

Well #13, Water Tower, and Iron Filtration Building FAQ Document

Prepared by: Warrenville Public Works

Last updated 9/22/2022

This is a working document that addresses comments and questions received by the City of Warrenville via the August 4, 2022, Public Hearing and other separate individual comments from people. This document is likely to be updated as additional work is performed on the City's revised design documents for the project.

When it is modified, the date it was last updated will be reflected on the document.

IMPORTANT NOTE

City Council approved a real estate contract with Thorntons on 9/19/2022. The City now intends to purchase both the Thorntons and 30W121 Estes properties.

A request to continue the Public Hearing to 11/10/2022 has been submitted. This continuation will allow (i) Thorntons and the property owner to execute the approved contract, (ii) City staff and consultants to revise the City's proposed special use / PUD application documents for the Estes property to include only well and iron filtration facility related improvements on approximately the south half of that property, and (iii) staff and City consultants to prepare and submit a new special use application for a proposed 500,000 gallon elevated water tower on the southwest corner of the Thorntons property.

This would allow the continued Estes property public hearing and the new Thorntons property public hearing to both be conducted at the 11/10/2022 meeting.

Well #13, Water Tower, and Iron Filtration Building FAQ Document

Last updated 9/22/2022

| Question/Comment | Response |
|--|---|
| Is moving the site off of the spine a possibility even it might cost a little bit of more money? What is the City's priority? | City Council approved a real estate contract with Thorntons on 9/19/2022. The City now intends to purchase both the Thorntons and 30W121 Estes properties. A request to continue the Public Hearing to 11/10/2022 has been submitted. This continuation will allow (i) Thorntons and the property owner to execute the approved contract, (ii) City staff and consultants to revise the City's proposed special use / PUD application documents for the Estes property to include only well and iron filtration facility related improvements on approximately the south half of that property, and (iii) staff and City consultants to prepare and submit a new special use application for a proposed 500,000 gallon elevated water tower on the southwest corner of the Thorntons property. This would allow the continued Estes property public hearing and the new Thorntons property public hearing to both be conducted at the 11/10/2022 meeting. |
| Is eminent domain off the table for the BP/Thorntons site? | |
| Why can't a park be on the subject property? | The City has the property under contract to purchase, for the purposes of constructing critical water system infrastructure. The construction of a well and iron filtration building is necessary to support the recent development that has occurred in the Southwest District. It is the City's responsibility to provide safe drinking water and fire protection to the existing neighborhood and recent developments. The Warrenville Park District is |
| What is the benefit/value to homes on well? Has consideration been given to an alternative use for the subject property, such as a dog park or children's park? | |
| Can something like a park or something more beneficial be considered? | |
| Is the proposed building design providing varied building setbacks? | No, but the design of the building is being updated to look more like the Lexington Trace architecture. |
| Can the water treatment facility plant look like a home? | The design of the building is being updated to look more like the Lexington Trace architecture, including the gray color scheme. The City is not proposing to construct a net zero building at this location. The City is however planning to install solar panels on the building. |
| Can the building elevations be revised to match Lexington Trace? Specifically the gray pattern? Regarding the trim work and different orientations of finishes, can the masonry on the site go farther up, not just a little wainscoting, but three-quarters up the man door? Should the overhead 10' by 10' door be enlarged to 14' by 14'? Can the windows be upgraded to obtain net zero on this site? | |
| What is the approximate height of the equipment building? | Approximately 22 1/2 feet to the peak of the roof. |
| Why does the iron filtration plant have to be so close to Barkley Avenue? Why can't it be another 20 feet further to the west so that a setback variation is not required? | The site plan is being revised so the iron filtration building will be located in the south half of the site and meet the required 40 foot setback from Barkley Avenue. |
| Is it possible to move the building to the south of the site and the driveway to come off of Duke Parkway? | The iron filtration building will be moved into the south half of the site. Relocating the driveway to connect with Duke Parkway is not possible as there is a privately owned parcel with landscaping improvement located between 30W121 Estes Street and Duke Parkway. Staff is evaluating if and how far south on the property the proposed Barkley Driveway can be moved. |
| Was a metal building or whatever else an option? | A metal building was not considered for this site, as it is not appropriate for this location. |
| Is it possible to turn the building 90 degrees so the narrow end of the building faces Estes and set the building back a little further. That's a consideration. I know you said it's part of getting circulation around the tower, being able to work around it, but I thought that was -- that could be a viable alteration. | Staff and consultants are evaluating the appropriate layout and location of the well, iron filtration building, and pavement in the south half of the property. |
| My comment would be if you're filling a pond could be filled with stone and compacted to give you a structural base to build on without having to wait for settling. So, I don't think if this was a house coming forward on a residential -- you know, if the guy had a house burn down and he came back to the plan commission to go 22 and-a-half feet from Barkley, I don't think that would be approved. I know it's similar to Lexington Trace setbacks, but this is on the south side of Estes, so I think -- I feel it's kind of isolated from that, and it would look like it could go to the 40 feet with a little bit of extra planning for that. | The proposed use is not a residential use. The site plan is being revised so the iron filtration building will be located in the south half of the site and meet the required 40 foot setback from Barkley Avenue. |
| The development includes reduced building setback of 22.5 feet, and I think that is along Barkley Avenue, which is consistent with the Lexington Trace subdivision. This use you are utilizing something that is not a residential use, though; correct? | |

