

**SYCAMORE CITY COUNCIL**  
**AGENDA**  
January 19, 2004

**City Council Workshop Meeting: 6:30 P.M.**

State Representative Robert Pritchard has asked for an opportunity to listen to the legislative concerns of the City Council as the Spring session of the Illinois Legislature begins.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Regular City Council Meeting**  
**At the Sycamore Center**  
**7:00 P.M.**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **INVOCATION**
3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
5. **AUDIENCE TO VISITORS**
6. **CONSENT AGENDA**
  - A. Approval of the Minutes for the City Council Meeting of January 5, 2004;
  - B. Payment of the Bills for January 19, 2004;
  - C. Plan Commission Minutes for the Meeting of December 8, 2003.
7. **PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS, COMMUNICATIONS, AND BILLS.**
  - A. Consideration of a Presentation By the Sycamore Economic Development Commission Featuring Sycamore Containers.**

Sycamore Economic Development Commission member John Swedberg will introduce Marvin Barnes of Sycamore Containers, 215 North Fair Street, to give a brief overview of the company's products and services.
8. **REPORTS OF OFFICERS**

**9. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

**10. PUBLIC HEARINGS--None**

**11. ORDINANCES**

**A. Ordinance No. 2003.76—An Ordinance Concerning the Recommendation of the Plan Commission With Regard to a Petition From DeKalb Clinic Chartered for an Amendment to the Annexation Agreement Between the City of Sycamore and DeKalb Clinic Chartered, Dated October 20, 1999. First and Second Reading.**

On March 15, 1999, when the DeKalb Clinic and the Roush family petitioned the City Council for the annexation of approximately 20 acres of land at the northeast corner of Plank Road and IL. Rt. 23, the annexation agreement included a provision for a north-south road running along the eastern boundary of the property. According to that agreement, the Clinic was entitled to a reimbursement for 60 percent of the cost of the roadway improvements and the fair market value of the land beneath. The smaller relative cost borne by the Clinic was owing to the fact that the roadway was to be built entirely on the Clinic's property, which would result in less land available for development on the west side of the common boundary with the Kocher farm.

Upon the approval of the North Grove Crossing P.U.D. on June 16, 2003, Dave Johnson of John Clare Ltd. and the DeKalb Clinic Chartered began work on an understanding that would permit the developer to proceed with road improvements without requiring an untimely contribution of capital from the Clinic, which has no present plans for the development of the east third of its Plank Road property. These negotiations continued as Mr. Johnson transferred the title to the development parcel to David Fagenal, a Batavia home builder. The attached revision to the original DeKalb Clinic agreement, along with minor revisions to the text of the John Clare annexation agreement, described in item "B," below, together set out the terms of that understanding. The specific provisions are as follows:

- a) The DeKalb Clinic will donate the land for the right-of-way for that portion of Luther Lowell Drive that runs north and south along the east boundary of the Clinic property;
- b) The developer, John Clare, or its successors and assigns, will pay for the entire cost of the construction of that portion of Luther Lowell Drive that is contiguous with the Clinic property;
- c) The DeKalb Clinic will pay for the lesser of \$30,000 or 40 percent (40%) of the cost of the intersection improvements at Luther Lowell Drive and Plank Road, including a turn lane and widening of Plank Road;
- d) The DeKalb Clinic will pay up to 50 percent (50%) for any future traffic signals at the intersection of Plank Road and Luther Lowell Drive, once warrants are established.

This understanding between private parties needs to be memorialized in order to insure that public bodies will not be financially accountable for public improvements that will be necessary at an undefined future date, and which are typically the responsibility of private development firms.

This item was originally placed on the December 8, 2003 Plan Commission meeting agenda, then continued until the January 12 meeting to allow additional time for the attorneys for the DeKalb Clinic and the contract purchaser for the North Grove Crossing project, Dave Fagenal, to work out certain details. These details were resolved by Brett Brown (in behalf of the DeKalb Clinic) and Kevin Carrara (in behalf of Mr. Fagenal). Consequently, this matter was reviewed by the Commission on January 12. The Commission recommended, by a unanimous vote of 11-0, to forward this matter to the Council with a favorable recommendation.

