

**SPECIAL JOINT MEETING  
CHANNAHON VILLAGE BOARD AND PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION  
MAY 29, 2007**

Village President Joe Cook called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Trustees Davidson, Nash, McMillin, Militello, Slocum and Greco were present. Also present were Planning and Zoning Commission Chairman Curt Clark, Commissioner Simon, Loizon, Ciarlette, June, Hiller and Lyman.

Staff present was Village Administrator Jamie Bowden, Director of Community Development Mike McMahon, Director of Public Works Ed Dolezal, Village Planner Jake Melrose and Deputy Village Clerk Leti Anselme.

**ROUTE 6 & INTERSTATE 55 TRAFFIC STUDY**

Director of Community Development Mike McMahon stated that in September 2006, the Village of Channahon commissioned Strand Associates to prepare a traffic study for the Route 6 and I-55 interchange factoring nearly 1,000 acres of nearby vacant and potentially developable properties.

Strand focused on the traffic impacts of trips that will be added if the potential developments become reality. The study identifies the existing PM peak-hour traffic volumes and evaluates the existing traffic operations; predicts the traffic that will be generated by the potential developments during the PM peak-hour; evaluates future PM peak-hour traffic operations with the potential developments; and identifies transportation improvements to accommodate the traffic generated by the potential developments.

The study area includes the properties in the four quadrants directly adjacent to the I-55 interchange with following intersections being evaluated:

- Northbound West Frontage Road and US 6
- Southbound West Frontage Road and US 6
- Southbound I-55 ramps and US 6
- Northbound I-55 ramps and US 6
- East Frontage Road and US 6

In addition to the potential developments adjacent to the I-55 interchange, a background growth rate of 2.0 percent per year was also applied for existing traffic. The growth rate is representative of historic trends and is therefore a good estimate of the impact continued development beyond the immediate study area will have.

Based on the current traffic load and potential future developments, Strand developed two alternatives to improving the interchange and frontage roads. Alternative 1 provides a six lane cross section of the Route 6 bridge deck. Consequently, intersections up and downstream of I-55 are limited to three through lanes in each direction. Traffic modeling suggests that at PM peak-hours the overall

intersection will operate at level of service (LOS) D or better with specific intersections operating at LOS E and F, typically considered acceptable for urbanized areas.

Alternative 2 provides an eight lane cross section on the Route 6 bridge deck. This allows intersections up and downstream of I-55 to provide four through lanes where necessary. Traffic modeling of Alternative 2 suggests that overall the intersections will operate at LOS D or better and that each individual movement will operate at LOS D or better at PM peak-hours.

Strand then developed planning level Opinions of Probable Construction Cost (OPCC). OPCCs are based on the horizontal footprints of the alternative improvements. The costs are presented in 2006 dollars and are to be used for the purpose of general information only.

The total OPCC for alternative 1 is \$29,854,440 and \$33,345,000 for alternative 2. The bridge deck OPCC is \$6,500,000 and \$8,000,000 respectively. These numbers include the widening of Route 6, realigning the Frontage Roads, and signalization. It does not include the acquisition of right-of-way, if needed.

Strand then determined how the Village could allocate these costs associated with future capacity expansion on the interchange. The study calculated three ways to do so as listed below.

- Assess future developments \$365 per forecasted daily trip.
- Assess future developments \$4,130 per forecasted PM peak-hour trip.
- Assess future developments \$31,360 per acre.

Each of the three methods above will produce a different assessment value. The Village may use the range of calculated values to determine an appropriate assessment on a case-by-case basis. Alternatively, if a single method is desired for all developments, Strand Associates recommends using calculations based on forecasted daily trips.

Over the past several years, the Village has had discussions with developers interested in properties located in three of the four quadrants. More recently, staff met with three developers each with contracts to purchase properties in the study area. Staff told each that the frontage roads in their respective quadrant would have to be realigned as part of the development

Funding for interchange improvements through the State is unlikely in the immediate future. Once the Traffic Study is complete, efforts will begin to lobby State and federal legislatures for road improvement funding. The next federal transportation-funding bill is scheduled for 2009. Therefore, questions that remain include:

1. Will the Village approve these developments prior to the full interchange being rebuilt?
2. Can these developments proceed with just the realignment of the frontage roads?
3. Should developers pay into the bridge deck replacement or should the State fund the bridge deck?

