

**MINUTES OF UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

Thursday, May 19, 2022 6:30pm  
City Hall Council Chambers  
800 Game Farm Road, Yorkville, IL

NOTE: In accordance with Public Act 101-0640 and Gubernatorial Disaster Proclamation issued by Governor Pritzker pursuant to the powers vested in the Governor under the Illinois Emergency Management Agency Act, the United City of Yorkville is encouraging social distancing by allowing remote attendance at the UDO Advisory Committee meeting due to the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic.

**Meeting Called to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 6:30pm by Chairman Chris Funkhouser and a quorum was established.

**Roll Call & Establishment of Quorum**

**Committee Members:**

Chris Funkhouser, Chairman/Alderman/in-person  
Jeff Olson, PZC Chairman/remote attendance  
Deborah Horaz, PZC Member/remote attendance  
Dan Transier, Alderman/remote attendance  
David Schultz, Engineer-HR Green/in-person

**Others Present:**

Krysti Barksdale-Noble, Community Development Director/remote attendance  
Jason Engberg, Senior Planner/in-person

**Previous Meeting Minutes March 31, 2022**

The minutes were approved as presented.

**Citizens Comments None**

**1. Introduction**

Mr. Engberg said the meeting would be an overview of Chapter 7. Staff and engineering have reviewed the comments and he asked for committee input as well. After Houseal Lavigne updates all the responses, this Committee will review again.

**2. Review of Materials**

**a. Chapter 7: Subdivision Standards and Procedures Discussion**

Mr. Engberg shared the updates in a PowerPoint presentation. He said the individual sub-topics in this chapter review how development is subdivided and how roads, bicycle lanes and sidewalks are regulated. This is not in the zoning ordinance now, but is part of the subdivision code, so it has become part of the unified development ordinance.

**Following is a summary of consultant updates received and Committee discussion for each sub-section of Chapter 7:**

**10-7-1 INTENT AND PURPOSE:**

No comments

### **10-7-2 LOTS:**

*Updates:* There are new requirements for landscaping for double frontage lots which can occur, but are discouraged. An update to the ordinance precludes frontage along major thoroughfares or collectors. The Comp Plan defines all existing and future roadway classifications. If a major development comes in, there will be more collector streets rather than fronting on a major road.

*Committee Discussion:* Staff looked at other UDO's, including Montgomery's which was just updated and includes many best practices. Montgomery has required east/west access of roads and orienting houses to be south-facing to utilize solar power. Mr. Schultz said it should be a recommendation, but not requirement for Yorkville. Mr. Funkhouser commented that the idea opposes design intent of streets that should be located according to features and topography, to which other committee members agreed. Staff will consider language to promote solar power generation. It was agreed that more flexibility is needed for whoever makes the determination for a cluster development and the definition of a cluster. Also needing clarification is the intent of the right angles requirement.

Discussing double frontage lots, Mr. Funkhouser said one provision states that those lots can be extra deep and create a buffer. He cautioned against extra depth and recommended the buffer be an outlot. This could result in issues of HOA management/maintenance vs. homeowner maintenance because a transition yard is required. The landscaping would be maintained by the HOA. Ms. Noble noted this is how some of the Grande Reserve lots are designed. Also questioned was who would maintain easements within a subdivision.

Access to streets: Ms. Noble said staff recommends language stating that all lots shall have access to public streets. She said there is a townhome development in Kendall Marketplace that has private roads, but they have connectivity to public streets.

Access fronting to thoroughfares/collector streets: there are requirements for separation and Mr. Funkhouser asked if this is for primary entrances and the type of inclusions. At this time, the code is written for all entrances and could include full access.

Distance between access points: Mr. Funkhouser asked if there are standards based on right in/right out traffic studies. Ms. Noble said there are standard specifications which will be detailed in an upcoming version of the code. The typical 200 feet between driveways and corner intersections will be included.

### **10-7-3 STREET DESIGN AND IMPROVEMENTS:**

*Updates:* Original block lengths were 1,320 feet and the consultants recommend retaining that for non-residential, but the length should be decreased to 800 feet for residential. This is also a CMAP recommendation to improve connectivity and walkability. A Connectivity Index was added, however, the wording was confusing. Typically developers put in street stubs and a turnaround for cars should be finished. The consultants updated lengths, widths and improvements for best practices. EEI and staff will meet for clarification.

