

President Wallace called the Committee of the Whole meeting to order at 7:21 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairman Camerer, Carbonaro, Deyne, Gabrenya, Hopkins Reinke, and

President Wallace

ABSENT: None

ALSO PRESENT: Village Administrator Paula Schumacher, Assistant Village Administrator Scott Skrycki, Finance Director Todd Dowden, Community Development Director Jim Plonczynski, Assistant Community Development Director Roberta Grill, Economic Development Coordinator Tony Fradin, Director of Public Works Dan Dinges, Public Works Engineer Bob Allen, Building Director Brian Goralski, Food & Beverage Manger Paul Petersen, Chief Patrick Ullrich, Deputy Chief Chuck Snider, Deputy Chief Geoff Pretkelis, Village Attorney Bryan Mraz and Village Clerk Lorna Giless.

PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE

1. Solicitation of Bids for Vacant 1.87 Acre Parcel in Town Center Subdivision

Chairman Hopkins introduced the bids for the vacant 1.87 acre parcel in the Town Center. He stated that back on October 18, 2016, Bartlett approved a TOD plan and staff has recommended what we do an RFP for this piece of property.

Economic Development Coordinator Tony Fradin stated that this item is a component of the downtown TOD plan. This parcel is one of the most shovel ready development sites in the plan. The site is 1.87 acres and is on the southwest corner of East Railroad Avenue and Berteau Avenue and is a Village owned site. It is just east of the existing Bartlett Town Center condominium buildings. Economic Development staff has received several inquiries as to the availability of the site for possible purchase and development. At this point, staff has been working with the Village Attorney to craft this document and they are seeking direction from the Board to move forward with the solicitation of bids that would include statements or qualifications and proposed development package for the purchase and development of this property. Attorney Mraz has provided the legal guidance to staff with a crafting of the document you see before you tonight.

Chairman Hopkins asked if this site was originally under a TIF district?

Mr. Fradin stated that it was part of the original Town Center subdivision that was never actually completed by the Town Center developer New England Builders.



Chairman Hopkins asked if the TIF fund paid for the utilities that are currently installed on the site?

Mr. Fradin stated that the TIF helped pay for land acquisition, environmental cleanup of the land and items such as the utilities that were brought to the site.

Chairman Hopkins asked if the appraisal includes all the utilities that were currently installed on the property?

Mr. Fradin stated "yes", the appraisal is for the site as it is today. The size and shape, proximity to the downtown area, all the utilities and it is relatively flat. It would be commonly referred to as a shovel ready site.

Chairman Deyne referenced page 5 of the RFP in which stated "the property will not be sold for less than \$660,000". How did we arrive upon that number?

Attorney Mraz stated that there are 3 different statutes that allow a municipality to sell its property:

- 1) Going out to bid, publishing and selling it to the highest bidder;
- 2) Determine its value by getting an MAI certified appraisal (which they have done). It was actually updated more recently to include an area that had an easement. The appraised value is \$825,000. This particular statute allows a municipality to use that appraisal and sell it for no less than 80 percent of the appraised value.
- 3) Requires 3/4 of the corporate authorities, the municipality determines that the real estate is no longer necessary, appropriate, required for the use of, profitable to, or for the best interest of the Village.

They are using number 3 but he has done a hybrid. It allows the Board to not just base and except the highest bidder, but to also consider the development proposal of a prospective bidder and developer. If they are looking at plans and like the plan of developer "B" as opposed to the highest bidder developer "A", we could accept the plan we like more, provided they have offered at least the 80 percent figure. The alternative is to just go with the highest bidder and let him go through the zoning process. Your exclusive control is just like any other developer who comes in and are approved or disapproved of the zoning. Sometimes that may not be enough because if you turn them down they could sue you. Here, admittedly, we have a little more control because it was in a PUD and they have to amend that to delete it from the PUD or be consistent with that PUD. You have some zoning control over the property, but the thought is that you exert more control and don't to chose by price alone. When the Town Center was approved, you had the TIF, and you could enter a development agreement and it was



all about the developer. This is an outlot and he thought they would want some additional control. There is a schedule in the RFP, which is contingent on them getting their zoning. He thought this would give them a little bit higher price. The Board will see a preliminary plan along with the price before any decision is made.

Chairman Camerer felt that they absolutely needed this. He was not convinced that the residents that bought their condos would be completely on board with the property adjoining them now having an open parking lot with 57 parking spaces outside. They bought these units, anticipating that the other two buildings would be built with underground parking comparable to what they have with some degree of fluency. He has some issues with that and he is not overly thrilled. He didn't think that they have actively tried to pursue this as a condominium building.

