VILLAGE of SUGAR GROVE
PLANNNING COMMISSION/ZONING BOARD of APPEALS
MINUTES of January 16, 2019 MEETING

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting of the Sugar Grove Planning Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Ochsenschlager in the Community Room of the Sugar Grove Public Library.

2. **ROLL CALL**

Planning Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals member present:
Chairman Irv Ochsenschlager, John Guddendorf, Greg Wilson, Larry Jones, James White, James Eckert, and Rebecca Sabo

Absent: None

Also present: Walter Magdziarz, Community Development Director and Renee Hanlon, Planning & Zoning Administrator

3. **PUBLIC HEARING:**

Petition #18-010 Rezoning from E-1 to PDD and assignment of PDD Zoning to annexed land Applicant: Sugar Grove LLC

Chairman Ochsenschlager called the public hearing to order at 7:00 p.m. Witnesses were sworn in by the Chairman.

Chairman Ochsenschlager announced that, due to the large crowd in attendance, the Planning Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals has directed village staff to find a larger venue if the public hearing is continued.

Director Magdziarz presented information intended to clear up public misconceptions about the petition including: tax increment financing district (TIF) establishment regulations and the difference between PDD and PUD zoning designations. He explained that a TIF had not been requested and the purpose of this public hearing was for collecting evidence to determine if the proposed zoning regulations are appropriate for this area. He further explained that if a TIF is requested in the future, a public hearing will be held to collect evidence related to the TIF request. Director Magdziarz went on to explain the differences and similarities of Planned Unit Development (PUD) and Planned Development District (PDD) zoning. He concluded by stating that the size of this project justified the PDD request.

Chairman Ochsenschlager explained the zoning approval process and the rules of conduct during the public hearing.

Dan Olsem, representing the petitioner, presented a power point presentation (Exhibit B, Public Hearing Record) which explained the project and requested zoning. Mr. Olsem explained that Sugar Grove LLC is a division of Crown Community Development. He provided a brief history of the company. He

PLEASE NOTE: These minutes are not a word-for-word transcription of the statements made at the meeting, nor intended to be a comprehensive review of all discussions. They are intended to make an official record of the actions taken by the Planning Commission / Zoning Board of Appeals, and to include some description of discussion items. They may not reference some of the individual attendee's comments, nor the complete comments if referenced.

stated that the company has owned the property for seventeen (17) years and believes that with the tollway interchange construction, now is the time to develop the property. Mr. Olsem explained that the current market demand is for warehouse uses to support e-commerce. Mr. Olsem walked through the proposed project explaining that the portions of the property which are adjacent to the tollway will be developed with large warehouse type buildings, the area immediate north of the existing Hannaford Farm subdivision will be developed with detached single family homes, and other areas (yet to be identified) may contain regional retail uses. Mr. Olsem presented his findings related to the costs of development and the anticipated tax revenue that the Village may collect if this project is completed.

Tim Sjorgen, representing the petitioner, stated that he is a licensed engineer with Kimley Horn Engineering and has been retained by Sugar Grove LLC to study the traffic impact of this project. Mr. Sjorgen walked through the proposed roadway improvement plan. He explained that Denny Road will be extended to gain access to the property. The Denny Road extension has been designed to minimize conflict between private automobile and commercial truck traffic by including two (2) traffic circles. Mr. Sjorgen explained that Merrill Road will be realigned and Seavey Road will be improved. He concluded by summarizing the finding from a traffic study that his firm prepared. (Exhibit A, Public Hearing Record)

Dan Olsem presented a summary of the architectural standards that the developer will adhere to when developing this property. These standards apply to all buildings within the PDD. He provided information about the residential land uses within the PDD. The residential portion of the project is expected to include: approximately 175 single family detached units, and one (1) multifamily development containing up to three hundred (300) units with a combination of 1,500 square foot one (1) bedroom units and 2,500 square foot two (2) bedroom units. (Exhibit A, Public Hearing Record)

Greg Sagan, representing the petitioner, states that he is a licensed landscape architect and has been retained by Sugar Grove LLC to develop open space and landscape plans for the project. Mr. Sagan walked through the proposed open space plan emphasizing the walking/bike trail system that will be completed as part of this project. He presented illustrative plans to help visualize how individual lots will be landscaped to provide screening from the public streets and soften large buildings. (Exhibit A, Public Hearing Record)

Mr. Olsem concluded the petitioner's presentation by summarizing the request for rezoning.

