

**VILLAGE of SUGAR GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION/ZONING BOARD of APPEALS
MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING
NOVEMBER 1, 2006**

1. CALL TO ORDER:

The special meeting of the Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) was called to order by Chairman Irv Ochsenschlager at 7:01 p.m. in the Village Board Room.

2. ROLL CALL

Plan Commission/ZBA members present

Steve Benesch	Bob Dray	James Eckert
Barbara Manzanares	Irv Ochsenschlager	

Absent: Ryan Reuland Ed Saloga
Quorum present

Also present:

Scott Buening, Community Development Director
Mike Ferencak, Village Planner
Steve Andersson, Village Attorney
Mike Hoffman, Planning Consultant, Teska & Associates

Before opening the public hearing, Chairman Ochsenschlager complimented the Village and it's Finance Director and Staff for the honor of receiving the award from the Government Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada for its distinguished budget presentation. He said the citizens should be proud of this accomplishment.

3. PUBLIC HEARINGS

a. Petition 06-021: Harter Road School Site - Rezoning

(Kaneland Community Unit School District 302 Petitioner)

A quorum of Plan Commission/ZBA members was present as at roll call.

Exhibits were submitted verifying the legal procedures for the public hearing to be conducted had been fulfilled. Ochsenschlager opened the public hearing and swore in those intending to give testimony.

Presentation

Ferencak explained the 206.8-acre site in question is on the South side Harter Road, just West of Route 47 extending South to Wheeler Road. In August of this year, the Kaneland School District submitted application for annexation and rezoning to the Village. The Village Board and Staff are currently working on the annexation agreement. Upon annexation the property will automatically come into the Village as an R-1 Low Density Residential District. The property has to be rezoned to a district that is suitable for the school, which will be BP - Business

Park District. The property is contiguous to the Village limits.

The school district purchased this site in 2003 in anticipation of locating future school facilities on the property. At this point in time the district has submitted a concept plan for the subject site. The Comprehensive Plan designates the entire site as "Public/Semi-Public". At the time the Comprehensive Plan was developed, it was anticipated the school district would develop facilities on this site.

Public Comment and Questions

Jamie Koz of 4S917 Harter Road said she believed the subject property was directly across from her property. Her concern was in regard to the rezoning to a Business Park use. She wondered what else, other than the school, could be put on the property. Perhaps a use that was not complimentary to the area. She said there were just a handful of people living in that area and they do not want their property values to decline because of something undesirable going on the site.

Ferencak responded that the Village does not have an institutional zoning district in its ordinance. As a result there is not particular zoning for government and school buildings. That is why the Business Park use was designated for the rezoning. The school district does not propose to have any business uses at the north end of the site.

Koz also had concern about the traffic once the school is up and running. Ferencak said the Village has asked for a road on the West side of the site that is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. This road would extend from Harter Road down to Wheeler Road to provide more access through the site. In the future there may be another road towards the eastern side of the site that would also provide access.

Tom Runty, Assistant Superintendent of the School District, then was given the floor. He introduced representatives of the School District; Elmer Gramley, Michele Proskey, Board Members and Dr. Charles McCormick, Superintendent.

Runty thanked the Village Staff for helping the School District through the annexation and rezoning process. He went on to say they are in the process of working on definitive plans for the school site. They have set aside a portion of the property for a fire station, since the Fire Department calls for, in their long-range plans, a station in this area. In addition, the School District is working with the Village for some wells and possibly, at a later date, a treatment plant.

With no further questions or comments forthcoming, Chairman Ochsenschalger closed the public hearing on Petition 06-021 at 7:14 p.m.

With the consent of the Plan Commission/ZBA, the meeting order moved to

5. NEW BUSINESS

b. Petition 06-21: Harter Road School Site - Rezoning

Plan Commission/ZBA Discussion, Questions Possible Action on Petition:

Eckert asked for clarification of the zoning district designation relating to the school district property on the Comprehensive Plan map. It was determined that the report needed to be corrected to show part of the site as being Business Park instead of entirely Public-Semi Public.

Eckert asked about that portion of land that did not appear to be within the school district's site. When told it was an adjacent owners separate property, Eckert wondered what the owner would be able to do in the way of developing his property. Ferencak said that piece of property was not within the Village limits, so any development that would take place would be under Kane County zoning. Ferencak indicated that if this owner should chose to annex to the Village in the future, once contiguous to the Village, he could hook onto Village water and sewer. Andersson interjected the annexation would depend on whether the Village would allow it.

