

**INITIAL PUBLIC MEETING SUMMARY
75TH STREET CORRIDOR STUDY
NAPERVILLE - TED BUSINESS GROUP
JANUARY 8, 2008 - 7:00 P.M.
MEETING ROOMS A, B, C**

The following notes represent a general overview of the public comments and questions received at the January 8, 2008 75th Street Corridor Study public meeting. These notes are intended to provide a summary of the meeting only and do not represent verbatim minutes.

Staff present: Allison Laff, Planning Team Leader
Rory Fancler, Community Planner
Ying Liu, Community Planner
Therese Gallivan, Project Assistant

1. Welcome – 7:05 p.m.

Liu started the meeting by stating that public involvement is the key to a successful study. The project team was introduced. A question was asked if all voices would be heard or just Naperville residents. Laff mentioned that all voices will be heard. Residents expressed concern that the study could be skewed by outsiders. Laff commented that she does not think that will happen noting that it would be wonderful to receive a lot of response but that is not historically the case. Laff noted that the city historically has not received a lot of response from people that are impacted and she doubts that people that are not impacted will get involved.

A resident asked if the study is being funded just by Naperville. Laff confirmed and noted that an outside consulting firm has been hired (using City funds) by the City of Naperville to conduct a market study.

A suggestion from the audience to lessen the “noise” was to only allow people to comment online if they were to announce their address. Others in the audience felt that would not make a big difference. People would still be able to put in erroneous addresses/names.

A resident asked why was there not more advanced notice given to the public regarding this meeting. Liu responded that information was on the web site, notices were sent via e-mail and there was supposed to be an electronic sign on 75th Street. However, due to the weather, the sign kept falling down. The date for the next meeting, February 21, 2008 was announced to everyone at the meeting.

2. Introduction of Project –

Fancler proceeded with the introduction and explained that back in August, 2007 the City Council directed staff to update the East Sector Plan that was last updated in 1998. City Council directed staff to conduct a series of small area studies over the next five years. The small area studies would be a more efficient use of staff resources than a complete overhaul of the entire East Sector Plan. It would also provide more focused community involvement and a shorter planning process.

Fancler explained this meeting is being held to get initial public input on the strengths, constraints and future opportunities of the corridor. The scope of the study is primarily focused on an analysis of future land use for the parcels within the study boundary; however, transportation, vehicular and pedestrian access, utilities and aesthetic enhancement opportunities will be addressed.

It was noted that the next meeting, on February 21, will summarize the feedback that was received at this meeting and that it would be another opportunity for public involvement.

Fancler emphasized that this is an iterative planning process. Following the iterative planning process, staff will draft the 75th Street Corridor Study Report which will summarize the data collection, planning process, and final recommendations. This report will be presented to the Plan Commission, Transportation Advisory Board, and City Council – all of which will be public meetings, where the public will be invited to attend and provide testimony. Fancler noted no single factor will determine the results of this study. All of the data and public comments will be thoroughly evaluated.

3. SWOT Analysis –

After the introduction, Liu requested the public to review the SWOT worksheet and, individually, come up with strengths, weaknesses, threats and opportunities along the corridor. A question was asked that it was stated that the community will determine what happens and yet all voices will be heard? Laff again mentioned that she does not feel that people that are not affected will get involved.

It was also stated by a resident who lives in the Campus Green subdivision that the meeting was mentioned in the homeowner's association newsletter, mailed to approximately 200 people, and that she was the only one from that subdivision in attendance.

Approximately 15 minutes were spent in completing the worksheet.

4&5. Small Group Sharing and Discussion –

Fancler had the audience count off one to six. The public was then split into six small groups to discuss the results of the SWOT worksheet. They were asked to come up with common concerns. They were also asked to come up with an opportunity/solution, for each concern. After the small discussions were complete, each group should appoint someone to come up and share the results of that group's discussion. If there were conflicting opinions in a group, more than one person could present the different view points.

Small group discussions were held for approximately 25 minutes. After the small group discussions, the results were shared with the entire group.

6. Large Group Discussion –

The six groups presented their concerns and opportunities/solutions:

Group One	
<i>Concerns/Threats</i>	<i>Opportunities/Solutions</i>
Limited access on 4-lane 75 th Street	Limit curb cuts. Alternate access by creating frontage road.
Traffic	Construct interchange rather than intersection
Safety	Limit access (combine driveways and parcels)
Residential not appealing along 75 th Street	Additional buffer for residential use
Lack of green space	Add bike trails, parks, or sound wall.
Noise	Preserve the existing trees. Add professional landscaping along 75 th .
Animals – where will they go	Add green space.
Becoming another Ogden Avenue (ugly strip mall)	Keep residential zoning. Allow single-story professional office buildings with residential character.
Drainage	
Politics	Listen to the residents!

