

**VILLAGE of SUGAR GROVE  
PLAN COMMISSION/ZONING BOARD of APPEALS  
MINUTES of FEBRUARY 21, 2007 MEETING**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Ochsenschlager called the regular meeting of the Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Village Hall Board Room.

**2. ROLL CALL**

**Plan Commission/ZBA Members present**

Steve Benesch, Bob Dray, Jim Eckert, Barbara Manzanares, Irv Ochsenschlager, Ryan Reuland and Ed Saloga.

**Quorum established.**

**Also present**

Scott Buening, Community Development Director; Mike Ferencak, Village Planner; Mike Hoffman, Planning Consultant Teska & Associates; Pam Hirth, Planning Consultant Teska & Associates.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JANUARY 31, 2006 MEETING**

Benesch made a motion, which was seconded by Saloga, that the meeting minutes of January 31, 2007 Special Meeting be approved as submitted.

**Motion carried** by unanimous voice vote.

**4. PUBLIC HEARING**

**b. Petition 06-034: 1267 Dorr Drive - Variance**

Sunspace Designs, Petitioner

Ochsenschlager opened the public hearing on Petition 06-034 at 7:04 p.m. and swore in those intending to give testimony. Quorum established.

Ferencak explained the Petitioner's request. Sunspace Design is requesting a variance to encroach 7.34 feet into the required minimum 30.00 foot rear yard setback for the purpose of the addition of a sunroom on the home located at 1267 Door Drive. The home is located in the Walnut Woods Subdivision. Ferencak went on to say that the Staff recommendation regarding this petition was that the proposed encroachment into the required minimum rear yard setback was not necessary to the continued use of the property as a single family residence. Staff did not believe the proposed encroachment met the criteria for a Variance and therefore recommended denial of the proposed variance for 1267 Door Drive.

Ochsenschlager explained that staff makes a recommendation to the Plan Commission. James Frank, the homeowner expressed his disappointment at the recommendation to deny. He said there was a 15' easement and a pond in the rear yard and that his request would not encroach on anything in the back. He wanted to enjoy the open air and chose a

sunroom over an open deck for protection from mosquitoes. Gary Berman of Sunspace Design testified that the space behind the home in question was an open area and the homeowner should be able to enjoy his yard with the addition of a sunroom.

No one of the public present spoke either in favor or against the petition.

Ochsenschlager then closed the public hearing at 7:09 p.m.

## 5. NEW BUSINESS

### b. Petition 06-034: 1267 Dorr Drive, Variance

Sunspace Designs Petitioner

#### **Plan Commission/ZBA Discussion and Action**

In response to Manzanares' question, Ferencak clarified that the stairway in the rear of the home did not count as being in the setback. Only the sunroom itself was counted.

Ochsenschlager asked if only a deck was proposed would that require a variance?

Ferencak said he did not believe so.

Eckert did not believe the variance would be detrimental as far as lowering the value of the properties in the subdivision. Neither did he have a problem as far as the setback. If there were neighbors immediately behind the subject home, that would be a different issue. But there is not.

Ochsenschlager explained that there are specific criteria that have to be met in order to grant a variance and Staff does not believe the petitioner has met those criteria.

Saloga was in agreement with Staff's recommendation to deny. If the petitioner was asking only for a 2 or 3 feet variance that would be worthy of consideration. However 7', an almost 30% variation, is too great. Granting it would set a dangerous precedent. Once allowed for this site, it would be uncomfortable to deny a neighbor coming in asking for a similar variance.

Berman questioned why the Village would require a 30' setback when there is a pond in the back. He said the required letters went out to adjoining property owners notifying them of the pending petition for a variance. No complaints were received by them. Dray emphasized that the ordinance dictates a 30' setback, regardless of what is on the neighboring property.

The question was raised about how this situation compared to a prior situation in Black Walnut Trails. Benesch said although there is an open space lot behind this home lot, in Black Walnut Trails it was a conservation easement on the home lot. Black Walnut Trails increased the setback for that easement.

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

**Eckert made a motion, which was seconded by Reuland that the Plan Commission/ZBA recommend to the Village Board approval of Petition 06-034 request for a variance to the required rear yard setback.**

**Roll Call Vote on the Motion:**

**Ayes: Eckert, Manzanares, Reuland**

**Nays: Benesch, Dray, Saloga, Ochsenschlager**

**Motion failed. Forward on to Village Board with a recommendation of denial.**

#### **4. PUBLIC HEARING**

- b. Petition 06-013: Southwest Corner of Illinois Route 47 and Park Avenue  
Rezoning to B-3, Preliminary Plat, Preliminary PUD  
Sugar Grove Holdings, LLC Petitioner**

The public hearing on this petition was heard and closed at the January 31, 2007 Special Meeting. The action taken at that time by the Plan Commission/ZBA was to recommend approval of the rezoning of a portion of the property from M-1 to B-3 and to recommend approval of the Preliminary Plat of Subdivision.