Dray noted the words "technically proposed" appearing in the Staff Report was a term not familiar with other developments. Ferencak clarified that he meant the plans for development of the site was not proposed as part of the current petition.

Benesch asked when the BP zoning would take effect in the course of the process? Ferencak said there would be a concurring ordinance at the time of adopting ordinances for annexation and the annexation agreement rezoning the property to BP.

Benesch said he could see Mrs. Koz' point in that if the school district doesn't use the property and possibly finds a different piece of property for development, this piece of land then would have the BP zoning and that might pose a problem having a BP zoned site just sitting out there for other uses to come in. Andersson explained that the Village Staff was aware of that same issue. So what was done was that the annexation agreement was designed to address that with a provision that the School District can build conceptually what they are planning, but if at any point they spin off the property to a third party or private user, they are going to have to come back to the Village and get an amendment and consent from the Village in order to build anything else.

With no further questions or comments, Chairman Ochsenschlager called for a motion.

Dray made a motion that the Plan Commission/ZBA recommend to the Village Board that upon annexation the subject property

(Petition 06-021: Harter Road School Site) be rezoned from R-1, Low Density Residential to BP - Business Park District, and that the Findings of Fact as set down in the Staff Report dated November 1, 2006 be accepted.

Benesch seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Benesch, Dray, Eckert, Manzanares, Ochsenschlager

Nays: None

Absent: Reuland, Saloga

Motion carried. Petition 06-021 to move forward to the Village Board.

Public Hearings continued

- c. Petition 06-025: Rich Harvest Farms - Rezoning and Special Use**
(Rich Harvest Farms Petitioner)

Chairman Ochsenschlager opened the hearing on Petition 06-025 at 7:21 p.m. Plan Commission/ZBA quorum present as at roll call. Those intending to give testimony were sworn in.

Presentation

Ferencak made the presentation saying the request was for rezoning from R-1 Low Density Residential District to E-1 Estate Residential District and a Special use to permit the operation of an existing golf course and existing private lodge facility. The Subject Property is approximately 198 acres in size and located along portions of both sides of Granart Road, portions of both sides of Camp Dean Road and the North side of Whildin Road. The property was annexed to the Village on September 5, 2005 and automatically zoned R-1 upon annexation, however the annexation agreement calls for the subject property to be rezoned to E-1. The E-1 zoning is compatible with the Comprehensive Plan.

Public Comments and Questions

Linda Voekler of 231 S. Glenwood, questioned what the lodging would be? Ferencak responded that there was an existing barn on the property that is planned to be used for lodging in relation to the golf course. (Note: this is in addition to the existing lodging on the annexed portion of the property) There are also existing houses on the property.

John Voekler of the same address said Linda and her sisters own land that is somewhat surrounded by the subject property. Their concern is that more houses might be brought on the property increasing the capacity for guests. Buening said there are no proposed changes for the existing house on the property. It will continue to be used as a private lodging facility. The barn on the property is in the process of being converted and is not annexed to the Village at this time. If the Petitioner desires to annex that portion on which the barn stands, he would have to come back to the Village for annexation and rezoning and special use. At this time the hearing involves only that existing mansion on the subject property.

J. Voelker asked how many more people would be staying on the site with the barn. Mr. Joyner, the attorney representing the Petitioner indicated he was not certain, but possibly 20 or 30 people, club golfers and guests. It would not be open to the general public. But that portion of land was not under the Village's consideration at this time.

Lester Hume of 07S405 Camp Dean Road wondered what there was to keep the Petitioner from building more buildings or a hotel on the subject site? Ferencak said any future buildings proposed would have to be reviewed by the Village and approval would have to be given through building permitting or the planning process. Buening explained the uses on the site would be limited by the zoning classification. The Petitioner would have to follow the Village ordinances and the minimum requirements of the E-1 District.

William Austhof of 7S349 Camp Dean Road asked if an E-1 zoning would allow a lower or higher density? Buening said E-1 is a more restrictive zoning district and would require larger lots if they were going to develop the property.

With no further comments or questions forthcoming, Chairman Ochsenschlager Closed the public hearing on Petition 06-025 at 7:29 p.m.