City Council approval of the Plan Commission recommendation is requested.

**B. Ordinance No. 2003.77--An Ordinance Concerning the Recommendation of the Plan Commission With Regard to a Petition From Sycamore Investments, LLC for an Amendment to the Annexation Agreement Between the City of Sycamore and John Clare, Ltd., Dated May 19, 2003. First and Second Reading.**

As noted above, the revised amendments to the John Clare agreement (see attached) are principally focused on the reciprocal responsibilities of the DeKalb Clinic and John Clare Ltd. regarding the construction of the Luther Lowell Drive extension to Plank Road. In addition, the preliminary plat is revised to reflect the following changes:

- a) A reconfiguration of the relationship between house lots 1 through 8 and the commercially-zoned Kocher farmstead. On the original plan, the house lots backed up to the commercial zoning and the roadway ran between the houses and the park. In the revised plan, the lots are separated from the commercial zoning by the roadway, and the house lots now back up to the park. The staff believe this revision will reduce potential conflicts between the commercial and residential zoning districts and afford a safer access to the interior park from the adjacent house lots.
- b) A separate preliminary plat is created to give more definition to the R-3-zoned townhouse area. Brian Grainger, a local builder, who introduced himself to the Commission on December 8, will be working with Dave Fagenal to build the townhouses. Now that more extensive engineering has been completed, typical layouts have been refined. There are 110 townhouses on 15.64 acres for a gross density of 7.03 units per acre. The original plan showed 106 townhouses on 10.83 acres, or a gross density of 9.79 units per acre. The two interior roads, Buckboard Lane and Overland Road, will be privately owned and maintained.
- c) The overall gross density of the combined townhouse and single-family development areas is 2.84 units per gross acre (164 single family detached; 110 townhouses on an acreage of 96.275 acres), slightly less than the original gross density of 2.98 units per gross acre.

The Plan Commission reviewed this matter at its regular meeting on January 12, 2004 and unanimously (11-0) recommended its approval. City Council approval of the Plan Commission recommendation is requested.

**C. Ordinance No. 2003.78—An Ordinance Concerning the Recommendation of the Plan Commission With Regard to a Petition From Charles Laing for a Final Plat for the Willows Subdivision in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.**

On August 20, 2001 the City Council annexed a 63-acre parcel at the northwest corner of IL Route 64 and Airport Road. The major portion of the property was zoned “R-3” Multiple Family Residence District, but an 8-acre section with frontage on Rt. 64 was zoned “C-3” Highway Commercial. The Council also approved a preliminary plan that depicted a planned residential development that would feature 90 attached townhouses plus 288 one or two-bedroom apartments for a density of 6.85 units per gross acre. Since the annexation and rezoning, the developer, Charles Laing, has been at work grading and shaping the land to create stormwater detention for the property as well as the runoff from about 2.8 square miles of farm property to the north and east. The observer will notice two very large detention areas and a reconfigured water course.

Mr. Laing has now petitioned for the approval of a final plat for the entire development area. As the Council will recall, no portion of the property will be sold to occupants since all units will be leased through Mr. Laing’s family firm. The attached plat has been reviewed by City Engineer John Brady and satisfies the City’s codes and ordinances.

The Plan Commission reviewed the plat on January 12. Commissioner and County Engineer Bill Lorence asked that a minor revision be made to the plat prior to recording, namely some reference to the dedication plat for the future Airport Road extension. With that condition, the Commission recommended the plat by a vote of 11-0. City Council approval of the Plan Commission recommendation is requested.

**D. Ordinance No. 2003.79—An Ordinance Concerning the Recommendation of the Plan Commission With Regard to a Petition From Norm Adshade and Castle Bank, N.A. Trust No. 2169 for a Special Use Permit and Resubdivision of the Duplex Property at 1633 Oak Lane and 2207 Highland Drive in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.**

Mr. Adshade is the beneficiary of Castle Bank Trust No. 2169. In cooperation with the Trustee, Mr. Adshade wishes to subdivide the aforesaid duplex rental property in order to sell each of the units in fee simple. This requires a special use permit as well as a resubdivision plat and a declaration of cross easements.