McMahon also provided the Village Board and PZC with Appendix D, which is the Opinions of Probable Construction Cost.

Village President Cook stated that the study shows that there are issues that need to be dealt with. Any development that will occur will cause for us to figure out what improvements we need to make.

PZC Member June asked what the Village thoughts were about taking control of the frontage roads as Bolingbrook did. She stated that the properties that are going to be develop, if the Village did take control, can the Village not include the right-of-way as something that the developers would have to dedicate to the Village to get the development passed.

Village President Cook stated that any developer that may be interested in that area will be informed of the responsibility of realigning of the frontage roads and provide the right-of-way to do it. Village President Cook stated that the Village has offered IDOT that once the frontage road is built to a travelable standard the Village would take jurisdictional transport of the frontage road. If it is developer who does it, we will still take the jurisdictional transport, because the Village cannot take the State's word that they will maintain the roads. If it is funded to provide new frontage roads, the Village wants to make sure that we are able to provide the maintenance for those roads.

PZC Member June stated then that the only property to have an issue with right-of-way would be the southeast frontage, behind the Citgo. Village President Cook stated that we would look at the route that it would take. It's not so much the route it is going to take, but the issue is where it will end up on Route 6 with the realignment. McMahan stated that every developer has been informed that the area would need to be realigned and that they would be public roads. PZC Member June stated that it will save the Village money if the developers are responsible for the realignment.

McMahan stated that the bigger box, as Alter is proposing or what Harvey Lewis, may have a larger acreage, they would probably pay more than Hammel.

Bowden stated that it is not fully funded as things take place. If it is per acre or trip. McMahan stated that the problem is even though the developers have been informed it is only ½ of the 1000 acres. There are still other properties to be accounted for. McMahan stated that the Village will probably get ½ of the full amount, for the complete reconstruction.

Bowden stated that we could possible move it up on the schedule. McMahan stated that staff recommends to allow these three properties Hammel, Harvey Lewis and McVickers. If the frontage roads are realigned the Village will be half way to completing that interchange and then go back and hit the State through our legislators and try to get the money through the five year IDOT plan. He stated that the Village may need to recapture that, part of the problem is the frontage roads.

PZC Member Hiller asked if the frontage road is realigned, will improvements be taken care of on the rest of the frontage road. Village President Cook stated that it is not part of it. The northwest frontage road is in horrible condition and soon the southeast frontage road will continue to deteriorate. Village President Cook stated that the Village is looking at different options for the northwest frontage road, but it doesn't include that. The hope is that with the investment of realigning the frontage roads, the State would see it as an initiative to fix the remaining road.

PZC Member Hiller asked if it is possible to force the big box companies to redoing the road and take the truck traffic to Bluff Road instead of Route 6. Village President Cook stated that it is a possibility but that bridge deck is in no better shape and it doesn't have the capacity. The hope is that on that Harvey Lewis property to have a mix of commercial and industrial, since it is a large piece of property. The idea is that retail commercial access through Route 6, and the industrial take a road to Bluff for that interchange. There is going to be traffic through there, with the retail component on the north side of Route 6. The bottom line is people complain when they are waiting for Home Depot to load and unload, but when they are behind 10-15 semi trucks, they get more upset.

Trustee Davidson stated that the residents from Rolling Acres and Fairhaven cut through McDonalds to get to Route 6 and then continue onto the interstate. He thinks that could be a significant problem for the Village because our goal when we redirected that out westerly was to increase the traffic count to sections that will be retail. It is a dangerous thing, since IDOT does not allow curb cuts close to the interchanges. Could staff look into access for McDonalds and the BP Amoco, it is inconvenient for those people that live in that subdivision. Is there a way to put up a barricade so that people would need to turn left instead of going straight through.

Bowden stated that we could conduct a traffic study. Trustee Greco stated that it normally occurs during the early morning hours. McMahan stated that BP Amoco conducted an auction for the parcel next to them. It was more of a franchise auction, for the stand alone BP Amoco. It has already been discussed with McDonalds, in which they may then become a stand alone McDonalds. There has been talk about a cross access road that would go to McDonalds and that frontage road would be closed, forcing cars to go around to the interchange. Technically that is how people coming westbound are supposed to enter McDonalds.

