

**VILLAGE of SUGAR GROVE
REGULAR MEETING of the
PLAN COMMISSION/ZONING BOARD of APPEALS
MINUTES of October 15, 2014**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting of the Sugar Grove Plan Commission / Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Irv Ochsenschlager in the Village Hall Board meeting room.

2. **ROLL CALL**

Plan commission / ZBA members present:

Irv Ochsenschlager, John Guddendorf, Mary Heineman, and Heidi Lendi were in attendance.

Absent: Jim Eckert and Rebecca Sabo

Also present: Mike Ferencak, Village Planner and Walter Magdziarz, Community Development Director, Thad Gleason and Mike Koehl from Gleason Architects for Petition 14-013

3. **PUBLIC HEARING**

a. **Petition 14-013: Prairie Pointe Assisted Living Resubdivision – Major PUD Amendment, Final PUD, Rezoning to SR, Preliminary / Final Plat (Prairie Pointe Partners, LLC)**

Chairman Ochsenschlager called the continued public hearing to order. He then swore in those persons in attendance planning to testify.

Petitioner Presentation: Ferencak gave a brief overview. This property is located on the southwest corner of Park Avenue and Division Drive. It's about 2.3 acres and extends west to the Windsor West subdivision and south to The Landings Office Park. It is lots 6 and 7 within The Landings PUD. The applicant is planning to resubdivide the two lots into the proposed Lot 1 of Prairie Pointe Assisted Living Resubdivision. A Major PUD Amendment is requested to add the proposed use to the use list for The Landings development, to resubdivide the lots, and for deviations from the PUD and/or Zoning Ordinance. A Final PUD is requested for final review of plans to develop the site. The subject property is also requested to be rezoned to the new SR Senior Residential District. The Comprehensive Plan doesn't designate areas for these types of uses specifically but it does call out for assisted living facilities and similar facilities to be provided in convenient locations to accommodate senior citizens within Sugar Grove. Staff feels it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The findings of fact are included for the Special Use and PUD. There are a number of deviations being requested by the developer regarding the height of the roof, various building and pavement setbacks, parking, minor

landscaping and percentages of building material on the building. Aside from the deviations there are a couple of other conditions including minor revisions to the plans, (EEI reviewed the prior plan not this latest one). Staff recommends approval.

The architects, **Thad Gleason** and **Mike Koehl** from Gleason Architects made a presentation of the project. Prairie Pointe Partners in this project includes Ari Maryles, Steve Kaufman, and Steve Ritzman. The operator, Citizen Healthcare, is located in Lincolnshire, Illinois and they have many facilities similar to this one all around Illinois. It's an assisted living facility with a Medicare component and 24 hour security. It's not a nursing home. There's also a memory care component in this facility. Most residents don't drive and the facility provides transportation for them. The building will be type 5A construction with full sprinkler system and include a main dining room, patio with barbeque grill & fire pit, bistro with pool table, ice cream parlor, commercial kitchen, reading room, exercise room and gardening room, residential laundry facilities on each floor, medical clinic, movie theatre, spa, hair salon, activity rooms and multi-purpose room. The assisted living area will contain 14 studio, 38 one bedroom and 2 two bedroom units. Each unit has a kitchenette with microwave and mini refrigerator and private bathroom. Memory care is a secure community with resident services located in an open area with access from each unit. This includes living, dining and activity functions. There are 17 studio units in this area, 16 are private and one unit is shared. Each unit has a private bathroom. The exterior architecture was reviewed and the breakdown of brick vs. siding was given; it's 59 percent brick and 41 percent siding overall. Construction is expected to start in the spring of 2015 and take approximately twelve months. This facility will be a little larger than the ones located in Loves Park and Sycamore.

Public Comments/Questions: **Commissioner Guddendorf** asked for parking breakdown. **Ferencak** stated that the parking rate is different for assisted living than memory care. The memory care includes a component for the number of employees. The total requirement for the two components is 49 parking spaces and they propose 42 on site. A deviation would be needed for that. There would be on street parking designated on the west side of Division Drive south of Park Ave. This site is isolated from other sites as far as parking. The Landings Office Park is located south and only has two of the seven buildings built, so there is some overflow area available there. **Commissioner Guddendorf** brought up street lighting for walkers going to Walgreens and Aldi as well as crosswalks and the ADA accessibility at them. The street speed limit was discussed. If not posted, it's 30 mph.

Chairman Ochsenschlager closed the public hearing on petition 14-013.