The necessary documents are attached and were reviewed by the Plan Commission on January 9. By a vote of 11-0, the Commission recommended favorable action. City Council approval of the Plan Commission recommendation is requested.

**E. Ordinance No. 2003.80—An Ordinance Concerning the Recommendation of the Plan Commission With Regard to a Petition From Kishwaukee Health Systems for a Plat of Subdivision for a Nine Lot Commercial Subdivision on Gateway Drive in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.**

The attached plat depicts a nine-lot commercial subdivision of approximately 12.5 acres of land immediately east of the property supporting the Hauser-Ross Eye Institute on Gateway Drive. The petitioner, Kishwaukee Health Systems, is interested in developing the small commercial subdivision for health-related uses. The further development of this commercially-zoned area has long been a goal of the City, and this initiative is welcome.

The plat satisfies the City’s codes and ordinances. The Plan Commission forwarded the matter with a favorable recommendation by a vote of 11-0. City Council approval of the Plan Commission recommendation is requested.

**F. Ordinance No. 2003.81—An Ordinance Concerning the Recommendation of the Plan Commission With Regard to a Petition From B&B Development LP for the Annexation Agreement, Rezoning, and Preliminary Plan for a Residential Development of 366 Acres Along Plank Road, Known as Sycamore Creek, Phase Two, in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First Reading Only.**

At the regular Plan Commission meeting of January 12, the Commission reviewed an annexation agreement and a preliminary plan for the residential development of 366 acres north of Lindgren Road and the Sycamore Creek subdivision, along the Plank Road corridor. The B&B project, which will be detailed below, was forwarded by the Plan Commission for approval by the City Council by a vote of 10-1. Ken Blood, the principal with the firm of B&B Development L.P., has requested the Council’s consideration of this matter on first reading only, because he must be out of town on January 19 to attend to family matters. In addition, Mr. Blood’s land planner and chief presenter for this project, Chuck Hanlon, is scheduled to attend an annual professional convention on the same date. In view of the public interest in this project and the complexity of the plan, the City Manager recommends that the Council receive and file this matter on first reading, as Mr. Blood has requested. With the Council’s consent, a second reading will be scheduled for February 2 at which time the same thorough presentation provided to the Plan Commission can be provided to the City Council as a body. The following information is offered for background purposes.

The Preliminary Plan

The proposed plan has the following features:

1. Land Uses. The following table depicts the various land uses by their relative area:

Single-Family Homes	Acres	Percentage
Single Family Lots	153.01	41.86
Townhomes	13.29	3.63
Private Parks & Conservation Areas	77.34	21.16
Public Park Land	18.90	5.17
School Site	22.09	6.04

Municipal Site	4.55	1.24
Public Road Right-of-Way	76.35	20.89
Total	365.54	100%

2. A gross area of about 366 acres;
3. A total of 568 single-family detached homes;
4. A total of 75-80 townhouses that might be constructed in the rust-colored areas on the plan if preferred densities are achieved (i.e. 6 units per acre);
5. A gross density of 1.77 units per acre ( $648/366= 1.77$ );
6. The donation of a 22.09-acre school site. Detention for this site will be provided by the developer, as well as the rough grading for the site, eliminating those costs from any future school construction.
7. The donation of lake and open spaces to the Park District consisting of about 19 acres;
8. The donation of 4.55 acres abutting Whipple Road (offering the required 500 feet of “green” belt) that could be used for a new City water tower. This area is the proverbial “high ground” for the northeast planning area.
9. A designation of opposing entrances on a straight section of Plank Road;
10. A shifting of traffic through the subdivision via Springfield Street to the intersection with Plank Road, to diminish the use of the intersection at Moose Range Road and Plank Road. The Plan also anticipates the realignment of Plank Road and ties the location of Springfield Street to that future realignment, per the recommendation of the County Engineer.
11. The signature B&B arrangement of private parks in addition to public park dedications. A total of 77.34 acres of private open space and detention would be provided.