Village President Cook stated that the goal is to allow these properties to be developable within the service areas. The goal is how to best capture the improvements needed and the time frame. Allowing the development to move forward without putting in the infrastructure then you have compounded the issues that are already present. There needs to be an even flow or some type of coordinated flow of infrastructure improvements verses the actual development.

PZC Member June stated to look at how other communities who have had similar issues. She was not impressed with how Shorewood handled the upgrade of their frontage road to accommodate Heartland Center. Trustee Militello stated that Shorewood's frontage road has not been completed. It is being funded by the State; it is already in the planning. PZC Member June asked when is it that going to happen. Shorewood currently has an old frontage road and a brand new lane for the trucks to turn in on, but it is still the junky, falling apart, old frontage road. Trustee Militello stated that they are suppose to be going behind that road.

PZC Member June stated that it is a nice idea, but it is not going to be done in a long time. If the Village is going to annex that property and take over those frontage roads, we would like to see the developers do it all, at least for their frontage.

Bowden stated that the northwest quadron has no anticipated time to fix now. PZC Member June stated that was fine because no one else, besides the people who are back there, should be going there. The part that is being developed should be done properly to that point.

Village President Cook stated that there are more than just a few people; there are emergency services, school buses. The frontage road is beyond the development area that needs to be repaired. The question is who is going to pay for it. He stated that there is an issue with the bridge deck, expanding the lanes on the bridge deck, approaches, realignment of the frontage roads, that is an enormous project to pass on to the developers. It may not be economically feasible for them to develop and cover the cost of paying for it. We are going to look at some initiative ways to help through some economic development incentives. There are sales tax in those areas with retail, but there aren't any sales tax in those areas that are warehouses.

PZC Member June asked what our sales tax is now. Village President Cook stated that it is 2%. PZC Member June asked if we have an option to increase with the potential retail that would go in there.

Bowden stated that we would have property outside of the interchange area, which are being proposed by the Alter Group, about 150 acres. They are looking for a 10-year abatement. They are property tax base right now and it's probably a couple hundred dollars. We need to look at that use in conjunction with this interchange.

Village President Cook stated that there are several issues, one being that just abating the Village portion of that property tax doesn't do it, and the Village's portion is a very small amount in the overall total. The line share is the schools and they are not easy to work with providing economic development incentives. Two is the potential developers want to use the abatement to incentive tenant users. We need that tax abatement to produce the infrastructure, provide for it and is there enough in there to get them both done. Those are the questions that are before us and we need to get ideas on some direction on where to move.

PZC Member Loizon stated that is what we need to focus on. Village President Cook stated that we are certainly not opposed to the abatements. This is property that is providing hundred of dollars in property taxes now and has potential to give tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands in property taxes, after an abatement.

PZC Member June asked if it requires the creation of a TIF district. Village President Cook stated that it would only be through an agreement. It would be easier if these were TIF eligible properties. If the area within this service were TIF eligible we would be having a different conversation with identifying those dollars and going after bonding to provide that infrastructure, but it is not TIF eligible.

Bowden stated that the question with the property is does the Board and Planning and Zoning Commission feel comfortable with the land use and if you are, you need to be comfortable with the abatement. The developers come to the table and ask to offset some of the cost of this infrastructure, what is the plan for their contribution for this whole interchange.

PZC Member June asked if these developers do not get this abatement are they not going to want to move to this intersection. She said that she feels that is highly unlikely since this is a very desirable intersection. McMahon stated that it would not be the full abatement and it would only be for a short period of time. It would only be one cent of our sales tax. If a shopping center went in on Anderson's, it would be one hundred million dollars in potential sales tax over a year, if that goes in.

PZC Member June then stated that we would have a problem with the school districts. Village President Cook stated that these are extraordinary costs that we are going to put up on the developers to provide the infrastructure. In other places they would need to make their own on site improvements and the interchange right outside their development. We need to figure out how to fund this. If we are going to look at developers to help fund it, we need to find a scope to get them here.