With the Commission/ZBA consent, the meeting order was moved to

New Business

c. Petition 06-025: Rich Harvest Farms -Rezoning and Special Use

Plan Commission Discussion and Action

Dray and Eckert asked for clarification of the location of the portion of the property that was not annexed. Dray wondered how common it was to leave a tract like that to remain unincorporated? Buening said this situation happened fairly often and the Village is left trying to clean up those donut holes.

With no further questions or comments, Ochsenschlager called for a motion.

Benesch made a motion to recommend to the Village Board that the Rich Harvest Farms petition for rezoning from R-1 to E-1 be granted, as well as the Special Use to permit the operation of an existing golf course and existing private lodging facilities and that the Findings of Fact as set down in the Staff Report dated November 1, 2006 be accepted.

Manzanares seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes Benesch, Dray, Eckert, Manzanares, Ochsenschlager

Nays None

Absent Reuland, Saloga

Motion carried.

4. **NEW BUSINESS**

Petition No. 06-022: Sugar Grove Center Lot 13 - Major PUD Amendment, Final PUD, Preliminary and Final Plat

(King Professional Center Sugar Grove LLC, Petitioner)

Ochsenschlager reviewed the progress of the Petition saying the Plan Commission/ZBA held a public hearing at its last meeting and continued further review on it to the present meeting. It is the lot behind the Jewel store and the Petitioner is seeking to develop four commercial-type buildings on the subject site. There was a difference of opinion between Village Staff and the developer as to how the buildings should be located on the site. A poll of Plan Commission/ZBA members was taken as to which plan it felt was preferable, and the outcome was a preference for the Developer's plan.

At this point in time Dray recused himself from discussion and vote upon this petition. With four voting members remaining, a quorum continued to be maintained.

Ferencak said since the last Plan Commission/ZBA meeting Staff went over the developer's plan and a full Staff report was written which included recommendations with 23 conditions for the plan. He then invited Jamie White, Attorney representing the Petitioner, to make comment upon Staff's report from the Developer's point of view.

White indicated that after reviewing the recommendation and conditions of Staff's Report, they found a number of them that they objected to. White then proceeded to enumerate those they determined objectionable and gave their reasons for objecting. They are as follows:

The Developer objected to:

Number 2, which states that the individual users shall be reviewed at the time of building permitting for permitted uses and parking requirements. The Developer did not understand why this provision was being suggested for in his opinion it was not part of the process.

Number 4, the second sentence, The Village shall have sole discretion over the uses going into each building over time to ensure that adequate parking will be available throughout the entire development. White said the uses are already set forth in the ordinance as to what uses are permitted and what aren't. They believed the Developer needs full discretion to do that. It would require the Developer or subsequent owner to come before the Village Board and ask that a use be allowed to occupy some space, which is not done in the Village anywhere for any other project or process.

Number 5, no more than 12,000 square feet of medical or dental facilities shall be permitted within this development. The Developer objected to this condition because it would limit the amount of square footage that should be permitted within the development. The Development is intended to be a professional office and may or may not have more than 12,000 S.F. He said under the Village ordinance there is adequate parking on the plan for dental offices.

Number 10, regarded the requirement for additional landscaping; two additional Douglas Firs near the end of the parking lot and one at the southeast corner of the site. The Developer objects to that condition because the plan submitted has sufficient Douglas Firs in that corner.

Furthermore the Developer objected to the Village dictating what kind of plants should be on the site. Also the ordinance does not require foundation plantings. It does require plantings at the front and side of the buildings, which are shown on the plan.

Number 18, states the second access drive shall be installed when the second building is constructed on the property. The construction of the second access drive that is not owned by the Petitioner does not give him the legal right to do so. In addition, this would prohibit the construction of anything beyond the second building on the subject site.

Number 19, which states adequate access to each building shall be constructed at the time of permits for each building. An asphalt base course of pavement shall be installed prior to issuance of building permits for buildings 3 and 4 to provide adequate access. White said they do not know if they will use asphalt or concrete, given the price of oil. Concrete may be an option.

White asked for clarification on Number 23, c. Parking bumpers shall be provided at all parking spaces without full barrier curb (accessible parking stall but not in access aisles). Buening explained that one was basically rear pads because the concrete pad is outside the rear door. A larger area is needed for handicap accessibility. White said they had increased them for handicap accessibility and they now comply with that condition. Buening said if that was the case then it was fine.

