

**VILLAGE OF WOODRIDGE  
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
MARCH 20, 2006**

5  
6 **V. CONSIDERATION OF A PROPOSED REZONING OF PROPERTY FROM THE DU**  
7 **PAGE COUNTY R-4 RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT AND VILLAGE OF WOODRIDGE R-1**  
8 **RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT CLASSIFICATIONS TO THE WOODRIDGE R-3 RESIDENTIAL**  
9 **DISTRICT CLASSIFICATION AND PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAT – OFFERMAN**  
10 **ESTATES SUBDIVISION – 5901 KATRINE AND 2615 59TH STREET – WOODGROVE,**  
11 **LLC**

12  
13 **PUBLIC HEARING**

14  
15 Chairman Zawacki called the Public Hearing to order at 7:41 PM, and reviewed the Rules  
16 of Procedure to be followed for the Public Hearing. He then asked the Plan Commission to  
17 consider the Rules of Procedure for the Hearing.

18  
19 **Commissioner Sydelko moved to adopt the Rules of Procedure, seconded by**  
20 **Commissioner Meiners.**  
21 **All in favor. The Motion carried.**

22  
23 **Applicants' Presentation:**

24  
25 Mr. Sven Dahlquist of SDA, Inc, Chicago, Illinois, said he was a management partner of  
26 Woodgrove LLC. He noted the presence of other representatives for the case. Chairman  
27 Zawacki asked that they all identify themselves and be sworn at one time.

28  
29 John Barry, consultant, 216 Marion, Oak Park  
30 Jeffrey Bock, management partner of Woodgrove LLC, of 1112 Woodcrest Dr., Downers  
31 Grove  
32 Kevin Gallaher, attorney with Dommermuth, Brestal, Cobine & West, 123 Water Street,  
33 Naperville, Illinois  
34 Theodore Feenstra, Jr., civil engineer, V3 Companies of Illinois, 7325 Janes Avenue,  
35 Woodridge,  
36 Brent A. Coulter, Coulter Transportation Consulting, OOC, 1524 Paula Avenue, Wheaton,  
37 IL

38  
39 Mr. Dahlquist said that they are asking for rezoning of this three-lot parcel on the border of  
40 Woodridge and Downers Grove. He said that they were present to respond to any  
41 questions from the Board at the conclusion of the Public Hearing.

42  
43 Chairman Zawacki then called upon anyone wishing to speak in support of the applicant's  
44 request, and called upon Staff to make its presentation first.

45  
46 **Staff's Presentation**  
47

1 Sara Hage said the applicant is requesting a rezoning of the property. She noted that the  
2 Commission had copies of her staff report and she then presented an overview of the  
3 project. This is an 8-acre site, planned with 23 lots for a single-family subdivision. There  
4 will be two outlots, one for stormwater management, and one for open space, to be  
5 maintained by a Homeowners' Association. She then used an overhead projection to  
6 describe the site. There are two residences on the property, one at 5901 Katrine, and one  
7 at 2615 59th Street. This development will also include a portion of 59<sup>th</sup> Street that has  
8 already been dedicated, and the proposal includes vacation of that right-of-way and  
9 rededication of the right-of-way in the center of the site.

10  
11 Ms. Hage then reviewed the planned zoning for the area, noting that the Village's  
12 Comprehensive Plan identifies the area for low-density residential development at 1-4  
13 dwelling units per acre. The proposed development would provide 2.86 dwelling units per  
14 acre. She described the surrounding zoning, saying a parcel to the north is R-6 in Downers  
15 Grove, and there are also several unincorporated lots. The proposed development will  
16 have an average of about 9,700 square feet per lot. She indicated that these three parcels  
17 present an anomaly in the area. These three parcels have remained undeveloped, and the  
18 proposal before the Commission would bring the properties more in line with the current  
19 fabric of the neighborhood. The development of this site has been contemplated for  
20 several years, and the Village and developer have gone to great lengths to work with the  
21 communities involved, including Lisle Township and the Village of Downers Grove.