Action on the third request, approval of the Preliminary PUD, was tabled to the February 21, 2007 meeting, because there were a number of outstanding issues that had to be resolved by Staff and the Petitioner.

Ari Rosenthal, representing the Petitioner, rose to say that after meeting with Staff and discussing the issues of concern, the majority of them had been resolved. The Petitioner agrees to accept certain conditions. Exceptions were conditions number 12 and 13 related to landscaping and 17 and 18 related to signage. They did however agree to reduce the amount of signage.

Issues with signage remain to be worked out. Rosenthal said some of the buildings may house multiple tenants and they could not determine at this time how many sign panels would be needed. Buening said these issues could be resolved as the process goes forward.

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

**Saloga made a motion, which was seconded by Reuland, that the Plan Commission/ZBA recommend to the Village Board approval of the Preliminary PUD subject to the twenty-eight conditions set down in the Staff Report dated February 21, 2007, pages 8, 9, 10 and 11.**

**Roll Call Vote on the Motion:**

**Ayes: Benesch, Eckert, Marzanares, Reuland, Saloga, Ochsenschlager**

**Nays: Dray**

**Motion carried. Recommendation to be moved forward to Village Board.**

#### 4. NEW BUSINESS

##### a. **Petition 06 - DWNTWN: Downtown Study Review**

Village of Sugar Grove, Petitioner

Ochsenschlager thanked Staff, the Planning Consultants Teska & Associates and all those who worked on the Steering Committee to develop a plan for Downtown Sugar Grove.

Buening said the plan before the Plan Commission/ZBA was to be reviewed and comments on the plan were welcomed. No public hearing would be required to adopt the plan, unless the Village Board opted to make it a part of the Comprehensive Plan.

Hoffman gave a slide presentation of the plan. In an effort to proactively plan for the future while embracing the past, the Village has developed a Downtown Plan. The plan provides a Plan for Action that addresses the revitalization needs of downtown Sugar Grove.

The study area the plan includes is generally south of US 30, north of the Prairie Street/Illinois Route 47 intersection, and a 1,400 foot wide corridor along Main Street including portions of Route 47.

The study also addresses the relationship of the downtown area to the potential for a Metra commuter rail station south of downtown and the 237-acre Special Development District to the north bound by Galena Boulevard, Route 56, and Route 47.

Early in the planning process, the design team toured the area to evaluate existing conditions and opportunities. The downtown area of Sugar Grove is the historic core of the Village. It is comprised of three unique areas:

##### Main Street

Traditionally a primarily residential area, Main Street will evolve into a mixed-use environment with a mixture of homes, shops, restaurants and other compatible businesses. The architectural character of this area will be focused on one or two-story traditional structures. The emphasis will be on renovation and adaptive reuse rather than new construction.

##### Expanded Downtown

The area at the southwest corner of Route 47 and the BNSF Railroad tracks is planned for an expansion of the downtown. This area will include mixed-use development, with buildings of between two and four stories. A potential anchor for this area would be a new Metra Station. This area should integrate higher density housing, shops, office and community facilities in a pedestrian focused design scheme.

##### Route 47 Corridor

As the gateway to downtown, this area will carry some of the design themes from the Main street out to the roadway, inviting people into the core of downtown Sugar Grove. In particular, the Route 47 and Cross Street intersection shall be enhanced to create a sense of arrival and identity unique to Sugar Grove.

There is a need for strong anchors to the downtown business district. Such anchors could be such businesses as a restaurant, unique shop or public or institutional facility such as the Village Hall, Library and outside corporate offices. A strong anchor is particularly needed south of the railroad tracks.

Hoffman said some thought was given to creating a specialty retail shop development that would carry a country theme fitting in with the farm and land south of the railroad tracks.

In order to address the numerous unknowns regarding downtown anchors, several alternatives were explored.

Concept A: Shows the least amount of development. This concept assumes that none of the public sector facilities locate in this area. Without these anchors the area would have limited commercial potential.

Concept B: Assumes the potential relocation of a new village Hall and Library south of the railroad tracks. With these stable anchors the potential for more commercial activities will allow an expanded downtown with the potential of a greater mix of uses.

Concept C: Is the preferred alternative of the downtown Advisory Committee. This plan focuses on the implementation of this concept. As more is known about the future location of a commuter rail station or other key community facilities, Concept A and B should be revisited.

The Downtown Study organizes the downtown into the following six districts:

- Area 1 - North Main Street Mixed Use District
- Area 2 - South Main Street Historic District
- Area 3 - Route 47 Corridor District
- Area 4 - South Downtown Transit Oriented District
- Area 5 - Cross Street Auto Oriented District
- Area 6 - South of Realigned Prairie Street

A future land use plan for the downtown suggests that zoning modifications will be needed to implement the plan creating a new zoning district/s.