Well #13, Water Tower, and Iron Filtration Building FAQ Document

Last updated 9/22/2022

| Question/Comment | Response |
|--|---|
| Many of the 22.5-foot building setbacks in Lexington Trace, are what we would call interior lots; correct, they are not on corners? | |
| Adjacent to the east, the City owns property that is zoned residential- how big a strip does the City own? How east-west wide is that strip? | Its approximately 0.46 acres and measures approximately 60 feet wide. However, with the City intending to purchase two properties and split the improvements between the two properties, the temporary use of the City owned property on the east side of Barkley is no longer being requested. |
| Not a huge buffer between that and the next property? | |
| Can you explain the road program on the sewer and water program that the city has, and at what point in time Estes and Briggs may be improved? | The City estimates that Estes and Briggs will be upgraded before 2030. The plan is to extend sewer and water down both those streets in coordination with that work. It is uncertain at this point to know what exactly what the design of that project would be. It is likely that there would be a sidewalk on at least one side of the street, and possibly concrete curb and gutter along the edge of the street. |
| Is providing water a governmental responsibility of the City of Warrenton? | Yes, serving the potable water needs of the community in a efficient and quality manner is an appropriate government responsibility. |
| Is one of the City's responsibilities to provide water to those the City already provides water to? Is it required by city ordinances? | It is the City's responsibility to maintain the existing water system to provide a safe consistent source of drinking water to City water customers. |
| Are there residents not getting city water? | Yes, there are residents, including incorporated property on Estes and Briggs that are on private wells, because City water is not currently available. A significant part of the City has sewer and water available. |
| Is there a construction cost difference between the Thorntons and the subject site as it relates to just pure construction costs? | The City is now intending to purchase both the Thorntons and 30W121 Estes properties, constructing the water tower on the Thorntons property and the well and iron filtration building on the south half of the 30W121 Estes property. This will shorten the construction time frame by an estimate 10-12 months and save the City significant money. |
| Can it be clarified if the construction cost on the subject property would be more or less than the Thorntons site except for the fact Thorntons is pretty much project ready? | |
| How long would construction last? What's the estimate? Is it a six-month or eight month time frame? | |
| Given the expected construction period of about three years, isn't it possible to do that additional infrastructure needed to put a water tower further away from where the additional planned communities are going to come in? | The City is now intending to purchase both the Thorntons and 30W121 Estes properties, constructing the water tower on the Thorntons property and the well and iron filtration building on the south half of the 30W121 Estes property. This will shorten the construction time frame by an estimate 10-12 months and save the City significant money. |
| Will construction take 3 years? | Construction is anticipated to be two years, because the improvements will be split between two properties. |
| How much will it cost to install a water main? | It depends on how far the water main would be extended and where the extension would occur. The City does not have current water main construction prices. Prices have increased significantly on everything. It is definitely more expensive now than it would have been a year ago. |
| What is the overall cost estimate for the whole project? | The City is now intending to purchase both the Thorntons and 30W121 Estes properties, constructing the water tower on the Thorntons property and the well and iron filtration building on the 30W121 Estes property. This will shorten the construction time frame by an estimate 10-12 months and save the City significant money. The total project cost is estimated to be approximately \$8.5 million dollars. |
| What would the cost be if the project would be moved, say a couple blocks? | |
| Is it possible, to provide an at-ground system or something with a different -- not as high a system. | It is very difficult for a ground storage tank to replicate the advantages of an elevated storage tank in terms of providing fire flows. |
| Can the design of the water tower be presented and be approved by the public? | The water tower is consistent with the City's three existing water towers and the white color with the City's new logo is the City Council approved design for City water towers. The City is not aware of any other public water tower design that has been presented for public approval. |

Well #13, Water Tower, and Iron Filtration Building FAQ Document

Last updated 9/22/2022

| Question/Comment | Response |
|---|---|
| Concerned with the influx of the folks in Lexington Trace is the increased number of dog walkers and dog waste in people's yard. Can a dog park be accommodated on the property? | The City has the property under contract to purchase, for the purposes of constructing critical water system infrastructure. The construction of a well and iron filtration building is necessary to support the recent development that has occurred in the Southwest District. It is the City's responsibility to provide safe drinking water and fire protection to the existing neighborhood and recent developments. The City has no plans to construct a dog park on the unused section of the Estes Property. |
| Is preservation of drainage ways and other natural features happening? | The City is obligated to maintain storm water drainage through and from the site in a manner consistent with existing conditions. The City is re-evaluating the existing trees on the property with the goal of preserving as many of the healthy ones as reasonably possible. |
| Existing natural conditions of the subject site indicate a very vegetative site with very overgrowth of trees, 50 feet tall. Wiping them out is against your Tree Protection Plan. | The zoning ordinance does not include a requirement for a tree protection plan. City staff and a consulting arborist are currently evaluating a recent tree survey in conjunction with the proposed well, iron filtration building, and pavement in the south half of the site, to determine what trees are appropriate to be saved. |
| There is an existing green tree is the 50-feet tall that can be seen from the street. There are also three Blue Spruce trees in front. These three trees were the ones proposed to being removed by that zoning setback. You can see they are rather large. Again, this is from the street. | |
| A night view of the subject site indicates the screening that the existing trees on the subject property provides to the neighboring property and from Route 59. Light pollution is coming off of Thorntons. Existing trees screen the light pollution. Lexington Trace's lights are well-contained. | |
| Can the existing trees/overgrown trees be preserved? Keeping them would help with the light pollution alone. | |
| Concerned with the removal of the existing manmade water pond that includes a lot of wildlife and contributes to the community quite a bit, and all the bird life that lives on this property contributes to our community. Can it be preserved? Is it a liability? | The manmade pond will be filled and the north half of the site will be planted with turf grass and other landscape materials. |
| The proposal indicates a board-on-board fence along the west side of property and a black coated chain link fence around the south, east and north sides of the water tank. Is it possible to update to a solid vinyl fence? | The fence materials will be upgraded to a vinyl board on board fence along the west side of the property and along the north side of the building, which is now proposed in the south half of the property. There will no longer be any chain link fence. |
| Is the chain link fence around the entire property or just the water tower? | |
| Can the chain link fence be changed to a black iron picket fence? Instead of a wood board fence can a composite board fence be provided so it doesn't need to be painted? | |
| How are the proposed improvements be paid - out of property taxes or out of our water bill? | Generally, the water system is funded by the specific funds that are paid by the users. In this case, since this is a TIF District, the plan is to borrow money and pay it back with TIF dollars. The project is not anticipated to impact property values. |
| Approximately how much would project impact property values? What would be the timing of the impact? | |
| Question regarding gas tank or fuel tank, how is the property going to be powered? via a generator? Underground? | The generator will be fueled by natural gas. |
| How frequent will the generator run for? | The 120 kW generator will run weekly on Wednesday at 10:00 a.m. for 30 minutes under normal conditions. If there's a power outage, it will run as long as it needs to. The generator noise is 70 decibels from a distance of 23 feet away, similar to a gas-powered lawn mower. The building design is being modified to incorporate the generator inside, so the noise will be much quieter outside of the building. The fenced area that was originally shown at the west side of the building was to screen the generator. It is no longer necessary, because the generator will be inside the building. |
| And then I thought if the decibel level from the generator could be provided, that would be helpful. That being said, people have home generators they also come on once a week. I don't know what the size of this one is versus a home generator because those are, you know, those come on once a week, too, just to keep them lubricated and running. | |
| Do you know the size of the generator? | |
| Is it going to be in an enclosure, soundproof enclosure maybe? | |
| Can a sound attenuated enclosure to enclose the generator be considered? | |
| Is the fence intended for the generator? | |

