



**LAND SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES  
October 4, 2018**

**ATTENDANCE**

<b>Land Subdivision Committee Members</b>	<b>Staff</b>
Gregg Humphrey, Chairman	Joe Zeibert
Nate Bottom	Ethan Hendricks
T.J. Heavisides	
Lori Cox	<b>Others</b>
Elliott McKinley	Kurt Wilke
Casey Pratt	Steve Walker
Steve Hall	Lori Beagles
Trustin Harrison	Rachel Clarke
Valera Yazell	Lori Williams
Dean Graven	Mike Irwin
	Jason Graham
	Kyle Quinn

- **CALL TO ORDER**

Gregg Humphrey called the meeting to order at 1:30 PM.

- **MINUTES OF MEETING**

Gregg Humphrey asked if there were any changes or corrections to the September 6, 2018, Land Subdivision Committee meeting minutes. Humphrey said hearing none, the meeting minutes would stand as approved.

- **ACTION ITEMS**

See attached

- **UNFINISHED BUSINESS AND NEW BUSINESS**

There was no unfinished business. There was no new business.

- **ADJOURNMENT**

T.J. Heavisides made a motion, seconded by Valera Yazell, to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 1:55 PM.

**SPRINGFIELD-SANGAMON COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF THE SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE MEETING**

**FILE NO.**                    1994-57  
**CENSUS TRACT #**        28.02

**NAME OF SUBDIVISION:** Iles Junction West – Location & Sketch Map and Variances

**JURISDICTION:** City of Springfield

**DATE OF MEETING:** October 4, 2018

**OWNER:** Fred W. Wanless Trust

**ENGINEER:** Steve Walker – Martin Engineering

**DESCRIPTION:** Pt. of the SE ¼, Sec. 8, Pt. of the NE ¼, Sec 17, Pt. of the SW ¼, Sec. 9, and Pt. of the N ½, NW ¼, Sec. 16, T15N, R5W

12.19    **Acres**    7    **Lots**

**MOTION TO RECOMMEND:** Variances Sec. 153.158(b)(2) – Lot Arrangement, Sec. 153.157(L) – Restriction of Access, Sec. 153.158(b)(2) – Through Lots - Approve

**BY:** T.J. Heavisides

**2<sup>ND</sup> BY:** Nate Bottom

**VOTE:** Unanimous

  

**MOTION TO RECOMMEND:** Location & Sketch Map – Approve, Subject To:

**BY:** Gregg Humphrey

**2<sup>ND</sup> BY:** T.J. Heavisides

**VOTE:** Unanimous

Kurt Wilke, Barber, Seggato, Hoffee, Wilke & Cate, presented the Location & Sketch Map. He said they have been working to get these particular lots platted for over 10 years. He said back in 1996 when the land was provided for the extension of MacArthur Boulevard to the south and Stanford Avenue across the north edge of the farm property, the Wanless Trust entered into a very detailed contract with the City of Springfield. He said one of the items in the contract was a discussion regarding the newly aligned MacArthur Boulevard. He said in that discussion in the contract, it states with respect to the lots being proposed, each lot shall have access to South MacArthur Boulevard. He said it was signed by the Wanless Trust and Mayor Hasara and the project was then allowed to proceed. He said it was a great deal for the city. He said it moved MacArthur Boulevard off a congested and narrow street. He said it was a good deal for the residents in the area as it kept traffic out of their neighborhood. He said it allowed the proper type of thoroughfare to be put in to extend traffic south to Legacy Pointe, I-

72, and ultimately Woodside. He said in doing so, it created the parcel being proposed for subdivision, which has no access except for on MacArthur Boulevard. He said it is the only way these lots can be utilized. He said in 2008, more than 10 years ago, these lots were laid out with Martin Engineering. He said in 2008, they brought in traffic engineers to identify the best access points from a traffic safety point of view. He said the initial location and sketch map was then submitted about 8 years ago. He said they used shared access points between the lots to limit the number of curb cuts they would have onto MacArthur Boulevard. He said there were many meetings, including one in 2010, in which IDOT was present, and acknowledges that the agreement allows each lot to have access to MacArthur Boulevard. He said IDOT told them they did not want entrances in the turn lanes, and asked them to adjust the location of those entrances. He said they agreed to do that. He said in 2010 they were told they needed a traffic study. He said they retained a traffic study engineer, and spent a long time getting that done. He said in 2014 the traffic study was presented to the city and IDOT. He said they went through two years of revisions and edits to the traffic study. He said he has a five page letter from IDOT telling them all of the things needed to fix the traffic study. He said all of those were completed. He said they spent over \$35,000 on the traffic study. He said they then resumed the efforts to get these lots platted. He said early this year, they sat down with the city and IDOT trying to find out what it would take to get this done. He said they offered to take it up the chain of command at IDOT, if necessary. He said they received an email from IDOT in April stating they will not allow access to MacArthur Boulevard, and that they do not know when the jurisdiction transfer will take place. He said they have gone through 10 years, spent tens of thousands of dollars, jumped through every hoop IDOT has put in front of them, and have not made any progress on the project. He said they cannot get this done, and that it is part of their contract with the city. He said he noticed in the comments that there are four different places that say the plan is fine, as long as the jurisdiction transfer takes place. He said they have been talking about the jurisdiction transfer for 10 years now. He said that at the Land Subdivision Committee meeting back in 2010, the first item on the agenda talked about was the process of doing the jurisdiction transfer. He said the discussion in 2010 said it would only take about a year to do. He said the jurisdiction transfer is eminent, but nothing ever happens. He said they feel the project needs to move forward. He said they have no problem if it is a month or two for the jurisdiction transfer to take place. He said at some point, they have to say enough is enough. He said this is a great area for development. He said they had a car wash go in. He said next to that is a credit union that plans to build soon. He said a Casey's went in across the street. He said there is lots of opportunity for this area, but they have to have platted lots.