22  
23 Ms. Hage said that the street grid was established in the 1920s, and various segments of  
24 the right-of-ways were dedicated in the 50s and 60s as well. It has been the plan from both  
25 the Village, the Township and Downers Grove, that a widened 59<sup>th</sup> Street would serve as a  
26 collector for these adjacent uses. The extension of I-355 precluded 59<sup>th</sup> Street from  
27 becoming a major collector similar to 75<sup>th</sup> Street. More recently, Staff and the developer  
28 have worked with Downers Grove to establish a boundary line agreement for this area.  
29 The property falls immediately to the south of Woodridge's boundary line agreement with  
30 Downers Grove, but follows the 59<sup>th</sup> Street right-of-way. They have worked with Downers  
31 Grove to coordinate the various street connections and utility issues. She said that the  
32 Comprehensive Long Range Land Use Plan has identified this area as single-family  
33 residential development.

34  
35 The developer has worked with the three communities to answer all requests and to  
36 respond to issues of the site and concerns of the neighbors, including tree preservation,  
37 existing fencing on the site, sewer provisions, driveway relocations, etc. For these reasons,  
38 the Staff supports the request for annexation and rezoning, and a preliminary plat of  
39 subdivision, and is satisfied that all major issues have been adequately addressed and the  
40 developer is prepared to move forward in the development process. Staff recommends  
41 approval of the rezoning and the preliminary plat of subdivision.

42  
43 Commissioner Burtnette asked about the two houses on the lots and whether they are  
44 occupied. Ms. Hage said they are not occupied, and the developer owns the entire site.

45  
46 Commissioner Meiners asked whose idea it was to extend 59<sup>th</sup> Street. Ms. Hage  
47 responded that it was the Village's. The developer came in with various cul de sac

1 provisions and an option of accessing the site from Walnut. It was important from public  
2 safety and public works standpoints that the Village could have direct access to the site for  
3 police and public works.  
4

5 Commissioner Meiners referred to page 2 of the report regarding a sanitary sewer issue  
6 and, on page three, a driveway relocated. He asked if the residents have agreed to the  
7 relocation and Ms. Hage said they have agreed. She said both the staff and the developer  
8 have been in contact with the residents in question. He pointed out the location of the  
9 driveway and the sanitary sewer stub.  
10

11 Chairman Zawacki said, for the record, that the contemplation of extending 59<sup>th</sup> Street  
12 began in the 1920s, was defined in the 50s and 60s, and it was always the intention of  
13 either the County, Downers Grove or Woodridge that from a planning standpoint to have  
14 that road extended. Ms. Hage said those dedications happened when the various  
15 properties were subdivided. These subject sites were the only remaining holdouts in that  
16 area.  
17

18 Commissioner Meiners asked if they always intended to continue 59<sup>th</sup> Street to the west,  
19 why was a bulb built at the end of the street as is done on a cul de sac. It leads the people  
20 living there to believe that they lived on a cul de sac instead of a dead end street. Ms.  
21 Hage said at that point in time there was no decision made and there were only two homes  
22 in the area. As is the Village's standard, they do not generally construct a street until there  
23 is a property owner who is willing to redevelop and there are more taxpayers supporting  
24 that extension of road.  
25

26 Commissioner Meiners said that they usually do not put a bulb at the end of a street. When  
27 people move onto a cul de sac they generally pay a premium to buy on a cul de sac, and  
28 now 30 years later they are going in and changing it to a thoroughfare. So if they knew this  
29 would be extended all along, why was the bulb put on the end. Ms. Hage said she could  
30 not speculate that other than they needed an appropriate turning radius at the end of the  
31 street to accommodate emergency vehicles. Commissioner Meiners said there are dead  
32 end streets all over town, and they have approved subdivisions with dead end streets. The  
33 people in this area are now being told that the cul de sac that they paid a premium for is no  
34 longer a cul de sac.  
35

36 Chairman Zawacki said he doesn't believe that's the issue. The reason for the cul de sac  
37 as mentioned by Ms. Hage could be to create an easier turning radius for resident and  
38 emergency vehicles. It's a good idea to have a cul de sac. He doesn't think there's a  
39 requirement regarding how a street terminates. He asked whether Mr. Coulter had any  
40 comments regarding that.  
41

42 Mr. Zill Khan, Village Engineer, responded that this is not the only location where there is a  
43 cul de sac at the end of the road planned for extension. Last year the Plan Commission  
44 made a recommendation for the Noble Woods subdivision which connected to the  
45 subdivision to the north, which developed 30 years ago and had a cul de sac at the end of  
46 the road. That road, Oak Tree Trail, is now being extended into the Noble Woods  
47 subdivision. One reason to have the cul de sac is to enable snowplows to more easily

1 navigate the area and for emergency vehicles as well. Ms. Hage verified that there was a  
2 bulb on the end of the street for Noble Woods and that the developer for the subdivision to  
3 the north did convey a small parcel to the Village so that Oak Tree Trail could be extended  
4 in the future.