Group Two	
<i>Concerns/Threats</i>	<i>Opportunities/Solutions</i>
Lack of green space/natural resources (trees)/park. East Sector tremendously underserved by Park District properties.	Convert properties adjacent to Meadow Glens Park & 75 th and Naper to park/public enjoyment (Doing this would also reduce ingress/egress on 75 th).
Traffic (volume and density)	Limit commercial and preserve low density residential character.
Safety for students and pedestrian	Add a pedestrian overpass at 75 th and Washington. Add turning lanes.
Over Commercialization	Maintain existing land use

Group Three	
<i>Concerns/Threats</i>	<i>Opportunities/Solutions</i>
Loss of unique look of entrance to Naperville	More green space. Would rather have townhome development than commercial. Some of group 3 members were happy with the way things were and did not think anything needed to be changed.
Congestion	
Traffic Safety	
Invitation to criminal element	
“Domino” effect of commercial development	
Garbage	

Group Four	
<i>Concerns/Threats</i>	<i>Opportunities/Solutions</i>
Runaway retail (if commercial development begins, what is going to happen to existing residential?)	Limit commercial / maintain current use. Hobson Villas was brought up as a way to develop residential property along 75 th Street. Berms, landscaping and setbacks help to keep out the noise and are also aesthetically pleasing.
Loss of residential character	
Impact to neighboring properties	
RG Javorek, the owner of the property at the southwest corner of 75 th and Wehrli was in the group and also spoke. He stated that he does not believe every parcel along the corridor should be commercial. But there are right solutions for right parcels. He emphasized that communication and understanding is important and that everyone should keep an open mind and need to work together.	

Group Five	
<i>Concerns/Threats</i>	<i>Opportunities/Solutions</i>
Traffic Controls: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - volume of the traffic - speed - noise 	Allow for planned traffic controls: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - widen 75th Street - establish noise buffer - plan on lighted intersections to allow commercial development
75 th is county controlled	Work with DuPage County
Water drainage	Plan for water drainage control.
Water contamination of wells of unincorporated properties.	City has opportunity to provide controlled annexation and development of properties.
Land use	Residential plus limited commercial Additional development would help with the tax base. Convenience of having small centers available for residents. Planned development.

Group Six	
<i>Concerns/Threats</i>	<i>Opportunities/Solutions</i>
Land use change	Should be sensitive to existing land use. Should enforce transition or setback requirements. Maintain current zoning except at busy intersections specifically Wehrli & 75 th north of the SBC building.
Affordable Housing	Consideration of properties at Naper and Wehrli to provide affordable housing.
Fear of "Domino" effect of commercial	Buffer between commercial and residential

After the groups presented their results, there was time for questions and answers.

There was a question asked about setback requirements of Naperville vs. DuPage County and if the more conservative requirements can be used? Laff commented that if the city

requirements do not apply to unincorporated parcels. Laff mentioned that the city would look into what the county requirements were for setbacks.

A question was asked (based on Group 5 concerns/solutions) if there was a tax base problem? The speaker of that group said that they were not suggesting that there was a tax base problem but were stating that an increase in commercial and/or residential development would mean that there is more money going into the tax base.

A resident stated that when 75th Street was raised, the noise level for the homes along the road became much worse. Since the property is owned by the county, the city does not have control over the buffers.

A resident mentioned that the true issue is quality of life. What do you want to live in? What do you want to be surrounded by? If a commercial center is developed what does that do to the people behind that center? Liu mentioned that protecting and improving the quality of life is important to the city staff, and the study will consider the quality of life of residents near the study area.

Another participant mentioned that she was very concerned about Meadow Glen Park, which is the second busiest park in Naperville. All trees there were torn down, and there is no parking at that park. She expressed her frustration with the Park District and said that the Park District needs to have more parks in that section of Naperville. Laff noted that the Park District is an independent governmental body and that residents have the opportunity to voice their concerns to the Park District, through phone calls or by attending the Park District Board Meetings. Laff also mentioned that the Park District was interviewed by the City in reference to the study area.

The group requested the comments of this meeting be posted to the project web site. It was stated that communication of the meeting needs to go not only to the immediate corridor but also to adjoining communities.

7. Next Steps –

Liu closed the meeting with a few announcements:

- A public survey is now available online.
- Another public meeting will be held on February 21, 2008 at the Meadow Glen School, at which staff will share the results of tonight's meeting, interviews, direct mailed property owner survey, online survey and market study. Draft goals and objectives prepared based on public input will be presented for public review and comment.
- Participants can use the post-it notes and the issue bucket for any additional comments they may have.

8. Closing – 9:45 p.m.