Well #13, Water Tower, and Iron Filtration Building FAQ Document

Last updated 9/22/2022

| Question/Comment | Response |
|--|--|
| What is the outside storage on the west side of the building? | |
| Can you confirm the generator runs once a week for 30 minutes? Is there a specific time or day that the generator will run? | |
| Can the water tank be maxed at 60 feet to have a little peak over the 50-foot trees? The 157-foot tower is gigantic and will loom over the neighborhood. | The water tower is now being proposed on the Thorntons property, approximately 550 feet farther south of the previous location. The proposed elevated water storage tank is generally consistent in height and design with the City's three other existing water towers. |
| Regarding tax dollars that are going into the subject project, has a spine from the west or somewhere else. been considered? It might cost less overall. Can City consider making a plan, and how much it would cost for an alternative site with a spine? Can an alternative plan be considered? | The City is now intending to purchase both the Thorntons and 30W121 Estes properties, constructing the water tower on the Thorntons property and the well and iron filtration building on the 30W121 Estes property. |
| Could consideration be given to putting a berm, either around the property or at developed around the tower, so that if a major leak developed it would be contained? | Berms around public water towers are not typically installed to "contain" the site. They are typically installed for aesthetic reasons. |
| Can a berm that is five feet tall and with trees on top of that be provided for further screening of the facility? Can placing bigger mature evergreen trees closer to one another along the lot lines, in particular the north side and east side where feasible be possible? Can evergreen shrubs be added to supplement? | A berm is not being considered, however, City staff and consultants are currently evaluating a recent tree survey in conjunction with the proposed well, iron filtration building, and pavement in the south half of the site, to determine what trees are appropriate to be saved. The existing trees to be saved will be incorporated into a revised landscape plan the City landscape consultant will be developing for the revised project which includes the water tower being moved to the Thorntons site . The City believes the planned relative low building height in combination with the preservation of more existing trees and additional proposed new landscaping should together provide sufficient screening. |
| As far as the landscape plan, there's some large trees on there. Are any of those in a position on the lot to be saved? | |
| Why is the screening on the north abutting residential not as dense as some of the other sides? | |
| "The proposed landscaping will be consistent with Lexington Trace leaving space for future maintenance of the new system improvements and maintain visibility of the water tower and building from Estes and Barkley for Public Works and the police department for security purposes." That's why it's -- you're not fencing it with -- | The site is being redesigned with only the well and iron filtration building on 30W121 Estes, as the water tower is now being proposed on the Thorntons property. The landscaping and fencing will be adjusted with the trees to be saved and the revised well and building placement. |
| "Due to the construction area necessary to construct a water tower, all existing trees and shrubs within the site will be removed. "Will an attempt be made to try to save trees and shrubs? Is it realistic to do so?" | City staff and consultants are currently evaluating a recent tree survey in conjunction with the proposed well, iron filtration building, and pavement in the south half of the site, to determine what trees are appropriate to be saved. The existing trees to be saved will be incorporated into a revised landscape plan. |
| Can you clarify if public or common open spaces and landscaping is being provided? | Public or common open space is not being provide due to the type of public improvements. Public or common open space is generally not provided as part of the water infrastructure projects. |
| Is it possible to additional plantings on the interior of the site, not just the exterior parkways? | The proposed landscape plan is being revised and will include additional plantings. |
| Have most of the Lexington Homes been sold? | All of the units in the original subdivision have been sold. |
| Any preservation of natural features? The pond? | City staff and consultants are currently evaluating a recent tree survey in conjunction with the proposed well, iron filtration building, and pavement in the south half of the site, to determine what trees are appropriate to be saved. The manmade pond will be filled. |
| How much noise is going to be created during the construction of this tower and buildings? | There will be normal construction noise during the allowable working hours of the City. |
| In terms of odors, what experience of other sites in Warrenville or other cities, has that been brought up or a concern or something that somebody had to deal with? Is that any experience we've had with that? | The City experiences no odors outside of the water treatment buildings on its existing sites. It is anticipated that bleach for treatment of water, as well as fluoride and a blended phosphate will be used inside of the building. There will be containment inside the building to contain and minimize the possibility of any spills of these materials would leak outside the building. |
| Are there odors during construction? From underground? | Normal construction odors associated with moving dirt, constructing a building, welding and other things like that. Nothing from underground. |
| Does the city own the property just to the east where the temporary use permit is being asked? | The City is no longer requesting a temporary use on the City owned 0.46 acre parcel on the east side of Barkley. The City does not own the parcel east of the 0.46 acre parcel. |