A new concept suggested was mid-block pedestrian access in the 800-foot residential block. It could be longer if pedestrian ingress/egress is added between blocks. Heartland Circle currently does this. It has several bike trails and multi-use paths in mid-block creating easier access to the park in the center of the development. The committee will consider whether they wish to include.

Cul-de-sacs possibly should be avoided, however, they could be an opportunity to add connectivity.

There is a small amount of language for bike amenities regarding lane width and shared bike lanes that need to be in line with the current standards. Do we want to require them on the streets? Discussion is needed on this section.

*Committee Discussion:* Mr. Schultz asked the purpose of a Connectivity Index, the standards on which it is based, ranges and how to calculate it. Mr. Engberg will verify with the consultant, but the concept is to insure a good ratio of streets and intersections and to reduce the block length making the street more walkable. Mr. Funkhouser asked what is being accomplished with the block length and index. He is in favor of doing a mid-block requirement, but he said 800 feet is not very long for a street and is inefficient. He is more in favor of a good design, whether it be longer blocks, curved or a median in the middle.

Mr. Schultz said 800 feet is too short and might create too much roadway/right-of-way maintenance. Mr. Transier concurred and said more yield and stop signs will be needed and it could generate more accidents. Ms. Horaz agreed. The idea was to create a more walkable environment, said Mr. Engberg. These comments will be forwarded to the consultant. He also suggested creating developer incentives for streets longer than 800 feet. Mr. Funkhouser asked for a checklist of those incentives.

Ms. Noble said she had concern for increased impervious surfaces because it could impact the total developable area of the site. In an earlier review, the Public Works Director encouraged a trail and sidewalk rather than a sidewalk on each side of the street. Pervious pavers could also be used, said Mr. Olson, however, increased maintenance was cited. Permeable streets would be more flexible if they are wider and would reduce stormwater, Mr. Funkhouser said. Mr. Engberg commented that some communities have bio-swailes and no curb instead of grass parkways.

There was brief conversation about street intersections radii and that it must be adequate for fire apparatus. The ideal is 90 degrees and any exceptions should be considered by the zoning administrator. Flexibility was stressed.

#### Property Lines:

Committee members talked about sidewalks, straight vs. curved and recommended traditional saying the curved ones were awkward and could cause issues for utilities. They agreed corner cuts were OK too, as long as they are traditional. Cul-de-sacs should be able to accommodate fire trucks, plows, etc and Public Works should be consulted. A center island was also recommended for cul-de-sacs, but engineering should be consulted. Islands should be mountable for emergencies and there should be no vegetation that obstructs the view. An island that is wider on one end was also OK with the committee. Straight stubs must have the street built to collector standards. The committee recommended that trails/paths be called shared-use path.

#### Parkways:

The committee discussed either 5 foot or 7 foot parkways and if there would be adequate room if utilities and light poles were installed there. Ms. Noble noted that ComEd has made requests to put utilities in front yards and not under streets. Ms. Horaz questioned whether a narrower parkway is adequate for trees, however, Mr. Funkhouser said Public Works would prefer that trees not be planted in the parkway.

#### On-Street Parking:

Mr. Transier asked if all streets must be marked and striped for on-street parking. Most minor streets do not require marking.

#### Medians:

Landscaping should be required for mountable curbs, but Engineering and the Fire Department should be asked for their opinion before making it standard. If medians are landscaped they should be maintained by HOA's or the development rather than be a city obligation.

### Street Design Requirements:

The committee discussed right-of-way widths and minimum pavement widths. It was stated that the typical width in residential is 66 feet. Mr. Funkhouser questioned the justification to go from 66 feet to 75 feet and it is most likely for bike facilities. He said there should be a range and pavement widths will vary depending on other elements. Ms. Noble asked committee members to mark any suggested changes and email to staff. An example was given of collector streets in Fox Hill that allow parallel parking on one side while other collector streets do not allow parking. Flexibility is key. Mr. Schultz made a recommendation to increase widths of street from the current code to about 2 feet wider. It was suggested to obtain feedback from other government entities such as the fire and police, garbage trucks, Public Works and Septran for any concerns they may have. Mr. Engberg said staff will reach out to those agencies.

