buildings
- Proposed park is acceptable
- Decorative and creative landscaping around detention area is necessary

Table 1:

- Alternative B has most potential, given its distribution of uses
- Apartment concept of Alternative A is not desirable
- A frontage circulation road would be a function of the development, but rear access of the property to Prairie Avenue or Butterfield Road is important
- Townhouses or row homes seem to be a reasonable option for such parcel
- Detention is important

Table 3:

- Alternative A was favorable, due to the large assemblage of property that would be necessary on the west side of Home Avenue
- Office/retail is favorable use
- Locating the detention area in close proximity to Home Avenue would provide a more aesthetic view and buffer for Home Avenue residents and increase usable land for development
- Not in favor of multi-family development, as retail provides more sales tax revenue, and does not drain City services
- No park is necessary in this area, since one exists on Prairie Avenue

3. **Area 3 – SW Quadrant of Rt. 59/Rt. 56:** (80 acres)

- Shared Priorities/Issues/Concerns:
 - Barkley Avenue extension/stoplight for access
 - Stormwater management/drainage/wetlands/floodplain issues
 - Extension of city sanitary sewer and water utilities

- Preservation of and transition to existing residential uses
- Land Use Preferences
 - Assemblage and upscale commercial or mixed use PUD
 - Substantial support for 2004 “draft” subarea plan
 - Office/research/institutional component
 - Townhouse component
- **Alternative 3(A)** – This scenario reflects a north/south extension of Barkley Avenue from Butterfield Road to the location of the proposed new Duke Parkway in Aurora that will serve the industrial warehouse distribution development. The key component to this plan is to create the largest possible area to accommodate commercial or commercial mixed use development, using detention areas to separate the more intense non-residential uses from the core area of residential uses in the rear. At some point in time, when the residential segment becomes available for redevelopment, it could likely become a large-scale office research development, or possibly a multi-family development that could access the STAR Line Railroad if it comes to fruition. A commercial/office/research/flex space, similar to the office/industrial condominium arrangement to the north, is reflected along the Rt. 56 frontage. The potential for a cul-de-sac at Briggs Avenue would prohibit the connection between access to Rt. 56 and the rest of the neighborhood, thereby discouraging cut-through traffic. Access would be retained by the north driveway to the existing Baptist Church for its egress/ingress to Butterfield Road. A commercial development is reflected at the Rt. 59/Rt. 56 corner, with a possibility of either right-in/right-out access onto Rt. 59, or an internal one-way local access drive close to the right-of-way that would provide consolidated access for the commercial or mixed-use development in this area.
- **Alternative 3(B)** – This scenario also reflects a north/south extension of Barkley Avenue from Butterfield Road to the location of the proposed new Duke Parkway in Aurora that will serve the industrial warehouse distribution development. With particular focus on the area east of the residential core along Rt. 59, this plan proposes an apartment or townhouse component as a transition from the existing residential uses to the more intense commercial non-residential uses. Smaller commercial buildings oriented in a more typical arterial commercial situation are envisioned in the alternative as opposed to the larger, more consolidated mixed use or commercial development envisioned in Alternative 3A. A signal would provide access not only to this area, but also to the Kleinman property on the east side of Rt. 59. The preferable access point is at the center of the Kleinman property, where the proposed collector industrial street is intended to intersect with Rt. 59, but this would involve an intergovernmental agreement with the City of Aurora and Duke. Alternatively, Estes Avenue could be used for the signalized access point, to the east and west sides of Rt. 59. This would be less desirable, as it is situated at the north end of the Kleinman property, rather than being centrally located. This plan shows interconnected trails and sidewalks to serve commercial and residential development, including a connection from Summerlakes to the Illinois Prairie Path.

Following a facilitated small table breakout session, tables reported their findings on Area 3 as follows:

Table 1:

- Alternative B appears to be more likely to happen, because the existing residential to the west of the Barkley Avenue extension could stay intact, the Anderson property on the

south side of Estes could retain reasonable development potential, the area east of Barkley extension would likely be commercial and mixed-use development, and the residential component seems to be reasonable, and would provide a good buffer between existing residential to the west and proposed commercial use to the east

- Alternative A could occur on its own in the area to the west of Barkley and the area around Butterfield Road, but this plan is less desirable because it does not offer the buffer to the existing residential to the west
- In the event that Duke does not secure a stoplight at Barkley Avenue, the City must facilitate installation of a stoplight at Estes Street

Table 3:

- Alternative A is desirable because it protects the values of residential and church properties
- The STAR Line could potentially change the use of its surrounding properties
- The wetlands present a complicated area to develop
- A multi-family town home development could likely enhance the values of existing residences that could be assembled and ultimately developed
- Favor consolidation and assemblage of the maximum number of properties along Rt. 59 for highest return

Table 4:

- Alternative B is desirable, with the essential element being stoplight installation
- Property assemblage will be difficult, especially given the wetlands
- Briggs should be extended to the south and the residential should have cul-de-sacs to preserve the area
- New residential development of apartments and condominiums of higher density is acceptable if it is sizable

Table 5:

- Alternative A was favored, as it provides the most usable land for non-residential use (commercial/office/mixed use) east of Barkley Avenue, as a non-residential use would provide the money that would facilitate the construction of Barkley Avenue
- Relocated wetlands and detention would provide a buffer and separate residential from commercial uses
- Church access may be improved with the extension of Barkley
- Cognizant of the fact that it would be some time before this area is developed, given its challenges

Table 2:

- Alternative B was favored, with the variations that Briggs should not be cut off from Butterfield, but have a left-in access and be extended to Duke Parkway, with weight and size limits on traffic, as it would service both the residential and church uses
- Barkley Avenue extension is necessary, but with a more direct path to Duke Parkway, and with water retention on both sides of the road for a natural buffer from the commercial frontage and the high-density town homes to the rear