PZC Member June asked is this the type of development Channahon wants here. Village President Cook stated if PZC Member June does not want this type of development here, then we need to think of what we do want there. If it is not warehousing, is it residential. PZC Member June then stated what if we don't do anything. Village President Cook stated that it is not viable option.

Trustee Militello stated that the county would take over and do what they want to do with it. Village President Cook stated that his concern is that we tell people that they could never develop their property. The property is going to be developed around this area it is our job to make sure it is the proper land use, the proper zoning is taking place and that the development happens in a manner that meets the quality of life here in Channahon. To tell someone you're a 300 acres property owner, but you can't develop, isn't even viable. We would end up in court. PZC Member June stated so we just want control of it, if it is going to be developed.

Bowden stated that the property tax abatement and retail sales tax most of the control goes to the school district. The question is that the appropriate land use if it is what are they bringing to the table to off set some of the impact on the extraordinary cost. Village President Cook stated that there is also an issue of providing jobs and other things for the community.

Trustee Militello stated that with or without development that intersection has to be improved. This needs to be developed and we need to figure out how. To think we can get developers in and pay for the whole thing is unrealistic, if they did, they'd have to charge so much for their space that it would just add to the empty store fronts that we currently have. We don't want to price ourselves out of the market. The full interchange improvement needs to be done, because it is hurting our residents.

Trustee Davidson asked if staff is just looking for feedback. McMahon stated that as the Village is negotiating we are talking to developers, and staff does not know what the will of the Board is. Staff needs direction on how to approach these developers.

Trustee Davidson stated that he tends to agree with the Mayor, these are desirable corners, but we don't have the population base. We don't quite have the roof top numbers to warrant some of

the commercial vendors to stick their necks out here. We need to provide some incentives to get them to locate. He is glad that the Village has increased the design standards. He stated that Vessel probably overbuilt the building that he has because he needs to charge \$23 a square foot. You can't get \$23 a square foot at that location, he's got to be out on Ridge Road. Trustee Davidson is in favor of an abatement.

Bowden stated that retail commercial you live and die by sales taxes and revenues. What are your thoughts of industrial property taxes and the land use along this area?

PZC Member Hiller asked what type of abatement is going to be offered to these big box warehouses, what kind of guarantee are we going to get that they will stick around here? Village President Cook stated that something like that would be worked into an agreement, some longevity, some job creations, it would not be open-ended. It would have to come with some commitment.

Trustee McMillin stated that someone would still need to pay the property tax on a building. He asked if it could be put in the agreement that if they fail to make one payment, the day after they leave, the Village could take control of the property. Village President Cook stated that we could put some type of protection into the agreement.

Village President Cook stated that under the current Comprehensive Land Use Plan, that most of the Board present played a role in, it calls out for that piece to the proposed use for an industrial warehousing. Trustee Davidson stated that it doesn't seem to be an industrial warehouse location. He could be convinced otherwise. He would rather see commercial on the front and residential on the back.

Village President Cook stated that there isn't enough of frontage. McMahon stated that Alter does not touch Route 6. PZC Member Loizon stated that he keeps looking at the Harvey Lewis piece as the big commercial warehouse, that's the property that should be pushed for that. PZC Member June stated that it would flow with BP Amoco.

Trustee Davidson asked how the Boards would feel with Alter being all residential. PZC Member Hiller stated that it would be a better fit. Village President Cook asked the Village Board and the Planning and Zoning Commission what land use do they want for this property. PZC Member Hiller stated that it is all residential now and now we are going to add a big commercial park with warehousing back to back.

PZC Member June stated that when people are coming off of the Route 6 exit, assuming that they are going west, putting a big industrial building at the main entrance would not be the look and feel we want to give our Village, which then would give way to what would start our residential area. She feels as a buffer area and as a main entrance, it would not look very nice. It is bad enough to have some of the older and industrial building back off the frontage road now and they are visible from I-55. It's not the vision we want people to see when they come into Channahon. They come to Channahon for the parks and the I & M Canal.

PZC Member Hiller stated that he was under the impression that there was going to be a line drawn either between Navajo or Park Place and everything east would be industrial and everything west would be residential. Village President Cook stated he does not recall that.