5  
6 There being no further questions from the Commission at this time, Chairman Zawacki  
7 called for people who wished to support the applicant.

8  
9 Iris Nedas, a resident of 5875 Katrine Avenue, said that 600 feet of the southern border of  
10 her property is adjacent to the proposed Offerman Estates, and she would be in favor of the  
11 development if they resolved the following concerns: 1) she has an existing fence along  
12 the southern border of her property line and requested that the developer provide for a  
13 replacement fence; 2) in 1987 she paid for a stub for a sewer line that will be shut down  
14 and she requested that the developer provide replacement pipes to be located at the rear  
15 of her house to be able to connect to the sewer pipes now attached to the septic system in  
16 her back yard; 3) in 1987 field tiles were broken and the damage caused a lake to develop  
17 in the back yards of six families. When those tiles were finally replaced the flooding  
18 subsided and she requests that should there be tile damage again, the developer be  
19 responsible for replacement and repair; and 4) she is concerned about maintaining the  
20 topography of the land to facilitate the natural drainage of her property.

21  
22 Chairman Zawacki then called for anyone who wished to cross-examine the applicant or  
23 witnesses who testified in support of the applicant.

24  
25 Mr. Kevin Gallaher, attorney for the applicant, said that they have had discussions with Mrs.  
26 Nedas and have agreed to her requests.

27  
28 Chairman Zawacki then called for anyone who wanted to object to or oppose the proposed  
29 development. He said he would take comments on a row-by-row basis to assure not  
30 missing any testimony.

31  
32 Ms. Tracy Collins of 4652 Stonewall in Woodridge asked whether the sanitary sewer main  
33 is going to be moved. Ms. Hage said it will not be moved. The existing sewer line is in the  
34 59<sup>th</sup> Street right-of-way. Because the developer is relocating the right-of-way, the Village  
35 needs the sewer lines to be in a public right-of-way. The developer will abandon it and not  
36 dig it up, but will construct a new one and connect to the existing main. Ms. Collins asked  
37 whether they will have to be doing work on her property as a result of this development.  
38 Mr. Dahlquist responded nothing will have to be done to her property as the developer's  
39 work will remain within the site boundaries.

40  
41 Mr. William VanZoffen of 2720 Stonewall expressed concern with drainage as his property  
42 is lower than an adjacent area of the development. Chairman Zawacki explained that  
43 under the Stormwater Ordinance a development cannot increase the stormwater above the  
44 existing level in the surrounding area. In some cases the drainage improves because the  
45 developer controls the runoff from their properties. Ms. Hage then referred to the site plan  
46 showing how the water will be directed to run in a specified direction. She explained that  
47 the developer is proposing area drains along the northern edge of the property along the

1 existing right-of-way, along the new 59<sup>th</sup> Street and along the property's southern edge  
2 adjacent to Mr. VanZoffen's property. She noted that the stormwater management permit  
3 requires the developer to provide adequate drainage for the site as well as the entire 60  
4 acres area that drains into the site as identified in the stormwater management report.  
5

6 Ms. Jennifer Franza of Bristol Court at 5700 Walnut expressed concerns about traffic  
7 control signage, particularly with added traffic. Ms. Hage displayed a traffic pattern  
8 diagram. She explained that north of the development is outside of the Village of  
9 Woodridge and that Walnut Avenue is within the Village of Downers Grove's jurisdiction.  
10 Staff has worked with Downers Grove and, presently, that intersection does not warrant  
11 signage; but as soon as it meets the warrants, Downers Grove has indicated they would  
12 consider installing signage. The traffic situation will be monitored.  
13

14 Ms. Chris Blondin of 2700 Stonewall asked whether the developer has considered the  
15 impact this will have on the grade school, which is already overcrowded. She asked about  
16 lot sizes, including depth, and how utility lines will be brought into the area. Ms. Hage  
17 responded that the developer is responsible, per Code, to donate to both the Park District  
18 and the School District to meet the donation requirements. They provide a dollar amount  
19 for each school child and have a table to determine that cost. Regarding utilities, Ms. Hage  
20 showed the connections using the overhead and noted that the watermain is on the south  
21 side of Stonewall.  
22