Well #13, Water Tower, and Iron Filtration Building FAQ Document

Last updated 9/22/2022

| Question/Comment | Response |
|--|---|
| From a civil engineering standpoint, while it might be preferable to have a water tower, both from a cost standpoint, and maybe it's easier, is it possible to engineer a facility, a storage facility, that is not a water tower but is either ground or below ground using extra | Yes it is possible, but this is not what the City is proposing. |
| What would that cost be? | The City did not develop a cost estimate for a ground storage tank, so this cost is not available. It is very difficult for a ground storage tank to replicate the advantages of an elevated storage tank in terms of providing fire flows. |
| Concerned about the eyesore, proximity to residential homes, and impact to property values. Is a negative impact to property values expected? | A negative impact on property values is not expected with the water tower being moved to the Thorntons property and the well and iron filtration building proposed in the south half of the Estes property. |
| Can the homes be re-evaluated after improvements take place? | |
| Do you know if lots closest to a water tower are discounted? | No. Lots could be discounted for various reasons but were reportedly not in the existing neighborhood. |
| Could a water tower be one reason for discounting a lot? | |
| Are people concerned about their property values in the area? | Yes. |
| Concerned with the removal of the landscaping and negative impact to property values. | City staff and consultants are currently evaluating a recent tree survey in conjunction with the proposed well, iron filtration building, and pavement in the south half of the site, to determine what trees are appropriate to be saved. |
| Given the infrastructure that is expected- the spine- are you going to have to have something for the people that are on the other part of the community, so you're going to be building from there back to this well, why not just build further out to begin with? | The site is being redesigned with only the well and iron filtration building on 30W121 Estes, as the water tower is now being proposed on the Thorntons property. |
| How can we guarantee that the elected officials will listen to the residents with an open mind, | The public hearing process is intended to hear from all, including residents. Staff encourages the public to reach out to staff for project information and to their elected official. The Community Development and Public Works Departments are available to share the proposed plans and continue to carefully and seriously evaluate the public input provided at the initial Plan Commission public hearing for this project. The City has a responsibility to provide reliable and quality water service to its residents and businesses in a responsible and efficient manner. |
| The objective of a planned unit development, PUD, is not simply to allow exceptions to otherwise applicable regulations, but instead to encourage a higher level of design and amenity than it is possible to achieve under the usual land development requirements. What is the proposed project's higher level of design? | The site is being redesigned with only the well and iron filtration building on 30W121 Estes, as the water tower is now being proposed on the Thorntons property. Additionally, the design of the building is being updated and enhanced to look more like the Lexington Trace architecture, including the gray color scheme. The City is committed to increase the quality of the materials used in the construction of the building and fencing on the property and preserving more existing trees on the property than would be required on properties that are not part of a PUD. |
| Will the planned unit development dedicate or reserve land for park or school sites? | No, the site does not generate any impact to the Park District or School District. |
| Under Quality of Design, D-3, it talks about to be granted the flexibility to be permitted- "To be granted the flexibility permitted hereunder, a planned unit development must evidence a level of design and amenities exceeding those typical of conventional development." Does the proposed design and materials exceed what would probably be used for a normal governmental building? | Yes. The proposed design of the building is being revised and further enhanced. The City firmly believes the revised building design would be significantly more attractive and include higher quality materials than what would normally be used for a building like this. The design of the building is also being updated to look more like the Lexington Trace architecture, including the gray color scheme. |
| Among the features that may evidence a higher level of amenities may include amount, quality and interconnectedness of common open space. Is common open space being provided? Pedestrian or bicycle path separated from streets? | No new public open space is being proposed as part of this project but a new public sidewalk is planned along the south side of Estes Street along the north side of this site. |
| PUD requirements include "The project will be similar to the architectural finishes on future buildings and landscape materials consistent with Lexington Trace Subdivision." How? | The design of the building is being updated to look more like the Lexington Trace architecture, including the gray color scheme. The redesigned building will have more windows, more articulation, and an increased amount of masonry accents. |

Well #13, Water Tower, and Iron Filtration Building FAQ Document

Last updated 9/22/2022

| Question/Comment | Response |
|--|--|
| "This project will be compatible with the neighborhood and will not seriously impair property values or environmental quality in the neighborhood." I'm going through property values again, "Nor will it impede the orderly development of the surrounding property." Part of that may be because Lexington Trace was already built; correct? I mean, Lexington Trace has already been built, or at least the section these people live in directly to the north was built, has already been built? | Proposed development is being designed to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood including the Lexisting Trace Subdivision. The site plan, building elevations and material, and landscaping plans for the project have taken the design of the adjacent neighborhood into consideration and a conscious effort is being made to have the proposed improvements blend into the surrounding neighborhood as best as reasonably possible. |
| Are common recreational facilities being provided - enclosed, underground, depressed, or outstandingly landscaped parking areas. | No. |
| Can a rendering directly from the east looking west be prepared? | Yes, the City will have its architectural consultant provide a rendering directly from the east looking west. |
| Can you explain the City's road program, specifically for residents of Estes and Briggs. Is the road program on a 15-year cycle? As the city rebuilds the roads and if the sewer main and water mains are not in place, does the City still install the roads? Do homeowners pay a portion of that cost to install them? | The City's roads are resurfaced on a 15-year cycle. The intent is to extend water and sewer along Briggs and Estes when the roads are next resurfaced. The resurfacing of the roads and the water and sewer extensions would be paid for with TIF#4 funds. Residents would pay standard connection fees to hookup to water and sewer, but not for the extensions of the water and sewer mains along the streets. |
| Can landscaping hide it? | The water tower is now being proposed on the Thorntons property, approximately 550 feet farther south of the previous location. Preservation of additional existing trees and planting of additional new landscaping should help buffer the single story building being proposed on the 30W121 Estes property. |
| Why can a variance be requested to move the tower further to the south Further away from the Lexington Trace property? | The water tower is now being proposed on the Thorntons property, approximately 550 feet farther south of the previous location. |
| Do the proposed improvements include an additional sidewalk going down Estes that's not there now? | Correct. The proposed site plan indicates sidewalk along Estes adjacent to the subject lot. |
| The water treatment plant, the well, and the elevated storage tank don't all have to be on the same site. Can a small parcel maybe further south for the tank be acquired and use the main line to come back to the well. Has that been entertained at all? | The City is now intending to purchase both the Thorntons and 30W121 Estes properties, constructing the water tower on the Thorntons property and the well and iron filtration building on the south half of the 30W121 Estes property. |
| In general, if development takes place further west, why not build this infrastructure now in an open area where there aren't residents around before any subdivision comes in? | Everything west of the subject property in Warrentville is residential. |
| Is there an opportunity to do joint with Naperville? | No, Warrentville and Naperville have two different water systems. |
| There might be an opportunity for the citizens in the area to reach out to BP to create a PR nightmare for BP that would demand some response from them. And if the residents were to do that, and got the attention of their attorneys and they play ball, would that site be a viable option for the City plans if we re-invigorated the conversation between the city and BP? Is there an opportunity for get the attention of BP to respond to the City? | Thorntons reengaged in negotiations with the City, and the resulting contract was approved by City Council on 9/19/2022. The City is now intending to purchase both the Thorntons and 30W121 Estes properties, constructing the water tower on the Thorntons property and the well and iron filtration building on the 30W121 Estes property. |
| Was the initial plan for it to be at Thorntons; is that correct? | |
| And you negotiated with them for how long before they stopped responding? | |
| How long has it been from the time they stopped responding to the time the City put the project on this lot? | |
| So more than a year passed from the time they stopped responding to the time that this lot burned down? | |
| What was the strategy or plan in the interim after Thorntons stopped responding and before the house burned down? | |
| Was eminent domain an option with the Thorntons site? Is it an option now? | |
| What would the plan be if the subject property had not become available due to the house burning down? | |
| Would City have to select another site? Just waited? | |