- If the Rt. 59/Duke Parkway traffic light is not approved, Estes Street would be the secondary preference for locating such traffic light
- If Estes Street receives a right-in/right-out or cul-de-sac, this would limit access for commercial on the frontage
- Preserve west portion of residential and limit invasive improvements with the Barkley Avenue extension
- Rt. 59 frontage is dependent upon location of traffic light
- Assemblage would not be difficult, since only five owners exist and the majority of properties along Rt. 59 are on the market

Estes resident, Mark Goff's Comments

- Alternative A is missing/does not recognize three existing residential properties

4. **Area 4 – SE Corner of Rt. 59/Rt. 56:** (*Kleinman Property and area to the north along the east side of Rt. 59*)

- Shared Priorities/Issues/Concerns:
 - Extension of City sanitary sewer and water utilities
 - New traffic signal for Kleinman property
 - Preservation/enhancement of environmental features
 - Interconnect trails with Prairie Path/Monarch Landing
- Land Use Preferences
 - Mixed use (commercial/retail/sit-down restaurant/office/ residential)
 - Discourage apartments
- **Alternative 4(A)** – This scenario reflects the most residential use of the three options, with very little commercial use.
- **Alternative 4(B)** – This scenario offers an increased use of commercial use along the Rt. 59 frontage, mixed with lesser degree of multi-family residential use to the east, abutting the wetland/flood plain areas.
- **Alternative 4(C)** – This scenario depicts all of the property as commercial use.

Dir. Mentzer stated that the area to the north of the Kleinman property is not substantially altered, due to existing commercial use at the SE corner of the intersection, and a long-term opportunity for transition to live/work lofts or a small office use along Rt. 56, but due to access and wetland concerns, this likely would not occur within the foreseeable future. The development of the Kleinman property should allow for future expansion into the two separate existing single-family lots to the north in the event that such parcels are not part of the initial project.

Following a facilitated small table breakout session, tables reported their findings on Area 4 as follows:

Table 3:

- Prefer Alternative C, as residential component does not make sense and has no real value for the area

Table 4:

- Prefer Alternative A or B, because it provides the most immediate land planning opportunity
- By retaining commercial uses along Rt. 59, the opportunity may be lost to develop a viable portion of land in multi-family residential

Table 2:

- Prefer Alternate B, as this area is a “gateway” to community, has good transition, and would better fit with a developer’s desires
- Commercial area should have greater depth for quality development
- Monarch Landing connection is crucial through the Prairie Path and pathways leading to commercial uses
- Office/medical uses should be encouraged for this area
- Specialty grocery/restaurant use should be encouraged for this area (not fast food)
- A quality park should be retained along the Prairie Path and southernmost portion of the area, including a gazebo and enhanced landscaping
- Theatre/community space should be considered for this area

Table 1:

- Pragmatically, Alternative B is favored as a good compromise between commercial and multi-family residential, perhaps in a gated community, all of which will be determined by the market

Table 5:

- Alternative A is preferred due to its smaller commercial component, especially since commercial is preferred in other quadrants of the subarea
- Specialty grocery store such as Whole Foods could be situated on the corner of Ivan Albright to preserve gateway into Warrenville as one is traveling northbound on Rt. 59
- If the market allows, multi-family three to four-story condominiums should be situated in the south portion of the area nearby Monarch Landing, with access to the Prairie Path and downtown

5. **Area 5 – SW Corner of Subarea (Incorporated Duke Property):**

- Shared Priorities/Issues/Concerns:
 - Extension of City sanitary sewer and water utilities
 - Preservation/enhancement of environmental features
 - Property assemblage
- Land Use Preferences
 - Potential multi-family south of Duke property
 - Hotel on Duke property
- **Alternative 5(A)** – Commercial use is shown for the 12-acre Duke property at the SW corner of the intersection. Park space is shown to the south, given its wetlands/flood plains. Apartments/townhouses would be intermixed around such wetlands.
- **Alternative 5(B)** – Multi-story office or a potential hotel use is shown for the 12-acre Duke property at the SW corner of the intersection. Park space is shown to the south, given its wetlands/flood plains. Detached live/work lofts would be intermixed around such wetlands.

Following a facilitated small table breakout session, tables reported their findings on Area 5 as follows:

Table 1:

- Favored Alternative B and its commercial use at the stoplight, research component near Ferry Road, and ecology/park aspect

Table 3:

- Favored Alternative B, but recognizes that assemblage would be a challenge
- Ecology/park aspect makes sense, and trails could connect with existing trails
- Commercial flex component would appear more as single-family residences, which would enhance the ecology park

Table 4:

- Favored Alternative B, with its commercial use to the north, ecology/park use, and office/warehouse or light industrial use near Ferry Road

Table 5:

- Commercial should be continued from the north end on Alternative B, leading to wetlands, and detached living/working lofts toward the south, surrounded by the trails leading to a redeveloped downtown area

Table 2:

- Favored Alternative B, with a hotel on the Duke property
- Rather than attempt to build on the land, cultivate wetlands to create a golf course

D. Overview of Next Steps in Process/Future Meeting Date.

Dir. Mentzer stated that a preferred plan, draft vision statement, and draft goals/strategies/implementation actions would be formulated from tonight's input. These would be presented to the Plan Commission in a series of public meetings, at which the public would have additional opportunities to provide input. A final plan could likely be formulated by June of 2008, to be presented and approved at a public hearing. Dir. Mentzer instructed anyone who wished to be kept informed of this process to add his or her names and addresses to an "interested parties" email list.

V. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 10:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Approved: _____

Marie Lupo, Recording Secretary