With the number of conditions still in abeyance, Ochsenschlager asked if it would be necessary for the Petitioner to once again meet with Staff to arrive at some resolution regarding the conditions objected to. White responded that they would like to have the Petition voted upon at this meeting. He asked the Plan Commission/ZBA to drop those portions of the recommendations objected to and adopt the balance, so the Petition could be forwarded to the Village Board.

Buening asked the Chairman's permission to explain why Staff would like to have these conditions retained, which was given. Regarding Number 2, The Village just wants to clarify that the Village would be reviewing individual users to be certain there is adequate parking. There is a concern that if a potential user would require more parking spaces than the 5 spaces per 1,000 S.F. or 3 spaces per 1,000 S.F., when the development reaches the end of the project when the last building is built there may potentially be inadequate parking for that building.

Buening went on to talk about condition Number 4, Staff reviewed it and suggested making the change in the wording to say the Village shall review the uses of each building to ensure adequate parking would be available throughout the entire development. The Developer's concern is understood and what he perceives was not Staff's intent.

Number 5, stating no more than 12,000 S.F. of medical or dental facilities shall be permitted; medical and dental facilities require more intensive use of parking spaces. The concern is for the possibility of the entire development being medical and dental uses, Buening went on to say. Andersson added that medical and dental facilities usually have provision for more than the 5 spaces per 1,000 S.F., which is higher than the Village's standard. A higher parking demand is a reality.

Buening said Number 10, PUD's often come with some trade-offs between the Village and Developer. This developer is asking for a number of variances. So Staff felt that requiring some different plants that are species more appropriate for this type and location of development. Hoffman added that the plants recommended were plants thought to be more appropriate. Should the developer choose a different species, as long as the Village has conversation about it, that would be fine. There are other plants that would work well in that situation in addition to the plants named by the Village.

Regarding Number 18, Buening said the subject property, as well as the adjacent property to the South, are owned by the same property owner. The Village doesn't feel there's a significant barrier to getting the second access drive in place now. The Village prefers to have the second access in once the second building is completed.

Going on to Number 19, Buening stated that if the Developer chooses to put in concrete rather than asphalt that would be an acceptable alternative.

Eckert asked White if building would start from the back and move forward or from the front and move back? White said most likely work would go from front to back.

Eckert, although believing the Village should not dictate what uses should go in the development as long as they were permitted B-2 or B-3 uses, agreed he too had a concern about there being enough parking. Another concern was that the plan showed only one handicap parking space for four suites. He did not believe this was an adequate number. Ferencak noted that for the 72 parking spaces required for this site, 4 handicap-parking spaces would be required. Buening said that requirement was not only in the Village code but also in the Illinois Accessibility Code.

Eckert thought there were some areas in Staff's report that needed to be corrected. Ferencak said they could go over that after the meeting.

Ferencak said that the Village had not gotten a new signage plan, so condition number 13 was to remain. White said, as he understands it, if the Petitioner wants signage that is different he needs to get the approval of the developer of the site and approval of the Village. It is left open for the possibility of change. Buening said there has been other interest in changing the standards for lots, particularly on Capitol Drive. The Staff's concern is to standardize the signs on Capitol Drive even if something different is done with the rest of the shopping center. What would be undesirable would be several different sign designs.

Eckert initiated discussion about the secondary access drive and how much it would take out of the lot on the South. Ferencak said it would be two-lane and would have to meet the ordinance width requirement of 24'. The 24' would be next to the property line.

Another condition which remains is that the engineering comments from EEI must be addressed.

Ochsenschlager asked if the developer was contemplating building the whole parking lot at this time? White said no. They will build a portion if it, buildings one and two first, then three and four when they are ready to be built. The landowners are not going to be the same. There is not going to be a unity of ownership for those two lots.

Ochsenschlager deducted that the access drive to the south would not be built by the Petitioner. The burden of completion of the access drive would be a burden on the landowners to the South. White said that was correct. Buening thought one of the concessions the Village could make was that the condition to put in the second access drive could be changed to when the third building is constructed.

Ochsenschlager asked if the developer was suggesting the whole access surface be a base course of gravel until concrete could be poured? White said it might be.

Ochsenschlager summarized what had transpired and with no further comments or questions from the Plan Commission/ZBA asked for a motion on Petition 06-022.

