

**5<sup>th</sup> Avenue Development Steering Committee Meeting Summary  
September 23, 2019**

**STEERING COMMITTEE PRESENT:**

Councilman Kelly, Councilwoman Brodhead, Dr. Bob Buckman, Marybeth Box, Thom Higgins,  
Jim Hill, Jessica Lyzun, Jim Ruhl, Mark Trembacki, Katie Sowa, Laura Zeman

**RYAN COMPANIES TEAM:**

Jim McDonald, Brent Bunke, Curt Pascoe, Brandon Raymond, Lon Stousland, Kyle Schott,  
Dan Walsh, Rory Fancler (Kimley Horn)

**CITY STAFF PRESENT:**

City Manager Krieger, DiSanto, Emery, Laff, Loudon, Mayer Schatz

**PUBLIC ATTENDEES:**

Kathy Benson	Allison Lougenbaugh	Jim Schanchuck
Barbara Benson	Tim Messer	Mary Stoltenberg-Smith
Susan Breen	Sharon Neuman	Anne Swanson
Julie Camson	Dominic Nugent	Jennifer Taylor
Jeffrey Havel	Todra Oker	Rob Williams
Jayne Koller	Rob Pecak	Ed Williams
James Koller	Amy Phillips	
Bill Lannin	Becky Rudolph	

**1. Call to Order**

Doug Krieger opened the Steering Committee meeting and provided an overview of the project timeline noting that while the City Council is expecting this item on the October 1, 2019 agenda, the Steering Committee should take the time that they need to discuss this project. If needed, this item can be moved to the October 15, 2019 City Council agenda.

**2. Roll Call**

Krieger introduced City staff, including Allison Laff, Marcie Schatz, Rachel Mayer, Mike DiSanto, and Jennifer Loudon. Krieger also introduced Jim McDonald, Ryan Companies; Ryan Team present included Lon Stousland, Brett Bunke, Dan Walsh, Brandon Raymond, Kyle Schott, and Curt Pascoe, as well as Rory Fancler from Kimley Horn.

Amy Emery introduced herself and her role as facilitator of the Steering Committee meeting and the plan for tonight's meeting. Emery emphasized that the purpose of tonight's meeting is to provide feedback to the City Council on the baseline concept. The Steering Committee will not approve or deny the development tonight. Emery noted that all parties acknowledge that there are concerns with the baseline concept – those concerns will not be resolved at tonight's meeting. Tonight, the question is whether there is enough support for the baseline concept to move to the next step where additional data will be gained to address the concerns that have been raised.

### 3. Review Baseline Concept Presentation Public Meeting

Emery opened the floor to the Steering Committee for big picture feedback regarding the September 19, 2019 public meeting:

Jim Hill noted that he does not agree with concerns raised that placing all affordable units in one building stigmatizes those residents. However, he would like to understand the rationale behind the proposed affordable design. Dan Walsh, Ryan Companies, noted they are striving to hit the 20% affordable housing goal established by the Housing Advisory Commission and the City Council. Ryan believes that the most sustainable and financially feasible way to meet that goal is through a tax credit project; this is most achievable when all units are placed in one building. The proposed design also helps to create a community within a community, as well as assure that the building is maintained at an affordable level for a significant period of time.

Thom Higgins asked if the proposed affordable units will be senior; Emery and Walsh noted that this decision has not yet been made – it could be senior or family focused.

Brodhead noted that both the prior and current City Council are committed to the affordable component within this development. Brodhead was concerned with some comments expressed at the public meeting regarding affordable units. This building would be included within the overall PUD and built at the same time. Brodhead expressed that there is a real need for additional affordable units in Naperville; while it would be great if these units were spread out over the development, she would not want to lose the units if the single-building approach is the only one viable.

Marybeth Box noted that her neighbors are very concerned with the addition of low-income housing in their neighborhood. Concentrated housing of this type does not work – it needs to be spread out within the development. Why does the 20% even need to be met within this area if the City is not requiring it in all developments citywide?

Kelly – on the question of senior vs. family – is there a financing difference between the two? Kelly believes that senior housing makes more sense at this property as it does not add commuting traffic. McDonald noted that there may be more federal support if family affordable is proposed; Walsh noted that they will know more in the next 30 days.