4. **OLD BUSINESS**
None
5. **NEW BUSINESS**

a. Petition 14-013: Prairie Pointe Assisted Living Resubdivision – Major PUD Amendment, Final PUD, Rezoning to SR, Preliminary / Final Plat (Prairie Pointe Partners, LLC)

Commissioner Ochsenschlager clarified that there is no request for a special use directly involved. **Ferencak** explained PUD is a form of special use. The staff report comment regarding the improvements needed to the lighting plan are for the foot candle deviations and additional details and information are needed on the photometric plan as well.

A motion was made by Commissioner Guddendorf and seconded by Commissioner Lendi to recommend approval of the Major PUD Amendment for changes to the plans, including lots, uses and various deviations, pursuant to The Landings PUD Ordinances 2007-0403B, 2008-0401C and 20100907, The Landings Plat Resolution 2007-0918A and Section 11-11-6-D of the Sugar Grove Zoning Ordinance along with adopting the findings of fact on pages 5-8 of the staff report dated October 15, 2014 and subject to the conditions contained in memo dated October 15, 2014.

The motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

A motion was made by Commissioner Heineman and seconded by Commissioner Guddendorf to recommend approval of the Final PUD for development of Lot 1 (2.296 acres) of the proposed resubdivision as an assisted living / memory care facility, pursuant to The Landings PUD Ordinances 2007-0403B, 2008-0401C and 2010-0907, The Landings Plat Resolution 2007-0918A and Section 11-11-6-D of the Sugar Grove Zoning Ordinance along with adopting the findings of fact on pages 5-8 of the staff report dated October 15, 2014 and subject to the conditions contained in memo dated October 15, 2014.

The motion carried by unanimously by voice vote.

A motion was made by Commissioner Lendi and seconded by Commissioner Heineman to recommend approval of the Rezoning from B-3 Regional Business District to SR Senior Residential District, pursuant to Section 11-13-11 of the Sugar Grove Zoning Ordinance along with adopting the findings of fact on pages 4-5 of the staff report dated October 15, 2014 and subject to the conditions contained in the memo dated October 15, 2014.

The motion carried by unanimously by voice vote.

A motion was made by Commissioner Heineman and seconded by Commissioner Guddendorf to recommend approval of the Preliminary and Final Plat to create the Prairie Pointe Assisted Living Resubdivision, pursuant to Sections 12-4-3 and 12-4-5 of the Sugar Grove Subdivision Ordinance subject to the conditions listed in the staff report dated October 15, 2014.

The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Ferencak will update the percentages of building materials as provided by the applicant tonight and will address the comments made by the Commission tonight as this proceeds forward to the Village Board.

b. Petition 14-005: Comprehensive Plan – North Land Use Amendment (Village of Sugar Grove)

Commissioner Heineman had given her comments to the Commissioners earlier in writing. **Magdziarz** presented a refinement of the plan from the discussion at the October 1, 2014 Plan Commission workshop. A few of the items reviewed were the storm water detention requirements and identification of ways to enhance the areas that will not have development on them like wetlands and floodplain. The green on the plan is all the floodplain, wetlands and detention. The detention is placed where it would naturally be located based on the topography. One of the challenges of the plan is that some of the parcels may have to develop detention off site in order to achieve this plan. It's feasible because of the size of the parcels there, but will require a master plan approach instead of parcel by parcel approach. This would also help achieve some of the other environmental objectives that are illustrated with this plan.

The Village Board requested a change and the orange lines placed close together around Green Road, Seavey Road, Norris Road up by Main Street, and around Black Sheep Golf Club is to draw attention to the areas where the planning objective is to disconnect the road network within the business park from the roads mentioned in order to maintain the rural character of those roads so they don't become urban street cross sections and introduce land uses along the roads that would be inconsistent with what is already out there. Green Road could be left as is if the traffic from the business park isn't attached to it. This buffer area will need to be graphically indicated on the plan because it's really not a land use.

Commercial development is definitely a possibility but to an unknown extent at this time. The southwest quadrant of the State Route 47 and Interstate 88 interchange has access issues and retail requires good access. Maybe a flex land use would be advisable for this location.

The current plan is for Seavey Rd. to connect where it's separated by I-88. It will be a difficult and expensive road improvement to achieve. The land use shown in that location needs to support the cost of the improvement but should be one that cannot be supported without that improvement. This is one of the issues with showing Business Park at this location. Seavey Road is seen to be an overpass only and Main Street may be a possible next interchange.

