VILLAGE of SUGAR GROVE
PLANNNING COMMISSION/ZONING BOARD of APPEALS
MINUTES of January 23, 2019 SPECIAL 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 Academic Professional Training Center at Waubonsee Community College.

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: Steven Andersson, Village Attorney; 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 continued public hearing to order at 7:00 p.m. Witnesses were sworn in by the Chairman.

Attorney Andersson provided an explanation of the differences and similarities of PDD Planned Development and PUD Planned Unit Development zoning. He explained that procedurally the two zoning classifications are identical and neither allows more developer control than the other. He concluded by stating that the large scale and mixed use nature of the project justifies the request for a PDD zoning designation.

Michael Coghlan, 1203 S 2nd Street, stated that he is an area attorney and has been retained by area individuals and Woods Not Warehouses, LLC to represent their interests during the public hearing process. Mr. Coghlan offered to meet with Sugar Grove LLC outside of the hearing process to discuss the proposed project. He explained that he has submitted a freedom of information request to the Village to gain access to all information related to this project and is waiting for fulfillment of the request. He requested more specific plans from Sugar Grove LLC for the site development. He concluded his comments by stating that if area flooding is worsened by this development, there will be lawsuits filed under 65ILCS13.1.

Ross Powell, 43W976 Oakleaf Drive, stated his opposition to the rezoning for the following reasons: he has forty (40) years of experience as a professor of geology, this area is high value prime farmland and should be preserved as farmland, concern about wetlands contamination, hydric soils are not adequate

for building, shallow aquifer contamination, area flooding will be worsened by the development, soil erosion will be worsened by the construction, he moved to the area for the country atmosphere which will be destroyed by the development of this property, and this proposal is "not for the greater good". (Exhibit H, Public Hearing Record).

Sakina Bjowala, 1715 Hannaford Drive, stated her opposition to the rezoning for the following reasons: she explained that she is a physician specializing in allergy and asthma treatment, her experience in this field leads her to believe that the increased truck traffic will have a detrimental effect on the air quality and respiratory health of area residents, her findings were presented as a power point presentation which is marked Exhibit I, Public Hearing Record. Commissioner Sabo asked how many diesel trucks could pass through the area before the air quality is diminished. Dr. Bajowala stated that she did not know, but she would "run numbers" and get back to the Commission with the answer.

Anthony Basile, 2S303 Green Road, stated his opposition to the rezoning for the following reasons: he did not receive proper notification of the public hearing, flooding concerns, and this development will change the character of the area. (Exhibit J, Public Hearing Record)

Journey Steward, 43W833 Red Oak Drive, stated her opposition to the rezoning for the following reasons: semi-trucks passing through the residential subdivisions, noise and light pollution with twenty four (24) hour operations, Rt. 47 is not adequate to handle the amount of truck traffic anticipated, and lack of input from the community before plans were made. (Exhibit K, Public Hearing Record)

Ryan Walter, 1800 Hunters Ridge Lane, stated his opposition to the rezoning for the following reasons: TIF funds should not be used for this project, rezoning is only consistent with Comprehensive Plan because staff and Crown Community Development (CCD) changed the plan, conflicts of interest around this plan due to Dan Olsem serving on the Economic Development Corporation board and CCD is paying for the TIF study, Village worked with CCD and not with the residents to develop this proposal, traffic study is not valid due to time of year data collected did not account for school traffic. (Exhibit K-1, Public Hearing Record)

Diane Homan, 503 Fairlee Court, stated her opposition to the rezoning for the following reasons: less than forty percent (40%) open space is not acceptable, a two (2) acre park for the single family neighborhood is not adequate, traffic conflicts between automobiles and semi-truck especially student drivers, adding more low wage jobs will widen the income gap, bars and liquor stores are a proposed permitted use, and air pollution concerns. (Exhibit L, Public Hearing Record).

Perry Elliott, 860 Longview Court, stated his opposition to the rezoning for the following reasons: TIF will leave Village on the hook for expenditures, air quality will be compromised, and Village must require CCD to study many of the negative issues the public has outlined. (Exhibit N, Public Hearing Record)

James Huguelet, 1016 Oak Street, stated his opposition to the rezoning for the following reasons: loss of charm to the Village, area should be developed as office park or research facilities, multifamily is not compatible with current single family uses in the area, interchange should be reconsidered, rezoning

should occur after TIF is established, prefer development like Cantera, and Village needs a new Comprehensive Plan. (Exhibit O, Public Hearing Record)

Lisa Maathan, 900 Spruce St, stated her opposition to this rezoning for the following reasons: she is holding off plans to build her home at 1918 Hunter's Ridge Lane until this rezoning is concluded, would not have bought the lot had she known the Village was considering this project, noise and air pollution associated with truck traffic, TIF is not appropriate, and workers may be bussed in from other areas to work low wage jobs created by this project.

Bill Lenert, 765 Wheatfield Avenue, stated his opposition to the rezoning for the following reasons: his experience as a Kane County Board Member, negative effect on property values, light and air pollution, no guarantee that CCD will actually building the single family subdivision shown on the plans, and CDD will build and "unsightly" water tower on the property. (Exhibit Q, Public Hearing Record)

Janet Doherty, 526 Rose Street, stated her opposition to the rezoning for the following reasons: the public was not given adequate notification of the rezoning, neighbors should be part of the design process for this property, and project is not compatible with the 2005 Comprehensive Plan. (Exhibit R Public Hearing Record)

Commissioner Eckert moved to continue the public hearing to January 30, 2019 at the same location. Commissioner Sabo seconded the motion.

Motion Passed by Unanimous Voice Vote

4. **NEW BUSINESS:**

None

5. **OLD BUSINESS:**

None

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

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

Motion Passed by Unanimous Voice Vote

Meeting was adjourned at 10:05p.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.