Mr. Fradin stated that the first few years after New England Builders ceased to continue building, they did seek out other condominium developers, none of whom have moved forward. The inquiries they have been receiving have been mostly from apartment developers.

Chairman Camerer stated that the residents in the Town Center need to be advised of the potential changes to make sure that they are completely aware of it. They have had communities that abut certain properties, shut down things, because they were not happy with the potential development. He would be interested in hearing opinions from the residents who have invested in buying their units and live there.

Mr. Fradin stated that they would keep the condominium association apprised through this process so they are able to participate as well. They would ultimately have to go through some type of zoning approvals where there would be opportunity for public input.

Attorney Mraz stated but there is also a criteria, besides price, that they architecturally match or are consistent architecturally with the existing building. They are trying to get the property sold and accommodate the residents as well.

Chairman Reinke asked if it was possible that they would not like the responses?

President Wallace stated that is why the attorney set it up like this. Something has to be built here at some point and this gets preliminary interest.

Administrator Schumacher stated that her first impulse was to notify the residents that they were looking at this agenda item. Their response was "what are they going to react to" since there are no plans and just nebulous feelings. As we move on in this process and we have more proposals, than we have more valuable input.



Chairman Hopkins stated that they could choose to reject all the plans.

Attorney Mraz stated that they are not planning to bring this back to the Board for a vote right away. They are going to go out on the street and bid it as you see it. When the plans and the bid prices come in, they will be brought back to the Committee of the Whole and ultimately requires the Board to pass an ordinance saying that they are going to sell the property because it is no longer useful for our purposes.

2. 2018 Board/Committee Meeting Schedule

Chairman Hopkins presented the 2018 meeting schedule.

Administrator Schumacher stated that the Clerk normally puts out a list of the annual meeting dates of all the Boards and Commissions. She wanted to let them take an opportunity to look at their schedules for the year. One of the dates on the calendar is the Strategic Planning date and the plan will be brought back to the Board in January for final approval. This years' time plan went amiss but they would ideally like to have a plan by October so they could bring it into the budget process. They may want to consider skipping a year.

Chairman Reinke asked about the extra budget meeting in March.

Administrator Schumacher stated that the extra meeting would be on a Wednesday following the Tuesday night Board meeting.

President Wallace stated that he assumes that the 4th of July festivities would start on a Sunday and end on Wednesday in 2018. He suggested moving the July 3rd meeting to Thursday, July 5th.

POLICE & HEALTH COMMITTEE

1. TOD Implementation Strategy – 25 mph on Key Downtown Roadways

Community Development Director Jim Plonczynski stated that in the vein of implementing the TOD plan, this is one of the items that were considered. The police department provided the speed studies that went along with the roadways that the TOD plan recommended. It recommended 25 mph to make the downtown a more pedestrian friendly environment. They did the speed study on the major arterials the TOD plan recommended which is Oak, Railroad and down Main Street. The speed study indicated that people are generally not zipping through town, but are going a little over the limit. They have studied other surrounding towns and most of them had 25 mph



speed limits, including St. Charles, Geneva, Batavia, Glenview, Elgin, South Elgin. North Avenue was not on the TOD plan as one that they recommended, but because North Avenue has the school and goes to Bartlett Park it has a 35 mph speed limit reduced down to 30 and they would like direction to possibly study that and make it a 25 mph zone. The police department would do this additional study and staff would bring back an ordinance to reduce these speed limits to 25 mph as outlined in the TOD plan.

Chairman Deyne stated that they are in a precarious situation. He didn't think that anyone here would object to lower speed limits.

Chairman Camerer stated that he just might object.

Chairman Deyne stated that if there is a problem with safety he didn't think anyone would want to be responsible. It is a question of safety and if anything happens he wouldn't want it on his shoulders.

Chairman Camerer asked how many pedestrians have been hit by cars in Bartlett over the course of 5 to 10 years?

Mr. Plonczynski stated that the pedestrian vehicle accidents in the downtown have been three in four years.

Assistant Community Development Director Roberta Grill stated Main Street, Oak/ Oneida and Oak/Railroad. Police reports indicate that they were pedestrian and motor vehicle related accidents.

Chairman Camerer stated that he looked at the traffic studies and there are not that many people speeding. Yes, we want safety but is this overkill? Not to mention the cost of a traffic study. He didn't feel we should spend money to do a traffic study.