Benesch made a motion that the Plan Commission/ZBA recommend to the Village Board approval of Petition 06-022: Sugar Grove Center Lot 13 requesting a Major PUD Amendment, Final PUD, Preliminary and Final Plat approval adopting Staff recommendations in its report dated November 1, 2006, and in response to the Petitioner's objections to some of the recommendation, condition number 2 is to remain, condition number 4 is to be amended to read the Village shall have review over the uses, condition number 5 is to remain, condition number 10 will have a provision for approved alternatives to the landscape plantings, condition number 18 was amended to read the second access drive would be put in when the third building is constructed and condition number 19 is to remain indicating some type of base course can be used.

Ochsenschlager seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Benesch, Dray, Eckert, Manzanares, Ochsenschlager

Nays: None

Absent: Saloga, Reuland

Motion carried.

**d. Petition 06-029: Prairie Glen - Minor PUD Amendment
(The Windham Group, Inc.)**

The subject property is approximately 200.20 acres and is located Southwest of the fire station at Route 30 and Municipal Drive.

Ferencak had given the history of this property in the Staff Report dated November 1, 2006. The Prairie Glen development was annexed prior to 2004. It received Preliminary Plat and PUD approval in September 2004. In 2005 the Army Corps of Engineers denied the wetland permit for the development based on public safety issues raised by the Federal Aviation Administration. In view of these circumstances, the developer applied for and received approval to modify the plan. The development received a second approval from the Village in September 2005.

The PUD agreement for this development contains specific appearance standards and also contains language regarding financial items.

The Petitioner is requesting the following amendments:

1. Modify the requirement that exterior fireplaces be brick or stone on Lots 3 -27 and 99-105 in Unit 1 (currently required on all lots.)
2. Modify the agreement to remove the use of aluminum or vinyl siding, and remove the requirement that brick be used on the building fronts (currently allowed on all lots east of Municipal Drive).
3. Modify agreement to allow for a recapture of costs expended by applicant for infrastructure improvements benefiting property north of US Route 30.
4. Modify Exhibit F to provide that applicant shall receive a credit against the Final Plat Fee for Village consultant fees paid by the applicant that are otherwise payable from the Final Plat Fee.
5. Continue to provide escrow at the \$5,000 level.
6. Existing five year freeze on the fee increases to start with recording date of the first final plat (currently was to start on January 1, 2006).

Jamie White, Attorney representing the Petitioner, took the floor to elaborate upon the amendments requested. He stated this request came before the Village Board Committee of the Whole a month ago to arrive at some consensus of the board on the changes the Petitioner was requesting. And for which a consensus was not arrived.

White explained that Prairie Glen is intended to be a custom community, with lots sold to individual homebuilders. There were two standards the Village had set down. There was a standard for the East Side of Municipal Drive, which allowed aluminum siding if there was a minimum of brick on the front. The standards for the West Side, which would not allow aluminum siding would require cement wood hardyboard. Throughout the entire development, brick fireplaces were required if there was an exterior fireplace. An interior fireplace did not have to be brick.

After talking with a number of builders that were interested in the property, those standards became burdensome. What the Petitioner proposed to do is to eliminate the brick fireplaces and make the entire development aluminum or vinyl siding if brick is on the front. That did not set well with some of the Trustees.

In exchange the developer agreed to use only the hardyboard/cement board on both sides of the project and remove the brick requirement from the front.

White went on to say, the next request was in regard to recapture. There are a significant number of improvements to the North. It has been determined that the Petitioner does not need to amend the agreement for that aspect, so it is no longer an issue.

The Final Plat Fee issue was explained by White with him saying that when a plat is approved and recorded, the developer is required to post a fee with the Village in the amount of 3 1/2% of the estimated costs of those improvements. That then is used to pay the engineer to review and oversee the construction of improvements. Permits were given prior to recording the final plat, which the improvements are in except for some trees and some of the bikepath. The Village has gone through the process, the Village engineer has gone through the process of inspecting, and they still haven't been paid the plat fee. The developer still pays the Village engineering firm to do all that. So the developer is seeking a credit against that final plat fee since they already paid for the engineering. So instead of having a number at 3 1/2% the Village is considering the developer to keep a bond and/or escrow with the Village to pay consultants from. Having a minimum fee on a large project and a larger fee on a small project. This method has been agreed to by the Prairie Glen developer. It is more of a policy shift. Buening added changing to an escrow would actually recapture 100% of the Village's costs as opposed to hopefully all the costs.