23 In further response to Ms. Blondin, Ms. Hage said the donation requirement assume that  
24 homes will have four bedroom, three baths. Mr. Dahlquist added that the sites are being  
25 sold to individual developers and will be custom-built homes. Ms. Hage estimated a cost of  
26 about \$600,000 per home. In terms of lot size, Ms. Hage explained that there are specific  
27 dimensions and setbacks that must be met for particular zoning districts and they can build  
28 up to 50% of the lot.  
29

30 Mr. Randy Haubold of 5899 Walnut thanked Ms. Hage for the help she has extended to the  
31 residents. His driveway is in the 59<sup>th</sup> Street right-of-way and would probably have to be  
32 relocated. They would like to have that driveway kept clear. If 59<sup>th</sup> is improved he and his  
33 wife have the potential of subdividing their lot to obtain an extra lot from their property;  
34 however, the proposed plans would not allow them to do that. They're caught in a Catch-  
35 22. He's not against the development but has some concerns, which they would like to  
36 have addressed. He said they have spoken with the developers about assisting him in  
37 obtaining access to the rear of his lot and subdividing but he has not seen anything in  
38 writing. Chairman Zawacki said that this will be up before the Village Board for their final  
39 decision, but in the interim, he suggested that Mr. Haubold meet with Staff and with the  
40 developers to come to some compromise or understanding prior to the Village Board's  
41 decision.  
42

43 Mr. Alan Baldwin of 5873 Walnut expressed his concerns regarding the extension of 59<sup>th</sup>  
44 Street and why this is being done now. Ms. Hage explained that historically the land has  
45 been planned for a specific density and the extension of 59<sup>th</sup> Street has also been  
46 contemplated for many years. Mr. Baldwin asked that the Village and developer reconsider  
47 the extension. The properties in that area have an inherent value because they are in an

1 unincorporated and enclosed street. There will be a significant negative impact in terms of  
2 traffic and property value. Mr. Baldwin said that there are about 15 pre-school and  
3 elementary school children on Walnut and there are no sidewalks. Connecting 59<sup>th</sup> Street  
4 through would bring a significant increase in traffic and safety concerns for children and  
5 pedestrians. He asked that this be reconsidered.

6  
7 Mrs. Donna Pavlak of Clarendon Hills owns the bottom lot at the end of Lomond Avenue,  
8 adjacent to the development area. Her concern is that there is insufficient space between  
9 the homes and the property boundary. She asked that the developer put in a fence along  
10 the subdivision from Lomond to Katrine to protect the people on the north side. She said  
11 the developer said they plan to perhaps put in vegetation, but children and dogs can get  
12 through to the property easily without fencing. She also asked about the fire hydrants and  
13 whether they will be capped and put on the Woodridge side. Ms. Hage said she did not  
14 believe the Lomond one is planned for relocation but she is certain the one on Katrine is  
15 being relocated. Ms. Hage then confirmed that the one on Lomond is not planned for  
16 relocation at this time.

17  
18 Mr. Louing resides on Lomond, which is a dead end street. He noted that 59<sup>th</sup> Street to the  
19 east dead ends into woods. If they relocate 59<sup>th</sup> Street they owe the people who own those  
20 lots a letter stating that they would be landlocked and would be losing large sums of money  
21 because of this as they would be unable to subdivide their lots. He further discussed the  
22 issue of the abandonment of the right-of-way, which would affect the rear property line of  
23 some buildings. Chairman Zawacki asked what area the gentleman was talking about. Mr.  
24 Louing said the Village should be honest about what is being done. His concern is where  
25 the property line will end up if 59<sup>th</sup> Street is vacated. Ms. Hage said the property line for  
26 those homes will stay exactly where it is and that they will share a property line with the  
27 homes proposed for this subdivision. She also showed how the utility connections are  
28 planned using the overhead projection.