Well #13, Water Tower, and Iron Filtration Building FAQ Document

Last updated 9/22/2022

| Question/Comment | Response |
|---|--|
| Why was the proposed improvements for a water tower not negotiated into an agreement with Thorntons when they bought the site? If the house had not been burned down, what was a solution or the process that was going to be followed? Why is the City not following or pursuing that? | |
| How was the site selected? How difficult would it be to move? | |
| Have other sites been explored? | |
| All of the other maintenance facilities have very little drives unlike the subject proposal. The amount of pavement/drives be reduced? | The pavement area will be reduced on 30W121 Estes, when the plan is updated with only the well and iron filtration building on that property. |
| Does the project incorporate green building, smart growth and other sustainable design principles, such as solar panels? | There will be solar panels installed on the roof of the building. |
| Will the building be a LEED certified building? | No, the City is not currently planning to construct a LEED certified building. |
| Can you confirm the solar panel will on the south side of the site rather than on the north side where they'll get shaded by the tower itself. | The location solar panels will be installed on the building is still being evaluated and will need to be coordinated with the final design and orientation of the propose building. |
| They're on the south side of the building positioned on the north side of the site, so they will mostly be under the shadow of that tower. | With the water tower proposed on the Thorntons property, and the well and iron filtration building on 30W121 Estes, this is not expected to be an issue. |
| Is the approval criteria listed on the Special Use Permit Application - Form B, actually standards of the special use? | The application includes the approval criteria found in <i>Table 7C: Approval Criteria for Special Use</i> of the Zoning Ordinance. |
| B indicates <i>In evaluating the suitability of a proposed special use, the plan commission and city council shall examine the following characteristics, et cetera.</i> Is that part of the language? Is that in the Ordinance? | That's part of the application. The approval criterial for Special Uses can be found in Table 7C in C. Special Uses of the Zoning Ordinance. Community Development Department staff feel the approval criteria for Planned Unit Developments, as listed in Table 8A of the Zoning Ordinance are the most appropriate approval criteria to use in evaluating whether this project should be approved. |
| Item B.3. of the application indicates structure height as one of the characteristics to be examined? | Yes, item B.3. of the application includes structure height. |
| Is number 3 of the Special Use Application neighborhood character? | Yes. Neighborhood Character is included in the Special Use Permit Application and is <u>B.3.Neighborhood Character</u> |
| Does the application talk about the proposed use fitting harmoniously with the existing natural or manmade character of its surroundings and with permitted uses in the zoning district? Does the response talk about "the architectural finishes of the iron filtration building and any mobile carrier buildings, and the landscaping materials, will be consistent with the Lexington Trace subdivision? | Yes. It states <i>The proposed use will fit harmoniously with the existing natural or man-made character of its surroundings and with Permitted Uses in the zoning district. The use will not have undue deleterious effect on the environmental quality, property values, or neighborhood character already existing in the area or normally associated with Permitted Uses in the district.</i> The response was that the <i>architectural finishes of the iron filtration building and any mobile carrier buildings, and the landscaping materials, will be consistent with the Lexington Trace Subdivision.</i> The antennas and mobile carrier buildings have been removed from the proposed project. |
| Can it be confirmed the water tower was not mentioned in the response? | The water tower is now proposed on the Thorntons site. |
| Can you confirm that under item 3. Neighborhood character, property values is included - <i>The use will not have undue deleterious effect on the environmental quality, property values, or neighborhood character already existing in the area or normally associated with Permitted Uses in the district.</i> | Yes. It indicates <i>The use will not have undue deleterious effect on the environmental quality, property values, or neighborhood character already existing in the area or normally associated with Permitted Uses in the district.</i> |
| Is the City following the DuPage County Storm water Ordinance? Is this required. | Correct. There is an exception in the ordinance. When there is a community well, Best Management Practices cannot be constructed over the top of that, so the City will be paying a fee in lieu of for that. |
| Does an Alta survey for a project other than a residential use require all trees on-site with the caliper, height and breed of the tree listed? If so, the ALTA survey that was submitted is incomplete and is not showing to the council the degree with which the site will need to be changed. | ALTA surveys typically do not include all trees on-site with caliper, height and species of the trees listed. A tree survey on the other hand will include this information. A tree survey has been completed and will be submitted with the revised plans. The proposed site plan and related plans show the degree the site will change. |