PZC Member June stated that she could see nice commercial retail, business park and office buildings. Village President Cook stated if the market is there for it. We can say all we want, but it is not conducive for retail commercial. The frontage is not there. We are jumping through hoops to get them to locate right on the interchange.

PZC Member Simon asked if there was anyway that the trucks could go north. Village President Cook stated that we will continue to look at different alternatives. He stated that we don't need to have the mess that Route 53 and I-55 has. The infrastructure needs to be there to accept the traffic. PZC Member Simon stated that he was thinking about Ridge Road and I-80, with Pilot having trucks coming and going all day long. That is his concern with putting trucks on Route 6.

McMahon stated that this would be a different truck pattern, at Pilot it is a truck stop. This would be warehousing distribution, they are going to be typically throughout the day and mostly after the morning and after peak, they don't want to be there. If it were a Pilot, it would be totally different. Village President Cook stated that we still need the infrastructure to support the traffic and the trucks.

PZC Member Ciarlette asked if there would be signalization at the intersection. Village President Cook stated yes. Her concern is how long would it take to put in. McMahon stated that it would be part of the development. PZC Member Simon asked if the taxes on these buildings cover the wear and tear on the infrastructure. Village President Cook stated no. Bowden stated that it would come out of our general fund for the maintenance of our Village roads, but from the property taxes only 8% is for the Village. The benefit is that it will bring some jobs to the area. It may bring some retail dollars.

Village President Cook stated that it would also bring enormous dollars to the school district. Even with an abatement, there will be a large amount of money going into schools. Once the abatement is up, there would be more. A prime example is the TIF, it's another form of abatement, but the Aux Sable TIF brought \$12,000 to every taxing body, for years. Trustee Greco stated that it was also delayed a year, because the schools were opposed to it.

Village President Cook stated that these things do not just locate there, they are starting to see it. Grundy County has been jumped over. You see the warehouse taking place in Will County. It is just starting in Morris around Route 47, because of the incentives being done and the infrastructure being put in place. There is a Pet Smart over by Route 39 by Ottawa and LaSalle County. We can embrace it and work with it and say we need the infrastructure to support it or we can say no this is not for us. We need to make a decision, we cannot keep landowners and potential developers hanging on this.

Bowden stated that there is an advantage to the taxpayer by increasing the base, the Village rate will drop.

Trustee Davidson asked if the Harvey Lewis property primarily industrial. McMahon stated yes. Trustee Davidson stated that their piece is ideal for industrial, the Hammel parcel and Hamman property should be retail, and the Alter parcel should be residential.

PZC Member Hiller asked what is this going to do to the residential that is there now. Village President Cook stated that is a question we need to ask, is it going to be residential. What does 2.75 homes per acre do to the school districts and Village services? PZC Member Hiller stated that a senior citizen development would be nice. Village President Cook stated that we can shout out land uses all day long, but we need to come to a realization that a particular piece of property is only marketable and only going to support certain land uses. At some point we need to decide whether or not it is marketable and that it can support that land use.

Trustee Militello asked to go back to the interchange subject. Bowden stated that if the Village Board and Planning and Zoning Commission have any issues with the land use, because we are receiving inquiries daily. Bowden recommends that we move forward with the three that currently have interest and start to leverage them to contribute to that infrastructure. We do not believe if waiting until everything develops, are we going to have enough money to build it up. Trustee Militello agrees with Bowden.

Village President Cook stated as development occurs the already strained infrastructure gets more impacted. So whatever has to happen there has to be some phase or some investment made for infrastructure from day one.

Trustee Militello going back to the interchange, to make this full blown interchange we are talking some serious acres. Village President Cook stated that the issue is that we have the footprint there. It's just expanding some lanes widths and we would secure the right-of-way because it is within the development.

PZC Member Ciarlette asked if we were going with Alternative 1 or 2. Village President Cook stated that it needs to be determined. PZC Member Ciarlette stated that we should strive for Alternative 2, get it done now, instead of later. Trustee Greco agreed and PZC Member Loizon stated to do it correct, so that it is a solid interchange, so that we would not need to worry about it. Village President Cook stated to not only take on current development, but future as well.