White then addressed the escrow issue saying the \$25,000 escrow would be used for external Village costs through the entire development process to the end of the maintenance period.

White said the Petitioner asks that the impact fee freeze starting point be moved up to a more current date than the one in place now. Buening indicated it's almost into the completion of the first year of that five-year freeze before escalation.

Buening informed the Plan Commission/ZBA that based upon the direction received from the Village Board, they are willing to grant certain concessions to this developer. The Staff position is that an agreement has been negotiated and Staff thinks it is a fine agreement. The Board, however, feels the developer should be considered for certain types of concessions. Staff feels what was negotiated is an acceptable package.

Dray's thoughts were that the Village had established a standard in the Village for building materials, chimneys, and so forth. The only concession he would

consider is the Final Plat Fee changes. Buening thought the amendment for the escrow was reasonable too. Dray wondered if these changes would in effect be an overall policy for every developer?

Eckert asked if the reasons for changing requirements for fireplaces and siding were financial in nature? White explained that it was a matter of uniformity. Builders have said they would buy lots on one side, but not on the other. There are marketing considerations that are important to these builders. Dray noted developers like Kimball Hill, who is a production builder, is still able to build in their price point. Someone brought out the point that Kimball Hill was not required to put brick on chimneys. Dray responded that that was more the style of the development and wasn't an aesthetic or architectural concession. Buening said Kimball Hill was required to have cement board on all homes, however.

Dray thought the standard had been set, and he was reluctant to make these changes for Prairie Glen. Benesch agreed with Dray and he said the Village has already granted this development many changes.

Dray made a motion to approve the Minor PUD Amendments for Prairie Glen, incorporating only Staff recommendations or including only Items 4 (Final Plat Fee) and 5 (Escrow), but not including Items 1, 2, 3 and 6.

Benesch seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote

Ayes: Benesch, Dray, Eckert, Manzanares, Ochsenschlager

Nays: None

Absent: Saloga, Reuland

Motion carried.

6. PLAN COMMISSION/ZBA COMMENTS, PROJECT UPDATES, MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION

a. Cell Tower off Prairie Road

Ochsenschlager questioned the cell tower and road leading to it through what looks like a cornfield off Prairie Street. Buening said that property is unincorporated. The Village has been working with the cell tower company for some time. They needed to get road access from the Village because the Village controls Prairie Street in that area. Where Ochsenschlager saw the access to the road leading to the tower was the place the Village felt was the best location.

Discussion took place about cell towers in general and regulations concerning their placement. Buening said State legislature took away regulatory authority from Counties. In most cases cell tower companies seek out unincorporated sites for its towers. The site the cell tower is on off Prairie Street is unincorporated. Villages can regulate them strictly, the counties cannot. Dray said HUD has a regulation that you cannot make any kind of a HUD loan to any house that's in a fall zone of a cell or water tower.

Andersson told the Plan Commission/ZBA that the Village had talked with the landowner when they were seeking that access. The Village made it very clear that it was not in favor of that location believing it was wrong to put it where it is. If the landowner ever intends to develop that land, it will have to come to the Village for approval. If and when that happens, the cell tower will not be allowed to stay there. If the landowner spins off that portion of the property so they can claim they don't own it, the Village will still have this addressed.

b. **Capitol Drive and Park Avenue Traffic signs**

Benesch asked if the Village has any control over traffic signage at Capitol Drive and Park Avenue? There is a stop sign on Capitol Drive but nothing on Park Avenue. Benesch said he has witnessed near accidents, including his own person, at that intersection. Buening said that problem is being addressed. The matter of approving a package of additional signage in the way of a four-way stop, will come up on the Village Board's November 7th meeting. Ferencak said those are two collector roads and both should have the stop signs. Buening said there are some other street signage changes within the Windsor Pointe subdivision that are in the planning stages.

c. **Aldi Food Store**

Eckert asked about the status of the Aldi Food Store, Buening said ground breaking has occurred and the parking lot is scheduled to be in by the end of November with an opening date sometime in the Spring of 2007.

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

Benesch made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Manzanares seconded the motion. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Zak
Recording Secretary

Village of Sugar Grove
Plan Commission/ZBA
Minutes of November 1, 2006 Special Meeting