Steve Walker, Martin Engineering, opened the floor for comments.

Joe Zeibert, Regional Planning Commission, said the staff recommends approval of the location and sketch map with conditions. He said all essential services are available to serve the site, and the development is in accord with the 2037 City of Springfield Comprehensive Plan. He said while access to an arterial is inevitable in order to develop these lots, the access points shall be approved by the entity with jurisdiction over MacArthur Boulevard. He said while jurisdiction of the road is currently in the process of being transferred from IDOT to the City of Springfield, it is still under IDOT jurisdiction. He said IDOT policy does not allow direct access from a subdivision lot to an arterial street. He said the City Traffic Engineer has indicated that they have no exception with the proposed access locations. He said once jurisdiction of MacArthur Boulevard is transferred to the City of Springfield, the access points can be recommended for approval as per the recommendation of the City Traffic Engineer.

Zeibert said there were three variance requests. He said the first variance is for lot arrangement. He said the staff recommends approval of the shared access easement to serve Lots 3-6. He said the extension of MacArthur Boulevard created a unique circumstance by creating a parcel that is too narrow for an internal public street network. He said the parcel adjoins an arterial street with access restrictions and limitations provided by the center median. He said an access easement would accommodate the necessary traffic movements needed for the development. He said the second variance is to allow access to an arterial. He said the

staff recommends approval of the variance with conditions. He said it is IDOT policy to not allow direct access to arterial road. He said at this time, MacArthur Boulevard is under IDOT jurisdiction. He said the City of Springfield and IDOT are working on the jurisdictional transfer of MacArthur Boulevard to the City of Springfield. He said once jurisdiction of MacArthur Boulevard is transferred to the City of Springfield, the access points can be recommended for approval as per the recommendation of the City Traffic Engineer. He said the last variance is for through lots. He said the staff recommends approval of the variance with conditions. He said there is a unique circumstance created by the alignment of Old MacArthur and MacArthur Boulevard. He said the lots created by the extension of MacArthur Boulevard are too narrow to supply an internal public street network. He said no access shall be allowed to Old MacArthur Boulevard due to the existing trail and the substandard condition of the road. He said the staff had additional comments for the location and sketch map. He said there is a portion of Lot 2 that is not included. He asked for clarification on what that piece is. Steve Walker, Martin Engineering, said it is a separate parcel owned by a different entity. Zeibert asked if the western portion of Lot 2 that is currently owned by the City of Springfield is being transferred to the Wanless Trust. Walker said the City of Springfield owns the existing abandoned railroad right-of-way and an existing triangle piece. He said they are splitting off part of the triangle piece to allow for an access point that will be west of the proposed median for Westchester Boulevard. He said that would allow a full access point on Westchester Boulevard. He said the eastern access point to Lot 2 would be right in, right out only due to the proposed median. Zeibert asked if right-of-way will need to be dedicated along the west edge of Wanless property for Centre Street and the turnaround at the north end of Old MacArthur. He said Public Works can address this. He asked why there is no Lot 1. Walker said Lot 1 was the area south of Westchester Boulevard. He said that because of all the meetings with IDOT and the city, there have been several indications of access to specific lots. He said if the lot numbers were shifted, the minutes from previous meetings become harder to understand. He said if they do not have to change the lot numbers, it is easier to keep track of previous meetings. Zeibert said to add a note to the plat stating no access shall be allowed onto Old MacArthur Boulevard. He said the existing electric in the area shall be shown. He said general lot dimensions shall be provided. He said all arterial and collector streets shall be identified. He said all natural features and vegetation shall be shown. He asked if the tree line along the trail was going to be preserved. Walker said there is an easement for the trail with the Park District. Zeibert said with the trail being there, it would be nice to have vegetation along it. Walker said it would be determined closer to the construction plan stage of the plan. Zeibert said a floodplain statement shall be added. He asked why additional right-of-way is being proposed along MacArthur Boulevard. Walker said it was discussed in previous meetings that in order for MacArthur Boulevard to become six lanes as it is to the south, additional right-of-way would be needed. He said they do understand that it is more than what is required by the Arterial Roadway Network Plan, but it has just been part of the negotiations.

Lori Cox, CWLP-Water, said they do have adequate water to serve this development, but a developer funded water main extension will be required to serve the lots.

Gregg Humphrey, Sangamon County Water Reclamation District, said the project will require a sanitary sewer extension from the sewer along Westchester Boulevard.