Kelly asked if Ryan has a good idea of what percentage of units are affordable in the current proposal? Walsh noted that there are 275-300 market rate units; 50-70 affordable units; 20-25 workforce; and 30-35 rowhomes. In total, 300-335 market rate units are proposed, 20% of which would be 70 units. Kelly noted that he does not believe that workforce units should be counted towards the affordable goal.

Jessica Lyzun asked for clarification regarding affordable vs. workforce. Lyzun also noted that she has received feedback that the affordable units should not all be placed in one building.

Dr. Bob Buckman reiterated the financial benefits of including all affordable units in one building.

#### 4. Baseline Concept Discussion and Recommendations

At the conclusion of the general discussion, Emery noted that the Steering Committee will now move on to the table of summary recommendations and provided an overview of how the discussion will occur.

Higgins noted concerns that the table is too restricted in terms of discussion points. Emery explained that this is purposeful in order to respond to Council direction and help move this project to the baseline concept. Higgins noted that he understands, but disagrees, with that approach. He believes that the discussion needs to be brought back to the foundational element of this property serving as a commuter train station – is this development meeting that need?

In response, Emery noted that the group should start at **#8 (Multi-Modal Accessibility and Commuter Experience)**.

Steering Committee Comments:

- Train Station/Commuting need to be primary use. Some raised concerns that this is not the case with the proposed design, particularly related to proposed commuter parking locations. Others noted that the proposed design will offer additional parking opportunities beyond those that exist today.
- Traffic and commuter experience resulting from the proposed design needs to be studied, particularly due to potential increase in commuter parking spaces. The focus needs to be on a positive commuter experience (less traffic and congestion, ease of access in and out, access to a variety of parking types, etc.). Some noted that they do not believe that the proposed design will have a negative impact on the existing commuter experience.
- How is an enhanced commuter experience defined? This likely means different things to different commuters – how will we determine what is an acceptable/desirable “enhancement”?
- Some noted that commuters are a consideration in the project design, but not the sole or primary focus. A proposed redevelopment plan should focus on attempting to reduce parking demand (ride-sharing, use of buses, shifting to Route 59 station, etc.), not adding 1,200 additional parking spaces.
- The kiss & ride seems inefficient and is not located in close enough proximity to the train station.

#### **#4 (Parking)**

Steering Committee Comments:

- Regarding on-street parking, pedestrian safety is a top priority for Park Addition residents. As a result, they would support a significant reduction in on-street parking along 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue. If parking is removed, the street design would need to be addressed to reduce vehicular speed (bump outs, boulevard, speed bumps).
- Removal of on-street parking would also apply to Spring Avenue due to children walking to school in this area.
- Concerns also raised regarding commuter/parking conflicts resulting from proposed location of the commuter parking.
- Concerns raised regarding the proximity of the increased commuter parking on the DCM lot to Washington Junior High.

Emery noted that the Ryan will do an analysis of the parking required per code (non-commuter) vs. parking proposed to be provided.

Motion: **Does the Steering Committee agree that an additional 250-400 commuter parking spaces should be included as part of the baseline concept? Yes (6-3).** Higgins, Hill, and Lyzen opposed. Those opposed felt that the provision of additional parking spaces is not appropriate given discussions under #8 above. Others voted in favor of additional parking simply as a means to better understand traffic which would result from these extra parking spaces.

### **#3 (Plaza)**

Steering Committee Comments:

- Questions were raised as to the setback of the proposed plaza space to the train tracks (Ryan noted that the planter area is approximately 20' wide and its southern edge is approximately 25' to the train track).
- Plaza design works for today, but will it work for tomorrow's needs? Concerns also raised that the plaza will not appeal to some in the neighborhood due to adjacency to the tracks.
- Appreciation that the accessible ramps have been incorporated into the open space and have been made integral to the design (vs. as an afterthought). It was noted that the grade of the ramps is a far more important consideration than the distance that the user will have to travel.
- Where will the accessible parking spaces be located? This is an important consideration and needs to be conveniently located.
- The plaza, while beautiful, is unfortunately located on existing prime commuter parking spaces. What takes priority? Is there a possibility to provide commuter parking adjacent to the tracks and make the open space more centrally located? Ryan noted that the open plaza will help the adjacent retail, takes advantage of the sun, and opens views to the train station. Committee members asked about the potential for underground parking to address both goals.
- Concerns raised regarding the large amount of concrete in the plaza area. Recommendation to increase green space and possibly introduce a water feature.
- Concerns raised that Kendall Park has not been identified for stormwater improvements to support Pilgrim's Addition. Ryan noted that neither Kendall Park nor SD203 property along Mill Street are included within the limits of the project. Emery noted that the Committee could make a recommendation to include this area within the project scope.

Motion: **Lyzen recommended that Kendall Park be included within the baseline concept for purposes of mitigating stormwater within Pilgrim's Addition** (note: park usability would not be impacted as detention not retention is sought). **Approved (7-2).** Hill and Sowa opposed. Those in favor of the motion noted that now is the time to solve for these issues. Those opposed to the motion indicated that this property is under a long-term lease to the Park District City, can be addressed without the 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue Project proposal, should in fairness be weighted against other stormwater projects in the City, and should therefore be addressed separately from this project.

### **#6 (Traffic & Walkability)**

Steering Committee Comments:

- Noted that walkability has been a critical focus from the on-set of the project and should be a clear focus area within any traffic study as the project moves forward.
- Members noted that all school walk routes in the area should be studied to ensure no conflicts.
- All generally seemed supportive of proposed pedestrian crossing; however, some requested that the City work with BNSF to determine if the pedestrian crossing location will be impeded by the existing location of their signals.

- Concerns with the conflict that may arise between cars exiting the DCM lot to Spring Avenue; also concerns regarding the proposed location of mid-block crossings.

**Motion: Do you agree that the baseline concept should include a pedestrian crossing (tunnel) for additional study? Yes (9-0)**

### **#7 (Financials)**

Emery noted that a vote is not needed on #7. The City's advocate will need to do additional work on this item once additional information is available.

Steering Committee Comments:

- Has Ryan made any assumptions as to what costs/improvements that the City will be responsible for? Is the density proposed directly resulting from the need to cover public improvement costs? Ryan noted that decisions related to public improvement costs have not yet been made but will be refined moving forward once a baseline is established.

### **#2 (Greenspace)**

Emery noted that a vote is not needed on #2. Emery reiterated the public comment received with respect to #2 (i.e., impact on Burlington Park and pre/post greenspace amounts) and noted that these items will be further studied with the baseline concept.

**Sowa exited the meeting.**

### **#1 (Land Use & Density)**

Steering Committee Comments:

- Concerns raised regarding the amount of office space proposed (100,000 square feet). This increases density, height, traffic, parking, etc. The demand does not seem to align with current trends in the market (i.e., large corporations moving back to Chicago). Others noted that some office space is critical if there is a desire to have a mix of uses and create a successful development, particularly as office employees support retail in the daytime. Others noted support for office but preferred if it were reduced in amount/height.
- Concerns were shared in relation to the height and density of the overall development. Some concern was raised that it is significantly larger than the downtown. Others noted that the residential height/density on the Water Tower lot is not a concern.
- As a point of reference it was noted by Brodhead that the existing 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue Station building has 118 apartment units and does not appear too intense; it also only generates two students to SD203 (note: Ellsworth Condos generates zero students). For this reason, support was expressed by some for the residential proposed.
- Certain members noted a preference to take an approach going forward to start at a lower density and determine the impact and whether the density needs to be increased at that point (vs. starting high and lowering later).
- Opinions on height varied. Some committee members expressed concerns with the height. Others explained that the height is not a concern, but rather the density is the concern (due to traffic, parking, and sustainability impacts – i.e., there should be less reliance on cars).
- There was a comment that an additional 250 commuter spaces will be added to this area in October 2019 on the former Public Works Lot.

Motion: **The baseline concept continue to include the mix of uses shown moving forward. Approved (7-1).** Hill opposed the motion. The vote in opposition was based on the amount of office included.