29  
30 Mr. Roger Tagtmeier of 2536 Jackson asked the time frame for the project and how  
31 construction traffic would access the site. Mr. Dahlquist expected that work could begin in  
32 August. Ms. Hage said that 22 of the 23 lots have a deposit on them already. She  
33 explained that construction traffic would most likely travel down Walnut. Mr. Khan, of the  
34 Village, noted that the ideal location for construction traffic would be down Maple onto  
35 southbound Walnut. Mr. Tagtmeier said he is for development and growth but if they don't  
36 retain the roadway as a cul de sac it will be nothing but a thoroughfare. He recommended  
37 that blockades be put in place. He encouraged that the traffic pattern be studied.

38  
39 Mr. Mike Santeen of 2712 Stonewall Avenue said that his lot is lower than the property  
40 behind him. He questioned the drainage pattern and asked that they look closely at the  
41 topography. Mr. Santeen also said it will be a shame to lose all of the trees to the property  
42 behind him. He does not have a basement or a sump pump. He asked how he could  
43 possibly sell his property knowing that \$600,000+ homes are going in there. This will result  
44 in knockdowns and asked what the developers or Commission would do if this were their  
45 property. Commissioner Meiners said he would buy a home like this because it will only  
46 improve the future worth of his property. Mr. Santeen said he is concerned about having  
47 these homes looking down on him and about potential flooding. Ms. Hage again showed

1 the drainage plan for the site, saying there will be no additional runoff coming to his  
2 property.

3  
4 Ms. Hage added that the developers have committed to not disrupt the rear property line of  
5 vegetation and keep as much natural growth in the area as they can. There are  
6 requirements for the developer to survey trees of certain sizes. They plan to keep several  
7 of these trees, but need to re-evaluate the tree preservation when they complete the final  
8 grading and engineering.

9  
10 There were questions raised by Mr. Santeen regarding the Lockformer settlement that  
11 concerned possible contamination of water on the existing properties and whether this  
12 possible contamination would present problems later on. Mr. Gallaher said that the  
13 developer completed a Phase I environmental report and are satisfied with it, but they will  
14 comply with all the requirements of the Village in regards to stormwater and environmental  
15 issues. Mr. Khan said that he is not aware of any issue concerning these lots. There was  
16 further discussion concerning this situation and Mr. Meiners asked the reason for the  
17 settlement. Commissioner Caprio said he recalled that it had to do with solvents seeping  
18 into the aquifer some years ago. The possibility of damage was determined to be minimal.  
19 Mr. Gallaher, the developer's attorney, responded that they do not believe this is a potential  
20 problem for their development.

21  
22 Mr. Santeen then asked for an explanation of what the easement, which runs through his  
23 side yard, will mean. Ms. Hage said that the easement gives the Village the right to install  
24 and maintain utilities in that area. Mr. Khan added that the developer is being asked to  
25 make a connection to the existing watermain on Stonewall. The extension of the  
26 watermain will run along the east side of his lot. There will be very little disruption to his  
27 property. The watermain will be pushed from 59<sup>th</sup> Street all the way to the cul de sac where  
28 the existing fire hydrant is on Stonewall and they will tap into the existing well.

29  
30 Mr. Richard Weber of 2521 W. 59<sup>th</sup> Street commended Ms. Hage for her responsiveness to  
31 his calls and e-mails. His concerns are the change in an existing traffic pattern that has  
32 been in operation for 37 years since the last houses were completed in Winston Hills. His  
33 home is about three homes east of the cul de sac on 59<sup>th</sup> Street. He referenced the traffic  
34 study completed by Coulter Consultants, stating their prediction of 530-572 vehicles per  
35 day would be a ten-fold increase. He asked that they consider extending 59<sup>th</sup> Street for the  
36 new homes but create a cul de sac at the west end of the extended street to limit the new  
37 traffic. That would eliminate any new traffic on Walnut Street and would prevent changes  
38 to the current traffic flow which has existed for over 30 years. He said he thought this  
39 would also increase the values of the homes because most people would pay a premium  
40 for a house on a cul de sac. Mr. Weber said he discussed this with Mr. Dahlquist who  
41 indicated that the developer would prefer to have a cul de sac as it enhances their  
42 development. Mr. Weber then recommended that if necessary, they could create an  
43 emergency access to Walnut Avenue for fire trucks or other public safety vehicles while still  
44 maintaining the cul de sac closure. Mr. Weber pointed out that the street grid was  
45 established in 1922 and he gave an historical overview of 59<sup>th</sup> Street. He asked that the  
46 Commission and Village look to the present time and not to a grid established in 1922. Mr.  
47 Weber then asked what the Village's main purpose in connecting the streets. Ms. Hage

1 said the primary issue would be opening up the grid to the network of traffic. That would  
2 include relieving pressure on the homes on Elinor and others who are being inundated with  
3 traffic from both Woodridge and Downers Grove. Some are half streets only 14 feet wide.  
4 She clarified that according to the traffic opinion, the majority of the traffic is not going to be  
5 coming down his street, but that the traffic flow will be split pretty evenly. It is a traffic flow  
6 that the Village has long been planning for and 59<sup>th</sup> Street was originally constructed to  
7 handle that type of traffic.