Although the Downtown Study has been organized into five distinct character zones, urban design improvements such as gateways, signage and corridor enhancements will serve to visually integrate the entire Downtown into a unified whole.

The Village will have to develop an Action Plan in advance of implementing the Downtown revitalization plan. Priorities will have to be set in the Comprehensive Plan and related supporting zoning. (The areas of priorities are listed in the Downtown Sugar Grove study on page 49) In addition a marketing plan must be put in place.

The Steering Committee will continue work on the study. One goal is to seek financing tools to implement the plan. Some avenues for revenue could possibly be creating a TIF District or Business District or partnering with the private sector.

Stages of development could be spread from five years to ten years.

Eckert and Manzanares questioned if Route 47 would be improved, i.e. widening? Dray asked if changes were made to Route 47 if the underpass would be improved to be pedestrian friendly? Hoffman believed 47 would be improved and the underpass accessible for pedestrian use.

Dr. Joe Minardi, business owner, had questions regarding the alley shown on the plan and where it would exit by the BP station. Ferencak said the main idea was to have a cross access between the properties in this block, the exact location or characteristics have not been determined. Minardi had heard that an animal hospital was proposed for the 47/Cross area. He had concerns that his capacity to use his land would be limited. He asked if there could be any flexibility with the alleyway. Ferencak said the "alley" may just be a series of parking lots with their drive aisles joined together. Buening said improvements made would benefit the property owners. IDOT limits access onto Route 47. The Village may consider consolidating access.

Frances Alexander, a homeowner in the Cross/47 area expressed concern that she might lose her home should the plan need her property for the development. Hoffman assured her that the plan was still in its infancy stage and it wasn't known just how it would affect homeowners in that area.

The question was asked as to when a Metra Station would come into Sugar Grove. Buening said the Village has to express an interest in it to Metra. If there was interest in moving forward on it, the process would probably take 15 to 20 years, with a short term of 5 years. Saloga asked why the Board was not currently pursuing a station. Buening said not 100% of the Board is in favor of it, primarily because of concerns that people from outlying areas would be causing traffic increases. Hoffman said that this station being at the end of the line doesn't necessarily have to have a coachyard. It wouldn't have to be in Sugar Grove. For example, Elburn is the end of the line, but the coachyard is in West Chicago.

Manzanares asked what was the status of Forest City? Buening said they are still dealing with getting access to Route 47.

Ochsenschlager asked the Plan Commission/ZBA to review the "Downtown Sugar Grove - A Plan for Revitalizing the Historic Core of the Village". At the next meeting they could have conversation, input and have their questions answered. This was agreeable to all members.

- d. Petition 06-SUBORD: Subdivision Ordinance - Review Chapters 1 - 4**  
Village of Sugar Grove, Petitioner  
For later adoption with other Chapters

The Village is embarking upon a comprehensive update of the Subdivision Regulations. This action is being taken to strengthen policies, clarify and provide language/provisions that coordinate with best engineering practices, and generally conduct "housekeeping" that reflects current planning review processes and procedures. The last update was in 1994.

Hirth said staff had been working together in reviewing the ordinance for possible changes. The identification of changes and additions to the ordinance seemed to be a bit confusing to follow. Hirth said once input was completed, a clean copy would be distributed to the Plan Commission/ZBA.

Commissioners were in possession of a draft of proposed amendments for Chapters 1 through 4 of the Subdivision Ordinance. The Plan Commission/ZBA is being asked to review those chapters and relay its comments to Staff. Eckert, after reading and studying the proposed changes had compiled a list of numerous concerns. He, and other Commissioners, were asked to e-mail their comments to Staff if they wished. Eckert wasn't clear on the Village's ability to change the checklist if it was not a part of the official ordinance. Buening said it was necessary to have the checklist as a part of the ordinance to be able to enforce it.

Ochsenschlager asked that a review and discussion of the amendments proposed be placed on the Commission's March 21<sup>st</sup> meeting agenda.

## **7. PLAN COMMISSIONER COMMENTS, PROJECT UPDATES AND MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION**

Buening gave the updates:

### **Medical and Dental Parking Space Requirements**

The Village Board was divided on raising the number of required spaces to 5. It did compromise agreeing to raise the required spaces to 4 per 1,000 S.F. of building area.

### **Village Police Headquarters**

The Village Board approved of the rezoning and text amendment for a new Police Station.

### **Prairie Glen Office Park**

Staff is still waiting for a revised plan which includes changes to the driveway next to the residential area. As soon as the plan is revised, submitted, and reviewed it will go to the Village Board.

### **Harter Road School Site**

The Village Board approved the annexation agreement and annexation of the site. The School District is holding a referendum in April to gain financing of the new school to be built on the site.

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

**Benesch made a motion, which was seconded by Saloga, that the meeting be adjourned.**

**The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.**

**The meeting was adjourned at 8:29 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Zak  
Recording Secretary