Well #13, Water Tower, and Iron Filtration Building FAQ Document

Last updated 9/22/2022

| Question/Comment | Response |
|---|---|
| Is there a termination date on that temporary use permit regarding construction? | The temporary use permit is no longer being requested. |
| Is it possible to include a sunset clause or something similar to have this temporary construction easement, whether it be six months after construction is completed or whatever, go away to be fair to the property owner to the east? | |
| What is the timing of the water tower? Would that be the first? | The water tower would be constructed on the Thorntons property at the same time the well and iron filtration building are constructed on the 30W121 Estes property. |
| If the Thornton property was still on the table, how do you handle the proximity to the underground storage tanks when you could be obviously be closer than the 440 feet? | It's a 400 feet minimum. There's a very narrow location on the Thornton property where a well could possibly be installed. The 30W121 Estes property provides more flexibility to place the well, because the majority of that site is more than 400 feet from the underground storage tanks on the Thorntons property. |
| What is the proximity of storage tanks to other gas or underground storage tanks? What does code require, 440 feet? What is proposed, 483 feet? What are our other water tanks in terms of distance from that? | The City's other wells are not near gas stations or underground storage tanks. The IEPA requires a minimum of 400 feet of separation. The site plan is being redesigned with the well and iron filtration building in the south half of 30W121 Estes. The exact dimension will be shown on the updated plan. |
| However, the downside of that is it allows these residents and any properties to the east, they're going to have the full site, access to the site, they're going to see everything as well. | The water tower proposed on the Thorntons property, the well and iron filtration building on 30W121 Estes, and the building design being upgraded to be consistent with the Lexington Trace architecture, including the gray color scheme. The improvements will be screened from the residents and the view from the east will be of a building with a residential look. |
| North and the east line? | |
| The west property line? | |
| Is water utility exempt in the Warrenville Zoning Ordinance? | No. |
| One more question, you were saying about the kind of immense cost of moving the waterline to the main line. Where does the main line currently run? Does it run directly under the lot that you're proposing that the water tower is built on? | No, it runs in the west parkway of Barkley Avenue, adjacent to this site. |
| How far does the water line need to be extended to reach the proposed water tower area? | Connection to the water main from 30W121 Estes is less than a hundred feet. The water tower is proposed on the Thorntons property, which has a water main stubbed to the proposed water tower location. |
| What are the site improvements, like a water main, that would be needed if the water tower where to be moved west, south or to some other location? | Sites other than 30W121 Estes and Thorntons would all require significant water main extensions, and some have floodplain and wetland concerns. However, the City intends to purchase both 30W121 Estes and a piece of the Thorntons property for the improvements. |
| Why wasn't the water tower first commissioned before the townhomes were put in? | The City was engaged in negotiations to acquire the Thorntons site before Lexington Trace and Everton were developed. Negotiations did not proceed as expected, however, with City Council approval of the Thorntons contract on 9/19/2022, the City will have both 30W121 Estes and Thorntons under contract to purchase. |
| Is an elevated storage tank the only option looked at? Have the City looked at steel pipes or different alternatives-- using a ground storage tank with a water pump to facilitate the same result with less, like, tall structures that is going to be visible to every resident in the community? | Ground storage has not been explored. The City has only considered an elevated water storage tank, consistent with its other three storage tanks. |
| What are the specific benefits that the water tower will bring to local residents that are already being served by water? | The proposed improvements provide needed supply and storage so the City's water system has the capacity and redundancy to provide adequate water supply, pressure and fire fighting capability throughout the entire system, including the adjacent Lexington Trace neighborhood. |
| Specifically the communities that are close, how does the proposed improvements including the water tower help? How does it make the water better right away? | |

Well #13, Water Tower, and Iron Filtration Building FAQ Document

Last updated 9/22/2022

| Question/Comment | Response |
|--|--|
| Is the water tower considered a building? | No, the water tower is not considered a building. Building is defined as any structure permanently affixed to the land and constructed or used for the shelter, enclosure, or protection of persons, animals, or property. |
| What would the water tower be considered? | The water tower can be considered as a Permitted Public Use defined as <i>Poles, towers, tunnels, conduits, wires, cables, vaults, laterals, pipes, drains, mains, valves, hydrants, and similar distribution equipment for public services or utilities; fire alarms and police call boxes; traffic signals; and pay telephone.</i> However, Staff considered the water tower as a special public use defined as <i>The use of property other than as Permitted Public Uses as defined herein by a public utility, railroad, or governmental body for the provision of public safety, government administration, transportation, and communications, utilities or services, including sewerage, water supply, electricity, gas, fire stations.</i> Further, based on the proposed development the project was defined as a special use defined as <i>A use that because of its special character cannot be allowable generally in a particular zoning district but which may be allowed under special conditions and which is therefore subject to the prior approval of a Special Use Permit.</i> It is a Special Use. Defer to <i>Use, Special</i> definition in 13. Definitions: A use that because of its special character cannot be allowable generally in a particular zoning district but which may be allowed under special conditions and which is therefore subject to the prior approval of a Special Use Permit. |
| Is the water tower the same architectural character as Lexington Trace or Thorntons or anything? | No. The water tower isn't the same architectural character as Lexington Trace or Thorntons, however it does fit within the nonresidential Thorntons site. |
| Do water tower often times comes in first before a subdivision? | Water towers are sometimes constructed in advance of or as part of a new development. Sometimes, as communities develop and grow, water towers are constructed in already developed areas to serve the increased water demand created by new development and growth. |
| Is the water tower, including materials, consistent with the Lexington Trace? | No. The water tower is not consistent with the materials of the Lexington Trace, because the water tower is not a building. However, the water tower is now proposed on the Thorntons property. |
| Can the water filtration and the actual storage tank be separated? If possible, is it possible to place it further south so they are not together on the same property? | Yes, the project is being redesigned with only the well and iron filtration building on 30W121 Estes, as the water tower is now being proposed on the Thorntons property. |
| As it relates to different type of taxes and if the water tower where to move, what would be the additional cost to the residents from the water main. Speaking from a construction costs alone, the spherical water tank is one of the most costly designs. Can you confirm, the life cycle of the tank itself has not been taking into account when talking about the cost of the project? | The costs that have been discussed are construction costs. |
| Does it have to be 157 feet tall? And if it doesn't, are there -- is the need to put in additional cell towers a tail wagging the dog on this? If the water system can be whatever it wants to look like ultimately to serve the purpose of delivering better water, does it need to be 157 feet high? | Yes, as the water level in the tower has to be a certain height relative to the rest of the system, so that translates to a 157 foot tall water tower on the Thorntons site. Antennas will not be incorporated into the City's revised plans. |
| So, before that house burnt down, where was this tower going to be? | Before the house burned down, the City had been negotiating unsuccessfully with Thorntons. Since the last public hearing, Thorntons reengaged in negotiations with the City, and City Council approved a real estate contract to purchase a piece of the Thorntons property on 9/19/2022. |
| What is the height of the other water towers in the city? | It varies, dependent on the ground elevations at those locations, relative to the consistent water level of all of the water towers. The towers are approximately 150 feet tall. |