Chairman Ochenschaler opened the floor to members of the public.

Lynda Flowers, 2S233 Green Road, stated her opposition to the rezoning for the following reasons: PDD allows developer more control than a PUD would allow, this project represent a drastic change from the existing land uses in the area, and this project is not in compliance with the recommendations of the Route 47 Corridor Plan.

Linda Gaska, 921 Lakeridge Court, stated her opposition to the rezoning for the following reasons: she visited Elmwood, IL and does not want Sugar Grove to develop in the same manner, warehousing would increase truck traffic which will increase particulate matter in the air which will compromise air quality

in the area, infrastructure costs associated with this increased truck traffic, the jobs this project will bring will be low wage and will not enhance the community, and this project will change the rural atmosphere that she moved to Sugar Grove to enjoy. (Exhibit C, Public Hearing Record)

Jason Mann, 610 Hickory, stated his opposition to the rezoning for the following reasons: he believes that the project is a "done deal" due to marketing brochure claiming zoning is in place and due to Sugar Grove LLC sharing costs of the interchange construction with the Village, truck and automobile traffic conflicts on Denny Road, this project is not in compliance with the "spirit and intent" of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan, and the 2018 Comprehensive Plan amendment was accomplished without adequate public input and should be repealed.

Laura Remes, 43W484 Scott Road, stated her opposition to the rezoning for the following reasons: her experience as a real estate agency allows her to conclude that this project will result in a decline of area property values.

Mavis Bates, 60 S Harrison, stated her opposition, as a representative of the Sierra Club, to the rezoning for the following reasons: the area has a history of flooding, the PDD allows more control by the developer than a PUD would allow, open space plan does not provide the minimum forty percent (40%) that the zoning ordinance requires, Seavey Road Run must be protected from potential contaminates due to its status as a high functioning wetland, forested area at southeast corner of Rt 47 and tollway must be preserved due to its value to the environment, and all nonresidential buildings should be required to include solar. (Exhibit D, Public Hearing Record)

Nancy Nseytu-Freske, 43W874 Old Midlothian Road, stated her opposition to the rezoning for the following reasons: PDD allows more developer control than a PUD would allow, project will decrease property values in the area, the project has a high potential for contaminating the shallow aquifer which is the source of drinking water in the area, negative impact on wildlife, traffic safety questionable, increased noise and light pollution, crime will rise with the addition of warehouse buildings, forest at the southeast corner of RT 47 and tollway sequesters a large amount of carbon so it should be preserved, planting trees throughout the village will not replace the forest, proposal does not meet forty percent (40%) open space as required, and school bus safety with increased truck traffic is concerning. (Exhibit M, Public Hearing Record)

Rick Boyle, 43W857 Red Oak Drive, stated his opposition to the rezoning for the following reasons: low wage jobs will be created raising the demand for low income housing, more low income housing will raise the demand for bilingual teachers, moved here for rural setting which will be destroyed by project, buildings should be certified green buildings, and we will be"trading bald eagles for pigeons and rats". (Exhibit E, Public Hearing Record)

Commissioner White moved to continue the public hearing to January 23, 2019 to a location unknown. Commissioner Sabo seconded the motion.

Motion Passed by Unanimous Voice Vote

PLEASE NOTE: These minutes are not a word-for-word transcription of the statements made at the meeting, nor intended to be a comprehensive review of all discussions. They are intended to make an official record of the actions taken by the Planning Commission / Zoning Board of Appeals, and to include some description of discussion items. They may not reference some of the individual attendee's comments, nor the complete comments if referenced.

Chairman Ochenschaler explained that the Village Website will be updated with the location as soon as one is secured by staff.

4. **NEW BUSINESS:**

None

5. **OLD BUSINESS:**

None

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner White made a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Sabo seconded the motion.

Motion Passed by Unanimous Voice Vote

Meeting was adjourned at 9:20p.m.

Note: All documents referenced are on file in the Department of Community Development, 601 Heartland Drive. Documents may be viewed during regular business hours.

Respectfully submitted,
Renee Hanlon
Recording Secretary

PLEASE NOTE: These minutes are not a word-for-word transcription of the statements made at the meeting, nor intended to be a comprehensive review of all discussions. They are intended to make an official record of the actions taken by the Planning Commission / Zoning Board of Appeals, and to include some description of discussion items. They may not reference some of the individual attendee's comments, nor the complete comments if referenced.