Trustee Slocum asked McMahon and Bowden if we were married to the frontage road northwest coming right through the middle of Hammel, is that going to limit us with what we can put in there. It goes right through the property. Bowden stated that we have had discussion and we are keeping that in mind. The other question that Trustee Slocum had was to the Alter Group, he asked them what are they interested in putting in that area, trucking or warehousing. He would like an idea of what it would look like.

Mike Richardson and Pat Gallagher were present from the Alter Group. Mr. Richardson stated that what they plan is approximately 3 million square feet of warehouse industrial building on the Mantia property. The residential area to the south, there is about 150 feet of pipeline between the residential property and where they would start building. There is a 50-80 feet that

is owned by one of the pipeline companies and then there is an easement on the Mantia that has two more pipelines. A lot of separation where our buildings would go and the residential itself.

Mr. Richardson continued that their access is where the little red house is and there is a full public street on the south side, which would extend to the west to pick up the Hamman property. The only access it has now is Canal Road. The property is in the county we would need to be annexed and zoned and developed. We would need to extend sewer and water, which would be at our cost. There is no frontage of the property on Route 6.

PZC Member Ciarlette asked what the buildings were going to look like and if we would be able to see them from Route 6. Mr. Richardson stated that the building would look similar to the one on I-55 and I-80. He said that staff was provided with elevations of the building. He stated that it had been proposed residential but then there were issues with the school district. The other issue was that Mr. Hamman would like to use it as a quarry.

Mr. Richardson introduced Tim Schroger and Dave Dorgan with Metro Transportation. Village President Cook asked that they address the traffic issue. What type of infrastructure do you feel this type of development would call for? Mr. Richardson stated that there is no question the intersection has to be redone. He stated that you don't want to build these buildings and have gridlock.

PZC Member Hiller asked how many trucks do you think will go in and out of there in a day. Mr. Schroger stated that there are about 12,000 vehicles on Route 6 a day. The traffic study has been approved by IDOT. Village President Cook asked from our perspectives between your property and the interchange based upon your numbers and volume, what should the infrastructure be. The interchange is one issue, how about the lanes on two. Mr. Schroger stated they have sufficient capacity with the study that was done, with the turning lanes and signals at that location.

Village President Cook asked what the build out time frame would be. Mr. Gallagher stated that the traffic count is higher at peak times because of residential. Everyone is going to work at the same time. It is the quality of the building that we bring. We support the residential growth. PZC Member Ciarlette asked about how many jobs will it provide once it is done. Mr. Gallagher stated that it is really going to depend with what goes into the building that is going to be built.

Trustee McMillin asked if the intersection would strictly be dedicated to that project. Mr. Gallagher stated that the plan for the intersection standpoint was to incorporate the utilization of our property nothing to the west, but we did provide some access for when the Hamman property comes in they could hook into the road.

Village President Cook asked what they thought of the Romeoville's and Bolingbrook's, where the big boxes keep continuing to pop-up. Do you know what they are doing for incentives and what type of costs are involved with off-site improvements. Mr. Gallagher stated that the leverage is a combination package. When Pet Smart comes along they make comparison with rent and total cost of property taxes. Our rent is dictated by the cost of building, cost of the land,

the property tax abatement which is an incentive, because a lot of communities look at this type of development as a good source of soliciting there commercial.

Chairman Clark asked how many building do they foresee for this project. Mr. Gallagher stated that it would only be 6.

PZC Member Hiller asked if there would be access road to Canal or Tryon. Mr. Gallagher replied no. Village President Cook stated that if you recall during the Comprehensive Land Use Plan that was clearly stated as an issue and to not have access within the comprehensive plan. Mr. Richardson stated that there would be an emergency entrance and exit.

Trustee Militello had a question regarding the trucks going both ways on six and wanted to know why. She stated that the trucks could go west by getting on I-55. PZC Member Hiller agreed and stated that to not bring the traffic through town. Village President Cook stated unless the trucks are delivering to a big box over by Ridge and Route 6.

PZC Member Simon asked Bowden and McMahon if they know what kind of tax dollars this project will generate in a year. Bowden responded that we have received assessments based on square footage. It is only an estimate. Village President Cook stated that they have done this study, they are aware of it.