8  
9 Mr. Joe Radous of 2517 59<sup>th</sup> Street spoke in support of the remarks made by Mr. Weber  
10 concerning retention of a cul de sac at the west end of 59<sup>th</sup> Street. He described the present  
11 traffic situation and cars that race down 59<sup>th</sup> Street, do a U-turn and race back. He believes  
12 the proposal for this extension would create a much heavier traffic zone and suggested that  
13 speed bumps be placed on 59<sup>th</sup> Street to slow down the drivers who will still try and speed  
14 through. He added that having the cul de sac is a great deterrent for criminals as well,  
15 since they would avoid being trapped in that street.

16  
17 Mr. Don Quist of 2423 59<sup>th</sup> Street favors the cul de sac because of the increased traffic that  
18 would come off Maple in the mornings. The extension will provide a block and a half of 40  
19 mph traffic. The speed is his primary concern. People rarely stop at the existing stop sign  
20 at 59<sup>th</sup> and Elinor and never stop at Jackson. This has been a cul de sac for 40 years and  
21 emergency vehicles have had no problems in that time. He asked why there is now a  
22 concern for emergency vehicles.

23  
24 Mr. Nick Manula of Downers Grove identified himself as a contract purchaser for one of the  
25 lots and stated he learned a lot tonight. The traffic pattern concept is new information to  
26 him and it is a concern. He said that it appears as though the increased flow of traffic may  
27 be significant on 59<sup>th</sup> Street. He is anxious to get started, but doesn't think that is a good  
28 reason to not do the best thing for the residents on 59<sup>th</sup> Street. He doesn't feel extending  
29 59<sup>th</sup> Street is the best thing for the residents.

30  
31 Robb McGinnis, a resident of Elinor Street said they get about 1,400 cars per day and if  
32 they have the extension put through and it takes even a third of that amount away from  
33 their street it would be a great help. The streets were not built for that kind of traffic.

34  
35 Chairman Zawacki called for any cross-examination of the comments made.

36  
37 Mr. Sven Dahlquist said for the record that they have met with residents Iris Nedas and  
38 Randy Haubold who raised concerns about the project and have addressed those  
39 concerns. He submitted written responses into the record. He had no summation.

40  
41 There being no further comments, Chairman Zawacki called for a Motion to close the Public  
42 Hearing.

43  
44 **Commissioner Meiners moved, seconded by Commissioner Caprio to close the**  
45 **public hearing.**

46 **All in favor. The Motion passed.**

1 Chairman Zawacki adjourned the public hearing at 9:39 PM.

2  
3 **Review and Consideration**

4  
5 Commissioner Krywaruczenko asked about the traffic counts and whether they were  
6 accurate.

7  
8 Mr. Brent Coulter explained the process in obtaining the figures, saying they observed  
9 traffic along Elinor as it came up from Jackson and 59<sup>th</sup> Street, and traffic turning in and out  
10 of College. Based on that information they were able to make projections with the  
11 extension of 59<sup>th</sup> Street to Walnut as to what kind of traffic they expect to see on Walnut.  
12 They have traffic on the existing streets traveling north from Jackson to Maple, using Elinor,  
13 or the combination of Elinor, College and Walnut. He described the traffic pattern further  
14 with the extension of 59<sup>th</sup> Street, noting the information was all specified in their report.

15  
16 Mr. Coulter said two other components of traffic on 59<sup>th</sup> Street are the traffic from the  
17 existing 10-11 homes and the added traffic from the new subdivision. If they were to add  
18 up trip generation from 23 new lots and the 11 existing lots, the total expected daily traffic  
19 from those 34 units would be 405 vehicles per day. With a cul de sac, all of that traffic  
20 would be directed to the east and the Elinor intersection anyway. Opening both ends of  
21 59<sup>th</sup> Street provides all the users of both the new and existing units the option of either  
22 Street. He reiterated that the numbers that were quoted in the projections with a  
23 connection to Walnut are accurate.

