

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION  
CITY COUNCIL OF CREST HILL  
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS  
May 16, 2022

The May 16, 2022 City Council work session was called to order by Mayor Raymond R. Soliman at 6:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, 1610 Plainfield Road Crest Hill, Will County, Illinois.

The following Council members were present: Mayor Raymond Soliman, City Clerk Christine Vershay-Hall, City Treasurer Glen Conklin, Alderman Scott Dyke, Alderman John Vershay, Alderwoman Claudia Gazal, Alderman Darrell Jefferson, Alderperson Tina Oberlin, Alderman Mark Cipiti, Alderman Nate Albert, Alderman Joe Kubal.

Also present were: City Administrator Jim Marino, City Engineer Ron Wiedeman, Interim Planner Maura Rigoni, Interim Economic Development Director Steve Gulden, Deputy Chief Jason Opiola, Finance Director Lisa Banovetz, Community and Economic Development Director Tony Budzikowski.

Absent were: Director of Public Works Mark Siefert, Assistant Public Works Director Blaine Kline, Police Chief Ed Clark, City Attorney Mike Stiff, Director of Information Technology Service Timothy Stinnett.

**TOPIC: Presentation of Crest Hill Business Park Conceptual Land Plan**

Mayor Soliman presented the Crest Hill Business Park-Sub-Area Plan-Truck Route per the memo dated May 12, 2022. City Engineer Ron Wiedeman informed the Council that staff has been working with Teska Associates and CBBEL to create a sub-area plan for the business park. This would be an amendment to the City's comprehensive plan to better define how this area could potentially be developed and also how to address traffic impacts. The following tasks were performed to evaluate the Crest Hill Business Park. Review of the existing conditions. The future outlook. Look into current and future market areas. Do a traffic analysis. Look at Stormwater impacts and traffic management.

Engineer Wiedeman introduced Mike Hoffman from Teska Associates and Bryan Welch from CBBEL who will give a presentation. Mr. Hoffman explained where the business park is located. There are some parcels in the area of the business park that are not currently in our city limits. He went over a few of the existing businesses that are in this area such as Dayton Freight, Amazon Sort Center, Old Dominion Freight, and several others. Some of the projected uses would be transportation, warehousing and manufacturing which are among the top 5 largest job providers. As far as the market areas, he went over the five minute drive time and ten minute drive times. Regarding market facts, the population and household numbers has remained stable. Median incomes are the same in the City as statewide trends. Mr. Hoffman went over the total businesses, total employees and various business classifications and employment in the area. As far as the City, Hillcrest Shopping Center and Stateville have the highest concentration of jobs. He then went over the travel statistics for workers. The commercial outlook for the area includes the need for scalable units which are businesses that don't necessarily need to be in the office every day, but still need a storefront.

Bryan Welch from CBBEL addressed the Council in regard to the traffic analysis. Things that we take into consideration are traffic counts at peak times during the day. The 2050 traffic projections. The site trip generation of 182 acres industrial, 68 acres of

commercial/retail. The scenario analyses include the no build (Division Street remains truck route). Build, which would establish a new truck route through the business park. Currently east bound traffic turning left at Weber Road is problematic and further development will exacerbate the situation. A new truck route would eliminate the truck traffic on Division Street between Churnovic Lane and Weber Road by creating a truck route through the business park. Improve operations at Weber Road by eliminating left-turning trucks onto east bound Division Street. Establish a clear plan for accommodating additional cars and trucks generated by development within the business park. A consideration of the new truck route would be to designate Churnovic Lane as the new designated truck route at Division Street. Maintain one-way northbound to eastbound traffic on Enterprise Drive for cars only. This would result in trucks east of Churnovic Lane on Division Street would be prohibited and no left-turning of trucks on eastbound Division Street at Weber Road. As far as the new truck route there are a couple of options using Churnovic Lane and Crest Hill Drive (new west leg). He then went over the typical cross section of the roadway. The internal connector streets would provide for site circulation and access to the new truck route and Weber Road. He went over the typical cross section of the internal roadway. Other roadway improvements would include construction of an eastbound RTL on Division Street at Churnovic Lane. To widen Lidice Parkway for two-way traffic between Churnovic Lane and Enterprise Drive. Construct improvements at Division Street/Enterprise Drive to prohibit trucks. Modify channelization and traffic signal phasing at Weber Road/Crest Hill Drive. Other roadway improvements could be to construct eastbound RTL on Division Street at Churnovic Lane. In regard to stormwater management an estimated 40 acres or 15% of the 250 acre site will be necessary to provide the detention to accommodate the full buildout of the business park. There are several ways this can be done. Build one large facility versus smaller localized facilities. The downside of trying to get all of the stormwater to one facility is the size of the necessary piping. The positive of a larger facility is the possibility of some passive recreation space.

