

**NAPERVILLE DOWNTOWN ADVISORY
COMMISSION MEETING SUMMARY - UNAPPROVED
September 11, 2017 – 3:30 P.M. – NEU CONFERENCE ROOM**

Call to Order	Time:		3:35 pm	
I. Roll Call Commissioners:	Present:		Yes	No
	Steven Rubin		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Benny White, City Councilman		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Patty Gustin, City Councilman		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Marcie Schatz		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Peggy Frank		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Richard Hitchcock		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Christine Jeffries		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Joseph Costello, Jr.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Katie Wood		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Tony Zangler		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Tom Miers		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Brien Nagle		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Student Members			
	Rekha Iyer		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Ryan Miller		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Harvey Alvarado		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Staff Present:	TED –Allison Laff, Bill Novack, Jennifer Louden, Ashley Hagen, Amy Emery, Yifang Lu			
	<p>Advisory Commission on Disabilities: Barbara Stark Mike Briggs Michael Heyden</p> <p>Accessible Community Task Force: Mary Hamill Chris Murphy Gary Smith</p> <p>Senior Task Force: Jim Hill Carl Skrabacz</p> <p>Julie Rothenfluh, Naperville Public Library Debbie Grinnell, Naper Settlement Carl Peterson & Monica Gasteroni, Gary R. Weber Associates Art & Cindy Swanson</p>			

	<p>Crys Hum AnnaMarie Kissel</p>
II. Approval of Meeting Summaries	
5/11/17 Summary	<p>Commission noted two corrections: (1) Meeting date should be 5/11/17; (2) Final page of minutes: change “from parallel to angle” to “from angle to parallel”.</p> <p>Motion By: Zangler Second By: Nagle</p> <p>Minutes approved (7-0).</p>
III. Discussion Topics	
Washington Street Bridge	<p>Carl Peterson and Monica Gasteroni, Gary R. Weber Associates, provided an overview of the design ideas for the Washington Street Bridge.</p> <p>Zangler – what is the width of the sidewalk? Consultant noted that there is 6’ wide concrete sidewalk with a 2’ wide adjacent paver strip.</p> <p>Gustin – do we expect that the downtown will expand south past Aurora Avenue? If so, should the gateway monument be moved further south? Jeffries noted that she prefers the proposed location, it is symbolic and helps people to understand that they’ve arrived to the downtown area.</p> <p>Wood – supports the gateway features. Is the proposed bridge wider than the existing? Lu – yes, we will be adding a lane for a total of 5 lanes. Novack provided additional information about IDOT requirements for consistent lane widths approaching and leaving bridges.</p> <p>Hitchcock – is it contemplated that the center lane will be used for turn-lane stacking? Novack indicated that the turn lane for Burger King and Chicago/Washington will encroach into the bridge area. Hitchcock noted that it may be nice to include a median, where possible, whether landscaped or pavement.</p> <p>Hill noted concerns with the arched gateway, as it may be distracting to drivers and may become a safety hazard.</p> <p>Rubin requested clarification regarding the remaining process for public input. Novack clarified that additional public meetings are scheduled; the current project represents Phase I engineering.</p> <p>Hamill – what materials are proposed along the sidewalk? Consultant noted that it will match the proposed downtown streetscape. Novack noted that it will be brick paver. Hamill noted concerns with potential for uneven surface of the brick paver as it may impact persons with disabilities.</p> <p>Hitchcock moved that Option B be supported with refinements, including a taller</p>