24  
25 For clarification, Mr. Coulter said that the right turn volume off Elinor onto Maple is higher  
26 than the left turn volume at that location.

27  
28 Commissioner Caprio asked whether Mr. Coulter thought the cul de sac would cause  
29 undue hardship and Mr. Coulter responded that if all the homes were forced to travel east  
30 to Elinor, the volumes on 59<sup>th</sup> Street would not be substantially different than with the  
31 connection to Walnut Avenue on the west side. Additionally, he said 500 vehicles per day  
32 is about the average for a municipal street based on local and collector classification.  
33 Maximum volume of local streets is 900-1000 vehicles, which is considered "comfortable."

34  
35 Chairman Zawacki asked if Mr. Coulter saw the opening of 59<sup>th</sup> Street to Walnut increasing  
36 traffic in that area and Mr. Coulter said he did not. He indicated that the best practice in  
37 subdivision design is to have streets connected to the grid and would testify to that effect.

38  
39 Chairman Zawacki said he is trying to look at which will be better or worse and as far as he  
40 can tell from the testimony, opening up 59<sup>th</sup> Street would be an overall better solution.

41  
42 Mr. Khan said that one of the primary goals of civil engineers and traffic engineers is to  
43 move traffic safely and efficiently. The extension and connection of 59<sup>th</sup> Street will  
44 accomplish those two objectives.

45  
46 Commission Caprio asked if the developer would prefer to install a cul de sac. In response  
47 to Commissioner Caprio's question, Mr. Dahlquist said that, in the interest of time, they

1 would prefer to move forward with the existing plans and if the proposal is approved, they  
2 anticipate submitting the bidding for construction in July. One lot has not been sold. He  
3 would expect about a year and a half before the homes would be completed.

4  
5 Commissioner Meiners said that these infill developments in the middle of the city are the  
6 most difficult things to deal with because they impact so many people and yet the  
7 developer still has the right to develop his property. He pointed out to the public that this is  
8 a difficult decision for the Commission to make as well.

9  
10 Chairman Zawacki then called for Motions on the rezoning and approval of the preliminary  
11 plat of subdivision.

12  
13 **Commissioner Sydelko moved to recommend that the Plan Commission recommend**  
14 **to the Mayor and Village Board of Trustees approval of the rezoning of the three**  
15 **parcels, including the adjacent 59<sup>th</sup> Street right-of-way, to the Woodridge R-3**  
16 **Residential District zoning classification. Commissioner Meiners seconded the**  
17 **Motion.**

18 **All in favor. The Motion passed unanimously.**

19  
20 **Commissioner Burtnette moved that the Plan Commission recommend to the Mayor**  
21 **and Village Board of Trustees approval of a Preliminary Plat of Subdivision with a**  
22 **certain variation from the Subdivision Regulations, subject to Plans 1-4 on page 7 of**  
23 **Staff's Memorandum dated March 20, 2006, and subject to the five conditions on**  
24 **page 8 of Staff's aforesaid Memorandum, and subject to the variation to allow the**  
25 **construction of a 60' feet right-of-way as opposed to the required 66' right-of-way.**  
26 **Commissioner Caprio seconded the Motion.**

27  
28 Commissioner Meiners said he would like to explore the option of putting in the cul de sac.  
29 He asked if the Commission would want to discuss that further and delay the vote.

30  
31 Chairman Zawacki asked Commissioners Burtnette and Caprio if they wished to rescind  
32 their Motion and Second. Commissioner Burtnette said she feels that according to the  
33 information provided in the traffic study, 59<sup>th</sup> Street should go through and she does not  
34 wish to rescind her Motion. She believes this would also provide a better situation for the  
35 people on Elinor. Commissioner Caprio said he would also hold to his Second of the  
36 Motion.

37  
38 Chairman Zawacki called for a vote on the Motion.

39  
40 **AYES: Commissioners Burtnette, Caprio, Krywaruczenko, Sydelko, Chairman**  
41 **Zawacki**

42 **NAYS: Commissioner Meiners**

43 **The Motion passed 5:1.**