Well #13, Water Tower, and Iron Filtration Building FAQ Document

Last updated 9/22/2022

| Question/Comment | Response |
|--|--|
| Is the height intended to supply water to all the warehouses down the street? Is that why it has to be so high for the area of that community? | The water elevation in the tower has to be the same elevation as the water in the City's three existing towers. The height of the physical tower is dependent on that distance of the water in the tower from the ground onsite. The water tower would not supply the warehouses down the street as those buildings are located in and receive water from the City of Aurora. |
| From the other towers? | Yes, the water level in all the towers. The City's water system is on a single pressure zone. |
| Where in the application is the height of the water tower listed? | The documents are being revised with the water tower on the Thorntons property, and the well and iron filtration building on 30W121 Estes. The tower will be 157 feet tall. Antennas are no longer part of this proposal. |
| Public notice of height? | The notice did not include the specific height but did indicate the Petition was open for inspection at the Community Development Department. The Community Development Department did not receive any requests for petition review. |
| Is there a height limitation for structures? | The code is silent with regard to height restrictions for water towers. |
| Homes located on Estes Street and Briggs are on wells. How do you anticipate to pump water into the proposed 500,000 gallon water tower? How much water per day will this tower going to use? How is that going to affect the local wells in the area? | The local wells are on the same aquifer as the City's wells. The City's wells are 200 to 300 feet deep. When the City drills the proposed new well, it will evaluate the existing wells in the neighborhood, to determine if any are impacted. If any are affected, the City will work with the property owners to address those issues, at the City's cost. Solutions could involve modifications to the private wells, or extension of City water and connecting affected property owners to City water. |
| City well is 300 feet versus local well is 212 feet, which is almost the same. Is City going to drain from local aquifer to fill proposed City tank. | |
| Affects to existing wells- Will it cause to drain? Will there be lower or no water pressure? Are properties on well going to be forced to hook up to City water and sewer system? And who will pay for that? | |
| If subject property is not acquired, what is the City's next steps? Where would the City place a tower other than in this residential area? Is there someplace west or south of the subject property and Lexington Traces that the tower could also be placed that would not be in our residential area? | The City now intends to purchase both the Thorntons and 30W121 Estes properties so as to allot the water tower to be constructed on the Thorntons property and the well and iron filtration building on the south half of the 30W121 Estes property. |
| More homes are expected west of Lexington, so if the City places this tower farther west, would there also be pumping of water into the area, into the Lexington area? | |
| A map of other existing water towers, indicate a lot of empty space in the middle. Are there any other parcels or empty lots that have been investigated further, such northeast versus going southwest? | |
| Is the proposed location of the water tower on the southern side of the site because it softens it from the neighborhoods to the north? | |
| Will the water tower soften anything to the east? | |
| Long term, will the tank be painted and necessary precautions be made, such as overspray, containment, around the structure to protect the properties, vehicles, pets, people? | |
| Expected to take place every 15 years? | Yes. |
| How wide is this structure, the water tower at its widest part? The diameter of the ball? | The water tower is expected to be repainted every 12-15 years. |
| Can the water treatment facility plant look more residential to fit in more with the fabric of the community? Has alternate designs been considered for the building itself? Concern the proposed building is going to be blight. | The site plan indicates the diameter of the water tower ball is 55.83 feet. |
| The IEPA has published a new C-1 provision recently about the construction of wells where their primary and secondary contamination instances are deemed to be reported within 2,500 feet, not 400 feet. What is the contingency plan for Thorntons being so close? | The design of the building is being updated and enhanced to look more like the Lexington Trace architecture, including the gray color scheme. |
| The existing conditions of other water well sites in the City are an eyesore - chain link fences that are rusting and falling apart, falling doors, buildings in need of painting, old roofs, lack of gutters and downspouts, overgrown or overcrowding of landscaping, outdoor storage of utility vehicles and junk storage. Is the barbwire fencing required? Can these sites be organized or cleaned? | Public Works is planning to address the maintenance issues on the other sites as funding allows, over the next five years. The City is committed to proactively maintaining the proposed new sites from the beginning. Barb wire is not required and the City is planning to remove it from its other sites. |