Mr. Plonczynski stated that it is a speed study that the police department does. They have set parameters and the study is done with in-house staff.

Chief Ullrich stated that one of the things they look at when they set speed limits is the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). One of their guidelines is that speed limits should be set within 5 mph of the 85th percentile. Each one of these speed studies indicates what the 85th percentile is. It also lists other factors that could be considered including load characteristics, shoulder condition, grades, alignment, site distance, cruise speed, roadside development and environment, parking practices and pedestrian activity unreported crash variance for at least a 12 month period. Some of the things in the downtown is the pedestrian activity and the mid-block crosswalks. At this time of the year when it is dark so early in the morning and evening, people are walking to their cars along Main Street, in front of Town Center, on both sides of Oneida



and residents backing out of parking spots on Railroad Avenue into traffic, it is very hard to see. He could see reducing speed limits for those reasons as well as all the pedestrian traffic in town.

Chairman Deyne stated that his son rides his bike to Jewel and with the time change it is dark. He also had a number of encounters with traffic. Personally, and very selfishly, for the sake of his child, he sees no reason not to lower the speed limit by 5 mph.

Chairman Camerer stated that if he could see in the study that people were explicitly speeding, most of the studies indicate that people are not breaking the law. He thought it was just overkill and understands that they are trying to lower it for the sake of safety.

Administrator Schumacher stated that she didn't think they were doing it for the sake of safety, alone. This recommendation came from the TOD plan which has the goal of making the downtown more walkable and more pedestrian friendly. Having that slower traffic sets the overall tone for an easier way to get through the downtown on foot.

Chairman Deyne stated that he must be missing something. He was thoroughly confused this evening. We are talking about reducing the speed limit by 5 miles an hour and earlier this evening we talked about vaping in public and now the speed limit? He didn't understand the direction of where they were going this evening.

Chairman Hopkins stated that he thought a lot of work went into the TOD plan and he thought this was a good step to reduce the speed limit to 25 mph. There must be some good reasons for reducing the speed, not just for safety.

Chairman Camerer did not agree.

Chairman Carbonaro stated that it may have to be broken into three parts. He agreed with reducing the speed limit on North Avenue but reducing the speeds in the downtown is premature because we are in the process of trying to widen some of these sidewalks. We have a large population already avoiding the downtown going down Devon. If you are going to reduce the speed limits for safety and the school kids crossing in the morning, it's a good thing for safety, but a little bit too early. Maybe they should wait until they get the widened sidewalks applied. He also wanted to add an item, it seems they looked at 10 to 11 surrounding towns but one thing they did not look at was that there are towns (Arlington Heights, Rolling Meadows, Palatine) that at 9:00 p.m. to 4:30 a.m. they turn the traffic lights into flashing lights. Therefore, traffic can continue through the downtown without having to wait for the long and lengthy lights. He thought that reducing the speed limit was a little premature before they get the sidewalks.

Chairman Gabrenya stated that she believes that it was a good idea to reduce the speed limit, being an avid runner and seeing how much people are on their phones



while driving. If we reduce the speed limit downtown and it pushes people to use Devon even more, how do we address that? She foresees that as being a safety issue.

Mr. Plonczynski stated that they can certainly look at Devon even though it is not part of the TOD plan. We can monitor it and make sure it is not being exceeded.

Chief Ullrich stated that they get complaints about speeding on Devon frequently. He can put the speed trailers out there and do some radar enforcement. They would have to do that on a more frequent basis.

President Wallace disagreed with the comment that slowing the speed limit is going to push people out of the downtown. He goes through the downtown 2 to 3 times per week and it won't make any difference what the speed limit is and he thought that it would not make a difference to 20 of his friends. If people go downtown, they are going to go downtown. It doesn't make any difference if it's 25 or 30 mph.

Chairman Reinke stated that the main purpose is for safety but one of the other reasons is to help the downtown. If we calm the traffic and make it more walkable, it fosters economic activity. Nobody sees downtown as a shortcut. It makes sense to establish a baseline on Devon.

President Wallace agreed. A better discussion is how we slow down the traffic on Route 59. Let's get IDOT on board with that. He asked staff to bring this back after they take a look at Devon.

Chairman Deyne moved to adjourn the Committee of the Whole meeting and that motion was seconded by Chairman Hopkins.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO ADJOURN

AYES: Chairman Camerer, Carbonaro, Deyne, Gabrenya, Hopkins, Reinke

NAYS: None ABSENT: None MOTION CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 8:01 p.m.

Lorna Giless Village Clerk