Mr. Huffman then went over the existing water and sewer infrastructure in the area. As far as the zoning the current M-1 should be sufficient for the needs of the business park. He presented the proposed future land use and proposed master plan map. The main item is the re-routing of the truck traffic. He went over concept plans A and B in detail. The next step is to write an addendum to the comprehensive plan and conduct a public hearing. Alderman Albert questioned the amount of detention shown on the plans. Mr. Huffman explained how this was shown on the concept. There are a number of variables that can take place. Alderman Albert asked what is going to deter the trucks from continuing on the portion of Division that is not a truck route. There would be a significant amount of signage. Mayor Soliman questioned the curvature of the road in concept A versus concept B and stacking of trucks. Mr. Huffman explained that the least amount of turns the better. Discussion followed on the roadway design of both of the concepts, and which would be more beneficial to the City. Interim Economic Development Director Steve Gulden reminded the Council that this is an unfunded project. We would need several developers to coordinate on this project to get the work done. We need to decide on which design we would like to go with. Alderman Albert questioned a special assessment. Interim Director Gulden explained how the assessment would work. You can only impose a special assessment on new property's not existing ones. This is often difficult to do with existing businesses. Alderwoman Gazal felt that it wouldn't hurt to ask the current landowners. Alderperson Oberlin questioned the cost difference between the concepts. Engineer Wiedeman went over the area. It is roughly 4 million dollars to do the sweep. It would cost less to do the zigzag but was not sure what the savings would be. Discussion followed on the existing pipeline and how it will be crossed. Interim Director Gulden explained that until we decide on a plan we will not

know what the final cost will be. Alderperson Oberlin wants the City to look at the future to make sure we are making the right decision. Alderperson Gazal asked, taking the money factor out of the equation, which would be the best choice. It would potentially be the sweep, but there are variables that would also come into play for the future such as how much property is this proposed roadway going to take from the development. Alderperson would like to see a detailed report prior to a final decision being made. The Council could also hold a special meeting with the property owners to get their input into the project. The property owners who own the land where the proposed extension were contacted, and they do not want to currently sell their property for the roadway. Community and Economic Development Director Tony Budzikowski felt that by using the route along Lidice, you are pulling the traffic away from the residential area to the south. The next step in the continuation of this project would be a public hearing before the Plan Commission. Alderman Albert asked if there is much of a difference between this concept and the comprehensive plan. Director Budzikowski said that there is not much of a difference since 2014, but it may be a good idea to go through the process. Alderman Vershay questioned putting a road along the railroad track from Gaylord. Mr. Welch explained that there is not enough room between the existing ponds and the railroad tracks to construct the roadway.

Mayor Soliman asked for an informal vote on continuation of the Crest Hill Business Park Conceptual Land Plan and a future public hearing. All members present were in agreement.

**TOPIC: Presentation of a Proposed Development on InDeck Property Located in Crest Hill Business Park.**

Mayor Soliman presented the presentation of a Proposed Development on InDeck Property located in Crest Hill Business Park per the memo dated March 16, 2022. Interim Planner Rigoni informed the Council that the applicant is proposing to construct a 579,000 square foot industrial building on 36 acres of property located at the south end of Enterprise Blvd. and Lidice Parkway. The zoning is currently M-1, limited manufacturing. Parking is provided for 330 stalls for car parking and 151 stalls for trailer parking. The total required parking will be finalized at the time of formal submittal. The concept plan includes three access points to the site. One at the end of the cul-de-sac at Enterprise Blvd, the other on the west end, connecting to Lidice Parkway and additional access on the southeast corner to the proposed Enterprise Blvd extension. The design includes 113 docks, with 57 on the west side of the building and 56 on the east side. It also includes 2 overhead drive-in doors. A traffic study was included. Since the end-user is unknown the study was based on two types of warehousing uses. The developer has committed to \$250,000.00 toward the roadway expansion through the business park. Past proposals have included discussion on additional right-of-way along Lidice Parkway to provide adequate width for truck queuing, the extension of the roadway along the east property line, extension of a secondary road to Weber Road and limiting the number of loading docks and truck parking on site. Bulk regulations, parking, maneuverability, utilities, and site geometry will be finalized at the time of formal submittal. John from Panattoni addressed the Council. He went over the background of the company and where some of their facilities are located in the area. He explained how they would extend Enterprise Drive. Alderman Albert asked if necessary would they consider extending Churnovic. John explained that they would lose land in the corner of the property. Discussion followed on the access to the property. The developer spoke with Amazon in the past in regard to making this parcel a truck parking area, with no building. Discussion followed. The Mayor asked if there is potential for e-commerce. John said that it could be a possibility. The next step for this concept would be to appear before the Plan Commission. Mayor Soliman commended John on the look of their existing structures. Discussion followed on the architecture of the buildings. Interim Director

Gulden explained why the developer was asked to appear with the project in the concept plan. Director Budzikowski explained that this plan could be ready to go before the Commission for the July or August meeting.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** There were no public comments.

**MAYORS UPDATES:** Mayor Soliman had no updates.

**COMMITTEE/LIAISON UPDATES:** There were no committee/liaison updates.

**CITY ADMINISTRATOR UPDATES:** City Administrator Jim Marino had no further updates.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Approved this 6 day of JUNE, 2022  
As presented ✓  
As amended \_\_\_\_\_

  
CHRISTINE VERSHAY-HALL, CITY CLERK

  
RAYMOND R. SOLIMAN, MAYOR