Mr. Richardson stated that it gives them an idea of the breakdown (brought pamphlets). It shows the tax abatement. He stated in about a period of time, for example 10 years, with the 50% five year abatement, the Village would collect 1 million and a half dollars off of all of those buildings. If you look at the school district, for example district 111, you would have 5.5 million and district 17, you would have 7.5. This was based off of last year's numbers.

**Trustee Davidson left the meeting at 7:30 p.m.**

Village President Cook stated that what is proposed here is what mirrors our comprehensive plan, he needs to continue to stress that. First thing is it is a Comprehensive Land Use Plan that both Boards approved. Second thing no matter what development takes place here. But that the infrastructure is in place to handle that development from day one. From that point forward it is a policy question for the Board to take under consideration with advisement from the Planning and Zoning Commission.

PZC Member Lyman stated that he is not in favor of making that all residential and giving the school district any reason to build another school. Even if it was all residential, there is still going to add a lot of traffic onto the road. If we are going to add more traffic let it be trucks and let's get some tax dollars from some of the commercial buildings and don't let it be a burden on the school system.

PZC Member Loizon stated that he agrees with PZC Member Lyman. It was planned for with our land usage. We have all thought, looked and talked about it. If homes are put there you will have 2-3 cars for each house, which will cause a lot of traffic. The truth is we can use the money

and if the abatement is the way to go and it is an agreement we can work out and it is a 50/50 deal. He feels we need to go for it and get the intersection done.

PZC Member Ciarlette stated that she agreed with PZC Members Lyman and Loizon. As long as the infrastructure and lighting is in for the trucks to get in and out. If we are going to add we need to build this road. This is something we all agreed on with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

PZC Member June stated that not choosing this particular plan necessarily negates our Comprehensive Land Use Plan. She doesn't feel that a big box warehouse is what she would prefer to see there, she'd rather see it on the other side of I-55 and south of Route 6. PZC Member Hiller stated that as long as there is a guarantee that they do not walk away from everything and we are left with a mess. He is not in favor of it and would prefer residential in that area.

PZC Member Simon stated that he had two questions to ask. He asked if Alter would contribute to the interchange expense. Village President Cook stated that he would advocate, and that would be the next question, if the Alter Group is fine with the service area. The 1000 acre service area that we would provide to contribute to that exchange, but for their willingness to do that, we do not let them move forward with development. They are aware of it, that is something we have been open with from day one, so it is not a surprise to them.

PZC Member Simon then stated that they would bring sewer and water to that property. Bowden stated that they are going to be required to service their development from an infrastructure stand point. The reason we are meeting here tonight is because we have a transportation issue, which needs to be addressed. We are using this study to define a transportation area of 1000 acres to contribute to upgrade to that intersection. They are going to bring the sewer and water to that development.

PZC Member Simon stated to Bowden and McMahon, if they were aware of how Ridge Road and I-80 was financed. McMahon stated that it was through multiple grants, county and different sources. McMahon stated that there are three different road projects in that area. Village President Cook stated that the interchange project was through the State and Village of Minooka, Kendall County and Grundy County contributed. Village President Cook stated that Village's portion was from the big boxes that located there, in which they escrowed some road improvement dollars.

PZC Member Simon stated that he is not a big box fan, but he can go for this. With the retail you need a mix, all around I-55 and Route 6, get the retail in there and more will follow, but you need to start somewhere. The only concern he has is the traffic flow.

Trustee Greco stated that his concern was the traffic. He asked Trustee Militello if it is possible to get some grants. He travels that frontage road every day and leaves his home about 5:20 a.m. and trying to get on Route 6 is a nightmare. The Village says no U turns if you are heading west coming home but the State says you can. We have been talking about this for years, it needs to be redone, realigned, and it needs to get done. As far as the abatements, he has no problem with

them, but having served on the school board for years, asking them to abate taxes that is their main source of funding.

Trustee Slocum disagrees, he feels that this will affect hundreds of homes. Fairhaven, Meadowland Estates, the new church under construction and even Cherokee Ridge. These buildings are not going to just sit back there and not be seen. There will be lights and they will be heard. They will be noticed. He said that PZC Member June said that there is a perfect stretch for industrial, the Harvey Lewis area. If we are going to go big box, that would be my ideal place. He feels it is too close to residential, park, church, it will be noticed and it won't matter how many berms are put out there, it will still make a big impact to the people who live in that area. He is opposed to the big box because it would affect the homes around the area.

