

**VILLAGE of SUGAR GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION/ZONING BOARD of APPEALS
MINUTES of October 16, 2013**

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 Board meeting room.

2. ROLL CALL

Plan commission/ZBA members present:

Irv Ochsenschlager, Jim Eckert, Mary Heineman, John Guddendorf and
Rebecca Sabo

Absent: Ryan Reuland

Quorum established.

Also present:

Mike Ferencak, Village Planner; Rich Young, Community Development Director;
Mark Driscoll (applicant); and Ed Reitan (applicant's architect)

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES of the September 25, 2013 Plan Commission Meeting

Motion made by **Commissioner Guddendorf** and seconded by **Commissioner Sabo** to approve the minutes of the September 25, 2013 Plan Commission meeting, subject to changing all appearances of the word "clarified" to "asked for clarification".

The motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

a. Petition 13-011: Sugar Grove Center Lot 10 – Final PUD, Major PUD Amendment (Dri Bar Holdings, LLC and Dri Bar Ace, LLC)

Chairman Ochsenschlager opened the continued public hearing and swore in any present to testify. Quorum present as at roll call.

Mr. Ferencak explained that the public hearing was continued from the last meeting because the ownership transfer had not been completed. The ownership has now provided authorization for the application to proceed.

No public comment was made.

The Public Hearing was closed. Motion was made by **Commissioner Sabo** and seconded by **Commissioner Heineman**.

Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

5. **OLD BUSINESS**

None

6. **NEW BUSINESS**

a. **Petition 13-011: Sugar grove Cneter Lot 10 – Final PUD, Major PUD Amendment (Dri Bar Holdings, LLC and Dri Bar Ace, LLC)**

Mr. Ferencak provided a description of the Committee of the Whole discussion from the night before, including their discussion about the type of landscaping at the west building foundation and signage.

Mr. Reitan of Reitan Architects provided a description of the building design, the pet supply store, architectural features, outdoor sales area, lighting, and screening of equipment on the building.

Commissioner Sabo asked what the normal hours of operation would be. **Mr. Driscoll** answered the hours would likely be 8:00 am to 7:00 or 8:00 pm, seven days per week.

Commissioner Eckert asked whether semi-trailers would make deliveries to the site. **Mr. Driscoll** answered that some deliveries would be by semi, but not all.

Commissioner Guddendorf asked about fire truck access to the site. There was concern with maneuverability on the site, but once it was explained that all drive aisles are already established, having been reviewed by the Village years before, this item was determined to be ok.

Commissioner Sabo asked about temporary sign placement. Staff provided clarification on the requirements.

Commissioner Eckert asked whether this store would provide lawnmower repair service or oil collection. **Mr. Driscoll** answered that it would not provide either.

Commissioner Eckert asked about the roof warranty. The proposed staff condition requiring two bicycle racks was also questioned and explained.

Commissioner Eckert, Commissioner Guddendorf and others asked about safety and other concerns with the proposed propane storage location. The proposed bollards were discussed and complete screening was recommended. The filling procedure was also discussed.

The proposed staff conditions were reviewed one by one.

Condition 4 regarding a parking deviation was questioned by the applicant, but all agreed it should remain.

Conditions 14 and 15 regarding landscaping were struck from the list.

A portion of Condition 19 regarding placing four Fir trees in the south buffer was struck.

Condition 24 regarding cooperation on a potential sign easement for the subdivision sign was questioned by the applicant, but all agreed it should remain with the addition of “,subject to attorney review.” at the end of the condition.

For Condition 25 which was proposed by staff as one of two options for the walls signage, it was determined to go with the second option granting a deviation.

Condition 27 was reviewed and left as proposed.

Mr. Ferencak asked that a Condition 29 be added regarding engineering plans being submitted and reviewed as this was accidentally not included. All agreed to add it.

Commissioner Eckert made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Heineman to recommend approval of the proposed Final PUD subject to the Findings of Fact on page 5 of the staff report and subject to the staff recommendation memo dated October 16, 2013 as amended (described above).

The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Commissioner Heineman made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sabo to recommend approval of the proposed Major PUD Amendment subject to the Findings of Fact on page 5 of the staff report and subject to the staff recommendation memo dated October 16, 2013 as amended (described above).

The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

7. PLAN COMMISSIONER COMMENTS, PROJECTS UPDATES and MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION

Updates were provided on the search for a Plan Commission member, residential permit activity, and non-residential projects in the works.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Guddendorf made a motion, seconded by **Commissioner Eckert**, that the meeting be adjourned at 8:09 p.m.

The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Next regularly scheduled meeting is November 20, 2013

Respectfully submitted,
Holly Baker
Substitute Recording Secretary