Nate Bottom, Office of Public Works, said MacArthur Boulevard is under IDOT jurisdiction. He said there is a jurisdictional transfer agreement that District 6 has reviewed, but it is not out of the central office. He said they anticipate having it completed within a couple months. He said there is a city-state agreement in place that states the city would eventually take over jurisdiction of MacArthur Boulevard.

T.J. Heavisides, Office of Public Works, said the developer shall be responsible for the relocation of the section of the bike trail as shown on the plan. He said the bike trail shall be located in an easement or other means of property rights jurisdiction to the appropriate agency.

He said if it is already in an easement, show it on the plan. He said the proximity to the floodplain shall be shown or stated. He said the Office of Public Works takes no exception to the variances as submitted. He said building permits would be required to determine configuration.

Dean Graven, Citizen Member, asked Kurt Wilke if he was looking for a timeline on the jurisdiction transfer. He said Nate Bottom mentioned IDOT would have an agreement to him in two months. He asked if the motion could include approving the location and sketch map subject to the jurisdiction transfer being completed in 60 days or less. Nate Bottom said IDOT would have something to them in a couple months. He said he cannot bind IDOT to that timeline. He said the city is going to be taking jurisdiction of MacArthur Boulevard. He said he does not know if they will have a building permit or a final plat at that time, and that he does not want to put a 60 day time limit on the jurisdiction transfer. Graven asked how we protect ourselves from something that was started back in the mid-90s. Gregg Humphrey said it would not go forward if the jurisdiction transfer is not completed. He said if it takes two months or three months, it would have to be completed before the plan can move forward. Bottom said the location and sketch map can move forward. He said it would be held at the final plat stage. Graven said if it takes longer than 60-90 days, some action has to be taken. He said it is a very attractive piece of property for growth, development, and tax base. Bottom said IDOT has done a good job of completing jurisdiction transfers recently. He said he talked to the IDOT agreements analyst prior to the meeting and said the city should have a draft of the jurisdiction transfer shortly. Humphrey said the plan may be held up at the preliminary plan stage because all services must be in place at that phase. Steve Walker asked if the requirement to have all services in place could be extended until the final plat stage while the jurisdiction transfer is completed. Humphrey said that would have to be considered at the preliminary plan stage because it is a different document at that point.

Gregg Humphrey asked if IDOT had anything else to add. Mike Irwin, IDOT District 6, said Mr. Zeibert said it all with the staff's initial comments.

Lori Beagles, Resident on Centre Street, said she has lived in this area since 1981. She said Centre Street is very busy. She said it is like a race track. She said it would be wonderful if Westchester Boulevard was opened to reduce the traffic. Nate Bottom said as a long term project, Westchester Boulevard is planned to go through with a phase of the Legacy Pointe development. He said it will not be completed with this project.

Rachel Clarke, Resident on Centre Street, said she agrees with the issue of traffic on Centre Street. She said people do not stop at the stop sign. She said they are a small neighborhood. She said they do not have a stop light at Centre Street and MacArthur Boulevard and it is hazardous to turn onto MacArthur. She said her house flooded in 1994 because the sewer system was not adequate. She said the water still pools in her yard. She said she is concerned that the water runoff will not be adequately addressed with new development on these lots. She said she can see how the land is very attractive. She said they have been a nice buffer from the traffic of MacArthur Boulevard and the interstate. She said her concern is having businesses on the other side of the trees from her house. She said she hopes they are talking about residential development. She said it would increase the traffic and clutter. She said she hopes consideration is taken to the fact that an established neighborhood is already nearby. She said there is plenty of space available for development on the other side of MacArthur Boulevard. She said that with such a small strip of land, it is hard to see how development would be desirable in that location. She said she hopes other areas are considered so that the nearby homes are not interfered with.

T.J. Heavisides made a motion to approve the three variances as submitted for Lot Arrangement, Restriction of Access, and Through Lots. Nate Bottom seconded the motion, and the vote to approve was unanimous.

Gregg Humphrey made a motion to approve the Location & Sketch Map, subject to:

1. Add a note stating no access will be allowed onto Old MacArthur Boulevard;
2. Show the existing electric lines in the area;
3. Provide general lot dimensions;
4. Identify all arterial and collector streets;
5. Show all natural features and vegetation;
6. Provide a floodplain statement; and
7. Provide an easement for the relocated bike trail.

T.J. Heavisides seconded the motion, and the vote to approve was unanimous.

Joe Zeibert asked for clarification if the approval of the plan, subject to, included the jurisdictional transfer of MacArthur Boulevard. Nate Bottom said the subject to did not include the jurisdiction transfer. Dean Graven asked if the plan would move forward to City Council for approval. Nate Bottom said the plan would move forward. Gregg Humphrey said the plan could be stopped at the preliminary plan stage if the jurisdictional transfer was not completed. He said they could ask for the preliminary plan to be approved if the jurisdiction transfer was close to being completed at that time. He said he was not sure how soon a preliminary plan would be submitted. Steve Walker said a preliminary plan would be submitted in succession with the location and sketch map approval.