Motion: **The baseline concept is a reasonable starting point for additional study and consideration. Approved (7-1).** Box voted against the motion.

#### 5. *Public Comment*

Rob Pecak – 215 Center Street: currently impacted by commuter traffic. His concerns include: (1) Segregating people by income is not a good idea – opposed to all affordable housing in one location. If it cannot be integrated throughout the development, the City Council should revisit (and reduce) the 20% goal. (2) No one currently utilizes Burlington Square Park. Based on this, he has concerns with the potential usage of the proposed plaza. (3) Baseline should be looked at, as well as a 50% version and a 75% version for data and numbers. (4) Study inclusion of underground parking. (5) Commuter parking deck should span Washington Street to reduce commuter conflicts; include parking on Kendall Park; and alter circulation on Washington to reduce commuter traffic circulation into neighborhoods.

Becky Rudolph - a commuter who travels from south Naperville to the Naperville Train station. She has occasionally taken a bus home from the station; however, it is a 30-minute drive and is difficult to use if you have early commitments based on the bus's schedule. Regardless of the multi-modal design proposed, people will always prefer to use their cars due to convenience. Proposed commuter parking plan concentrates commuters in 2 parking garages which creates egress concerns both from the decks and from the general area. Can the office space be moved to the DCM lot and additional parking be added to the Burlington Lot?

Jennifer Taylor – 309 Spring Avenue. (1) She supports affordable housing but it should be spread throughout the development so as to destigmatize, particularly if it is family affordable. (2) She believes that Ryan is paying attention to pedestrian safety; however, she believes the proposed commuter deck at DCM will work counter to the intended pedestrian safety objectives, while only slightly (maybe) improving the commuter experience. (3) Close the vehicular access on the west side of the DCM. This should be pedestrian use only; however, logistical issues (garbage pick-up, fire access, etc.) will need to be resolved as a result of this change. (4) Disappointed that the Steering Committee did not spend more time discussing pedestrian safety. (5) Ask if the results of the Westside Traffic Study be able to be incorporated into this design since it won't be finished yet.

Dominic Nugent – (1) Re: Jennifer Taylor proposal regarding DCM vehicular access change – that roadway could be restricted to buses, service vehicles, and fire access only. (2) Re: 250 additional commuter parking spaces – those commuters are already coming to the site today, so it is not a net gain. (3) Plaza has too much concrete; additional greenspace needs to be added. (4) Starting from a point that is closer to what the community wants will make the project easier to accomplish. The current baseline is not there.

Jayme Kohler – (1) spoke up of what she believes is a more successful mixed-use development in Calgary – 3 story brick buildings that are inviting and balanced. (2) Cautioned that it is important to remember that Commuters do not go directly from home to the station and back – they make stops in between. (3) The plaza will offer a direct view of those who chose to take their lives by stepping in front of a train. The plaza should be re-thought.

Mary Stolkberg Smith – commuter who lives on North Avenue – (1) she has North Central College traffic, Little Friends traffic, and commuter traffic. Any traffic studies that are conducted need to be extended outward to get an idea of the overall situation. Her children have almost been hit 3 times. North Avenue is problematic at the intersection of Ellsworth, largely because people assume it's a 4-way stop. (2) She took the survey when it came out, as both a commuter and resident. She does not see how the proposed plan aligns with the survey results based on pedestrian traffic concerns and others. (3) She concurs with concerns regarding suicide risk from the plaza on the train line. (4) She appreciates attempt to reduce commuter parking; however, she does not believe it is a realistic expectation that it will actually happen and has concerns with longevity of bus services and kiss & ride. (5) She has concerns that retail is not sustainable based on past examples and it does not make sense to add office just to increase traffic to support these uses. (6) Many houses in her neighborhood have been converted to residences for college students. Will the proposed affordable housing units be largely utilized for college students? She supports affordable housing, but feels that a large college usage of these units could be problematic.

Jim Shanshuck – 15 years experience in parking industry. Parking and traffic study needs to be done for a wider area, including south to Aurora Avenue due to impact of commuters on Downtown Naperville. There are technology solutions for parking management; these need to be further studied.

#### *6. Adjourn*

Meeting was adjourned at 10:26.