Trustee Militello stated that she is fine with commercial/industrial.

Trustee McMillin stated that he is fine with the land use. If this piece of property were to be turned into residential, they would need to pay \$31,000 per acre towards the interchange. Bowden stated if that is what the Board determines.

Trustee Nash stated that the Village is either going to get 600 cars or 400 trucks. She is comfortable with the plan but has a lot of unanswered questions. She feels that other options need to be looked at besides bringing everything to Route 6 and I-55.

Chairman Clark stated that he is for the big box. This seems like a good place to get it started. Trustee Nash stated that the Village is prime location for big box whether it is this area or another. Our location being off of I-55 and near I-80 makes us more of a logistic area than anything else.

Village President Cook stated that Trustee Nash is correct on the location point. The land uses on the Harvey Lewis would most likely be industrial, some retail if we can get it in there and the Anderson piece north of Route 6 commercial and retail is the highest and best use for that property. The Alter/Mantia piece was the biggest question we had. He then asked the Village Board and Planning and Zoning Commission if they were comfortable with taking the cost of infrastructure improvements on the interchange and associating that over the service area.

Village President Cook stated that looking at the different ways of funding it gives a per trip, per acre and per peak trip. He would advocate a per acre because that best serves our needs, but is certainly open to any other thoughts. Bowden stated that he agreed with the Village President Cook. Bowden said that everyone needs to look at the figures and think about it and then we need to decide how we are going to approach these individuals. There are three different options; per acre is more emphasis on the big box, per trip takes more on the retail.

Village President Cook said just to reiterate staff has some direction on where to move and nothing is a done deal. Trustee Greco stated that the problem is going to be the schools. The Village Board and Planning and Zoning Commission will see this many, many times before anything goes through.

## **WEST SIDE SUB-AREA AMENDMENT TO COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

McMahon stated that in November of 2004, the Village began developing a planning document for the western area of the Village. In June of 2006, the Village amended the contract for SEC to fully prepare the planning document and amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

Phil Stuepfert with SEC was present to answer any of the questions that the Boards may have. Mr. Stuepfert stated that there was a work session and then the public hearing took place, it is just about a complete document

Village President Cook asked if the Board's, stakeholder's, property owner's and staff's comments were taken under advisement in the formation of the plan seen before us. Mr. Stuepfert stated that nothing much has changed in the plan except for the transportation standpoint. All along I-80 it would be light industrial, warehouse, business park and things like that. The only other thing that is new is in the northwest section where we added that part to the plan. We had commercial all along Brisbin, which if you look at Minooka's comprehensive plan, it's the same thing on the east side, so it is will be somewhat mirrored.

Mr. Stuepfert went through the pamphlet he handed out to the Board. He showed them the FPA boundaries. He also showed them some sketches that were put together to show the Board of things that may possibly come to that interchange. He went over a transportation plan, which would involve Bungalow Road and Gun Club Road. They are proposing three options, trying to swing Gun Club off all those lakes, which would elevate a lot of traffic coming through there. He stated that they had a development guideline, to help guide the growth for this area specifically. It compliments the existing one that the Village has.

Village President Cook stated that anything that gets done there, using best management practice will be an improvement for that piece. If the Board is in agreement, we should move forward with this Comprehensive Plan and adopt it as part of the Village's Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

McMahon stated that depending what happens with the boundary agreement with Morris, a piece would be gone. Village President Cook stated that the boundary agreement will trump our land use plan, but without it we need to move forward with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

Chairman Clark stated that a lot was accomplished with this meeting and hopefully it will go in the right direction. PZC Member Hiller stated that these types of meeting should happen more than once a year. Village President Cook stated that it may start to happen possibly twice a year, along with a tour. Village President Cook stated that it was a full house; it was good to talk to everyone to get some direction on how to move forward and talk to the policy makers.

Chairman Clark adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

Minutes Submitted by  
Leticia Anselme  
Deputy Village Clerk