It was noted that parking requirements change in neighborhoods as children get older and there are more drivers. The question was raised if parking should be restricted to one side. Ms. Horaz commented that requirements for bike lanes, medians, parking etc., may not be needed in certain areas. Mr. Engberg said there is information available that provides information for every street and it shows bike lanes as shared. Ms. Horaz also noted there are many trails but the difficulty is crossing the river.

### **10-7-4 CIRCULATION AND CONNECTIVITY:**

*Updates:* Under the current ordinance, alleys are not permitted in the city. With new language, they are permitted, maintained privately and are encouraged in more dense residential areas. A new requirement would have all new intersections marked with a crosswalk even in neighborhoods.

*Committee Discussion:* Mr. Funkhouser said he likes alleys for small lots and if there is a rear garage for a single family home, an alley would be required for a rear loading garage. Mr. Transier asked if there is a way to enforce maintenance of alleys. Ms. Noble replied maintenance and snow removal would be considered property maintenance. The city would not do the removal, but could ticket for it. The maintenance could be covered by a backup or dormant SSA and property owners could be taxed.

### **10-7-5 EASEMENTS:**

*Committee Discussion:* Committee members questioned easements being placed in front yards for private utilities. Mr. Schultz said there could be exceptions like in Kendallwood Estates where it is dependent on the topography. Storm sewers are sometimes placed in the front. Ms. Noble will check with Engineering due to changing policies. The easements would be for dry installations, but the concern is for wet installations in the front. The committee recommended keeping utilities in the back until a mandate is received.

### **10-7-6 WATER, SEWER AND STORMWATER**

*Committee Discussion:* For stormwater drainage, bio-swales were recommended. Ms. Horaz asked if they should be planted with tall grasses or natural vegetation and how they are maintained. Maintenance depends on the rear yard or common open spaces. It was noted in Windett Ridge, it would be a major overflow as there is not enough capacity. She also asked about bio-swales in parkways. That would be part of cluster designs. If they were in the parkway or public way, it would be the city's job to maintain. Aurora has already converted some areas to this method. Ms. Horaz said she likes bio-swales as a feature, but not in the front or parkway.

### **10-7-7 CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT:**

*Updates:* A new cluster development section was added and recommended in the 2016 Comp Plan. Cluster bonuses could include more density if they maintain conservation easements or preserve natural features.

*Committee Discussion:* Mr. Funkhouser asked if the density number is correct and appropriate since wetlands should be preserved. In the denser developments, a bio-swale could be located on one side and a sidewalk on the other side. The least amount of pavement should be used in maintaining these wild conservation areas. Ms. Horaz suggested a trail to wind around the bio-swales for an interesting look. Mr. Funkhouser noted this section

addresses resources to be preserved, but criteria should also be added for maximum density. Mr. Engberg said it is defined by IDNR. This will go through staff approval and City Council will be the final authority if something more specific should be preserved.

**10-7-8 ANTI-MONOTONY STANDARDS:**

*Committee Discussion:* Committee members asked what is considered the threshold for any of the anti-monotony standards. Ms. Horaz expressed concern for flat roofs, saying they are not practical with Illinois weather and that a more modern look is needed. It was noted that some commercial buildings have flat roofs and some in-fill buildings do as well. They concurred that more specifics are needed regarding roof heights, colors and products.

**10-7-9 PARK LAND PROVISION:**

*Committee Discussion:* The committee had no issue with parks being required and it was noted the size has changed to a minimum of 8,000 sq. ft. for a playlot. They were OK with the proposed requirements if Parks and Rec approved. They also had no issue with land dedicated for schools. If there are areas dedicated to older age ranges, the committee asked that it should be referenced with an age study.

**3. Committee Comments and Questions**

There were no further comments/questions from committee members.

In summary, Mr. Engberg said staff will have Chapters 3, 4, 5, 6 back from the consultants soon. He and Ms. Noble have reviewed them and the committee will review them again at the June 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting. They have also been working with Encode Plus who now has newer features and the completed chapters will be sent to Encode by this summer. Some of the chapters will soon be entered into the on-line interactive version and changes can still be made at that point. Also, a new feature will allow developers to visualize changes in 3-D while applying code standards. There are two more chapters left for the Advisory Committee to consider.

**4. Adjournment**

There was no further business and the meeting adjourned at 8:27pm.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Marlys Young, Minute Taker  
Transcribed from audio; not present at meeting