<p><i>Downtown Streetscape</i></p>	<p>column and incorporation of “downtown” wording in the sign. Hitchcock noted that the arch proposed in Option A will be out of scale given the width of Washington.</p> <p>Nagle noted concerns with the proposed location of the entryway feature as it excludes JC Licht. Walgreens and Water Street. Rubin noted that Aurora Avenue is the fixed southern edge of the downtown. Commissioners agreed that it would make sense to locate the gateway feature on the south end of the bridge (vs. the center bump outs as currently proposed).</p> <p>Rubin questioned if the bump outs could be enlarged to be consistent with those included on the Main Street Bridge.</p> <p>Hitchcock withdrew his motion for additional discussion.</p> <p>Rubin noted that DAC supports the overall design and feel of the proposed improvements. Additional refinements need to be made; however, the designs are moving in the right direction overall. Jeffries noted that she is opposed to the brick in the walkway area.</p> <p>Lu noted that the public open house is in Meeting Room A on Wednesday, September 20th. Online comments will also be opened on the same date.</p> <p>DAC indicated that they would like to review this again. Novack provided additional information regarding timing of the overall project, as well as coordination with the pending streetscape project.</p> <p>Hagen provided an overview of the project to date, including background, DAC discussions, and public input received to date.</p> <p>Jeffries noted that she prefers Option 2.</p> <p>Those in attendance discussed the details of the various options as they pertain to the tactile warning strips, ease for use by those with disabilities, and curbing. Hitchcock noted that the illustrations are prototypes, but each intersection will have its own distinct design requirements.</p> <p>Hagen noted that the sidewalk width will range from 6’ to 10’ depending on available right-of-way. Skrabacz noted his concerns that if the concrete narrows, the brick (e.g., amenity zone) will not narrow and he does not find that that design helps those with disabilities. Hagen noted that the plan is to provide as wide of a pedestrian walkway as possible and shrink the amenity zone when needed. Novack noted that sidewalk widths will vary in the downtown.</p> <p>Hitchcock noted that this group should establish a desired sidewalk width that should be sought to be provided and that the amenity zoned be established in any remaining</p>
---	---

area.

Louden noted that the concrete walkway is the priority in all of the proposed designs. Hagen noted that the majority of the downtown will fall into the “downtown narrow” and “downtown base” categories (6’ to 8’, respectively).

Hill requested clarification about the areas recommended for widening/removal of parallel parking. Hill noted that drop-offs are difficult with parallel parking.

Briggs requested clarification regarding the proposed Option 1 and Option 2.

Skrabacz believes that the location of the truncated domes in Option 3 are a safer design than those placed in Options 1 and 2 because they appear to align with the crosswalk direction.

Resident Hum noted that those in attendance with disabilities should be asked for their input on the proposed design.

Heyden noted his feeling that concrete is a superior material to use instead of bricks; he believes that Option 2 is a good solution and addresses the issues raised at the ACD meeting.

Briggs asked Cindi Swanson for feedback on the proposed design in Option 1 as it relates to the brick band adjacent to the curb. Swanson provided background and input regarding truncated domes and their use by persons with visual impairments; discussion points included a service animal’s training related use of the domes to stop and direct those with visual impairments to the path of travel. Swanson noted that this may be confusing depending on the location of the dome in the sidewalk area.

Murphy noted that while older versions of brick sidewalks were difficult to maneuver due to settling, newer brick areas do not appear to cause the same problem. Louden noted that the proposed brick is a significant improvement from prior technology and the amenity zone is not intended to carry walking traffic like the pedestrian sidewalk is.

Gustin asked for feedback on the accessibility of stamped concrete. While there weren’t any major concerns from those in attendance, Louden noted that staff did not recommend the use of stamped concrete due to long term maintenance/replacement concerns. Swanson noted that, in her opinion, stamped concrete presents similar issues as brick pavers.

Zangler made a motion to use concrete through the corners (Option 2). Wood seconded. The ACD, ACTF, and STF members in attendance agreed that this addresses their concerns. All agreed, given the uniqueness of each intersection, additional details will need to be engineered related to the exact placement of tactile

	domes and colors of design amenities to benefit users. DAC agreed unanimously (vote 7-0).
IV. Correspondence / Updates	
	None
V. Adjournment	Motion to Adjourn Approved unanimously.
Adjourned	5:19 p.m.