Well #13, Water Tower, and Iron Filtration Building FAQ Document

Last updated 9/22/2022

| Question/Comment | Response |
|---|---|
| The best maintained of the existing water well sites, includes a public pathway on this site. Can something like this be added to the subject property? | No sidewalks or paths are proposed on the Thorntons or 30W121 Estes properties. There is existing public sidewalk along the Barkley frontage, and a public sidewalk is proposed along the Estes frontage of 30W121 Estes. |
| Has there been any study on the health effects of having cell towers so close to residences? | Antennas are no longer included in the plans for these improvements. Should any wireless carriers approach the City in the future, special zoning approvals would need to be requested at that time and a new public hearing will be required. |
| Has there ever been a study done? | |
| Can a study be completed? Concerned with health effects of cell towers. | |
| Concerned with radiation emission and how it affects the human health and children growing up in the area. What radiation will the wireless communication antennas emit? What are the detailed plans on this -what are the buildings, wireless communication and materials that will be used, antennas that will be used? | |
| Will wireless communication antennas shown on top of the water tower require another hearing or is that approved as part of the special use? | |
| Will there be an opportunity for public input when the antennas go up? | |
| Will there be a separate public hearing specifically on the wireless communication antennas? | |
| Is there an opportunity to amend the proposal to eliminate the wireless communication antennas? Should a carrier in the future request wireless communication antennas, can a special use and public notice be required then? | |
| Is the property to the east zoned R-2? | Yes |
| Will the property to the east be developed commercially? If so, where did that come from? | It is expected the property to the east will eventually be developed with commercial as reflected in the City's Southwest District Subarea Land Use Plan. |
| How do you justify not following the zoning in the SD Zoning District which includes a 700-foot residential district setback requirement? | The SD District requirements only apply to the 650 acre mixed-use Cantera Project that surrounds the Winfield Road/I-88 interchange. The intent of the 700 foot setback requirement was to ensure the tallest office buildings in Cantera would be located furthest away from residential properties. |
| Using S requirements, there is a 700-foot residential district setback for anything over 60 feet tall. | |
| Is that defined in the zoning code that those lines only apply to the Cantera district? | |
| Is the Zoning Ordinance a guideline? Is a special use for a PUD a starting point for the subject development? | No, the Zoning Ordinance is a regulatory document. Yes, the special use/PUD request is a foundational component of the City's zoning application for this project. |
| Can you explain <i>Table 3-A: Permitted and Special Uses in All Zoning Districts</i> . Special Public Uses is not permitted use the R District. The table lists B-2, O-1 for Office, and M-1 for manufacturing. | Special public uses are listed as special uses in B2, O1, M1. Permitted public uses are permitted the R-2 District and a Planned Unit Development (PUD) is listed as a possible Special Use in the B-2 District. In a PUD, the City can legally approve specific land uses that would not normally be allowed in the underlying zoning district and attach conditions and restrictions to the PUD approval that would help insure the specific land use is designed and implemented in a higher quality manner than would normally be required in the underlying zoning district. The City has a long and consistent track record of using PUD approvals in this manner. The Lexington Trace townhome project is a great example of this. It was approved as a PUD in the detached single family R-2 zoning district. |
| Is the maximum building height, at least for R-2, 34 feet - under Table 4-A? | Yes, the maximum standard building height permitted in the R-2 is 34 feet. |
| The footnotes to Table 4-A include a section labeled (I), height bonus. Is the height bonus applicable? | No. The height bonus applies to the building height not to water towers. |
| Is the maximum height one of zoning guidelines in the R-2 District? Building height restrictions do not generally apply to all structures. | Yes, Table 4A includes a maximum building height. The table indicates a maximum building height of 34' in the R-2. The Zoning Ordinance includes minimum requirement and maximum requirements depending on the zoning district, the use, and the type of building. There's a number of different things that the Zoning Ordinance specifies and does not specify. The Zoning Ordinance does not include a maximum height for a water tower. |

Well #13, Water Tower, and Iron Filtration Building FAQ Document

Last updated 9/22/2022

| Question/Comment | Response |
|--|--|
| <p>Things in a Planned Unit Development (PUD) that do not comply with the underlying zoning, can be called exceptions to the PUD; is that correct?</p> | <p>Yes, things in the PUD that do not conform to the zoning ordinance can and do regularly get called out as PUD exceptions or PUD variations.</p> |
| <p>In the planned unit development in 8. Planned Unit Development of the Zoning Ordinance, A. Purpose it indicates that the provisions are intended for special situations including . b. <i>special amenities and benefits to the community...</i> -- Is one of the benefits bringing water to the community?</p> | <p>Yes. The proposed water tower is intended to benefit the community. The purpose of a Planned Unit Development can be found in 8.Planned Unit Development, A. Purpose, of the Zoning Ordinance: The provisions of this section are intended for special situations in which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. adequate space, light, air, and other objectives of this Ordinance relating to the public health, safety, and welfare can be achieved without the literal application of the detailed zoning and subdivision requirements otherwise applicable, and b. special amenities and benefits to the community beyond those required by this and other City ordinances can be achieved by allowing more flexible design than is otherwise permitted by such requirements. <p>These objectives can be achieved where an area of land is planned for development as an integrated unit and where its design is subject to more detailed review and approval by the City than is normally required. The objective of Planned Unit Development (PUD) is therefore not simply to allow exceptions to otherwise applicable regulations. It is instead to encourage a higher level of design and amenity than it is possible to achieve under the usual land development requirements.</p> <p>It is accordingly the intent of the City to suspend the application of detailed zoning and subdivision standards as provided herein only where such special amenity is achieved. In this way the City may grant the creative developer a desirable flexibility and at the same time not only protect but enhance the welfare of the residents and other users of a development as well as the rest of the community.</p> |
| <p>In the PUD section 6. <i>Dimensional Standards</i> it indicates that no building height shall exceed 45 feet, except as otherwise provided in Table 4-C above. Does this apply? If the water tower is not a building, what is it? Is the 45' maximum building height applicable?</p> | <p>A water tower is structure not a building.</p> |
| <p>Is the setback variation requested as part of the PUD from 40 feet to 22.5 feet?</p> | <p>The site plans for the project are being revised so the building will meet the required 40-foot setback. This setback variation request has been dropped from the City's application.</p> |
| <p>Are the proposed improvements considered a special public use under the ordinance? The definition of this type of use is a special public use; correct?</p> | <p>The proposed uses (Water tower, well, iron filtration building) fall under the Zoning Ordinance's definition of a "Special Public Use". The City has requested a PUD approval that would accommodate the proposed water system related improvements on the subject property per section 8.C.3 of the Zoning Ordinance.</p> |