Commissioner Guddendorf asked if there was a timeline for building this development. Number one would be getting utilities to the area for the interchange, but from there it would be development driven. It would progress from Merrill Road

north. **Commissioner Heineman** confirmed with Staff that the plan is consistent with the thinking of Crown Development.

A 35-40 acre section would be the largest in this development area. Different aspects of the plan were discussed including a possible pedestrian overpass over the tollway.

Commissioner Heineman expressed concern over creating a feeling of dictation with this map as direction for development of this area. **Magdziarz** explained that this is a realistic interpretation of the land uses allowed here due to the existing wetlands and floodplain and the possible detention. The amount of detention is variable based on the type of uses but industrial areas tend to be high impervious areas. Developers don't pay for those areas and all the green shown on the map can't be developed for any other use. **Commission Guddendorf** was envisioning lakes and ponds for the area. **Magdziarz** explained that it could be a possibility but would be a function of the master developer. They could provide a regional detention area for a much larger area which would reconfigure the green space shown. The objective will still be the same, to organize the storm water areas in an area that compliments the landscape features that are already there.

Commissioner Heineman confirmed with Staff that there are developers large enough to take on this type of mass development project in our area. The Village would be involved in the outcome of this development but not how the developers acquire the land. She stated that she feels there are many positive things happening but she doesn't agree with the Village taking an aggressive strong arm approach to expanding the future planning area up north of Seavey Road and Main Street because she feels it will result in a negative reaction from the residents there located in Kane County and Elburn. The plan should show how the Village sees the roads going in the future but in a way that will create support and not a strong stand that Sugar Grove is going to be Main Street. This area has always been the buffer area.

Magdziarz stated that Elburn's most recent comprehensive plan which was approved last year doesn't show any development south of Hughes Road. South of Hughes Road to Main Street is shown only as a future development area without any land uses identified. The extraterritorial jurisdictions overlap and Sugar Grove's extraterritorial jurisdiction is already at Main Street, west of Green Road.

Commissioner Heineman stated that the County may be agreeable to the Village looking at the north side of the tollway but if it's too aggressive they could knock the plan down for another 20 years. Especially since this is a future plan which is years and years out. Mixed use development also creates an opportunity for some dense housing to be offered to entice the employees in this development to live there. Maybe some townhomes, apartments or condos in the area of Seavey Road on the north and Black Sheep to the west behind the commercial area. It's a reality of development.

Using the County's land resource management plan as a starting point, this plan and our current plan would probably run into some resistance since everything north of the tollway is currently shown as agricultural. On the flip side, the proposed land use

is a tax base generating use that may receive the County's support. The area north of Interstate 88 is shown as all estate type zoning, which is mostly existing.

Magdziarz said the intention is not to try and make the area at the intersection of State Route 47 and Main Street in Sugar Grove. The area west of Green Road where it intersects Route 47 will be taken off this map. The red slash lines indicate a buffer without development use like agriculture or something else compatible.

The public hearing for this is scheduled for next Wednesday so **Magdziarz** will make changes to the plan for that meeting. **Chairman Ochsenschlager** likes the green area. **Commissioner Guddendorf** stated the business park aspect is so large he's concerned there won't be enough businesses to fill it. The interchange should be a big enough draw but it's all speculation of the future. **Magdziarz** said research and development isn't included here due to over saturation in the area to the east. Some of those buildings may end up being converted to residential or mixed use.

Commissioners discussed having business park be a flex use including possibly some residential. **Commissioner Heineman** stated that future development needs to keep a tight core and not take on all this green space. Add some mixed use and not go so far out of our core. Consensus was determined that the plan as presented was good but should be trimmed back some on the amount of area included. The Bliss Road / Seavey Road area should be shown as more of a mixed use. **Commissioners** mentioned determining the traffic movement from the business park to the train station. Staff should connect Bliss Road to Fabyan Road.

6. **PLAN COMMISSIONER COMMENTS, PROJECTS UPDATES and MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION**

Senior Housing Resubdivision was approved by the Village Board on October 7th.

Some changes to what the Commission recommended were made but were more of personal preference not superlative.

75 Railroad Street water tower with proposed cell antennas has not gone to the Village Board yet because staff is working out the lease agreement with the cellular company and having the consultant review completed.

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made by Commissioner Lendi and seconded by Commissioner Guddendorf that the meeting be adjourned at 8:23 p.m.

The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,
Holly Baker
Substitute Recording Secretary