#### The Annexation Agreement

On November 17, 2003 the Council enacted a measure (Ordinance 2003.65) that revised the City’s Zoning Code to limit the number of building permits that could be issued per year from each new annexation and to impose a time lag following annexation before any new building permits could be issued. The proposed B&B development is designed to comply with that new regulation in all respects.

Interestingly, the application of the new regulation raises some challenges regarding the wording of an annexation agreement, since the first permits cannot be issued until 2010, and the build-out of the development, at a maximum rate of 75 units per year, may not be reached until 2018 at the earliest, presumably after any officials involved in this process have moved on. Sycamore’s long-range planning has never had to be so technical and detailed!

The principal terms of the annexation agreement are as follows:

1. The Name. At the Plan Commission meetings of November 10 and December 8, the proposed development was known as “Harvest Lakes.” In keeping with the Comprehensive Plan’s preference for a gateway development on the northeast side that suggested one is arriving in “Sycamore,” the staff and the developer have cooperated on a change in name to “Sycamore Creek, Phase Two.” The subdivision

name “Sycamore Heights” has already been taken. “Sycamore Creek” has been taken, as well, but since this development proposal can be seen as an extension of Sycamore Creek in style, layout, and amenities, since the two development areas are under common ownership, and since any other “Sycamore” names carry the potential for confusion at the City’s planning edge, “Sycamore Creek” seemed the logical name. For legal purposes, the name of the subdivision will be “Sycamore Creek Phase Two (similar to Mr. Krpan’s successive “Grandview” subdivisions). To the observer, there would a unified entry scheme with “Sycamore Creek” on the upscale entry features that will eventually be built along Plank and Lindgren Roads.

2. The agreement runs for twenty years.
3. The eventual development of the “R-3” zoned property for townhouses shall only be permitted after a public hearing to consider a mini-development plan for such acreage.
4. The developer shall provide an irrevocable letter of credit for the public improvements on the site.
5. The developer shall donate 22.09 acres for a school site. In addition, the developer shall voluntarily contribute \$750 per lot to the Sycamore School District over and above the impact fee per lot, as it may be amended during the life of the agreement. The net combination of these contributions, not including impact fees as they may change over time, is \$2,855,900 (22.09 acres x \$110,000 = \$2,429,900; plus \$750 x 568 = \$426,000). By way of comparison, the net Sycamore Creek voluntary contribution for 352 single-family homes was \$606,000, excluding impact fees. The Sycamore Creek formula was calculated as follows: the developer got a land credit for 7.04 acres of \$528,000 [7.04 x \$75,000 per acre]; the District got an offsetting contribution of \$528,000 [\$1,500 per lot x 352 lots]; and the developer donated the remaining 8.08 acres for the school site [8.08 x \$75,000 = \$606,000].
6. Impact fees shall be assessed at the rate in effect at the time a permit is issued, allowing the rates to float upward over time as the City Council determines their appropriate levels, with the advice of local taxing bodies. At the rate recently proposed by School Superintendent Bob Hammon for a four-bedroom house, the school impact fee revenue from this development would yield an additional \$2,701,976 (\$4,757 x 568). Assuming the proposed fee of \$4,757 per four-bedroom home is enacted in the coming months, it will represent an increase of \$1,893 (66%) over the April 2002 level of \$2,864 per four-bedroom home. If we assume a conservative increase of 10% per year until 2010, the School impact fee per four-bedroom single family detached home would be \$7,611. Given this assumption, it would be more realistic to assume that the developer is assuring the City that the development might generate at least an additional \$4,323,048 in School impact fees after permitting begins in 2010.
7. The developer shall donate 18.90 acres of public park space to the Park District, with a value of about \$2,079,000 calculated on the current basis of \$75,000 per acre of developed land suitable for neighborhood park purposes. According to the Park fee ordinance, the developer is required to dedicate, not donate, land. In the event that the District does not want to develop park space in the subdivision, the developer must make a cash contribution.

Based on consultation with Park Director David Peek, the developer will likely be asked for a land donation since the likely population of the proposed subdivision justifies significant public park space. How much space is required? The dedication requirement is 11.5 acres per 1,000 population. Using the ordinance formula of 3.5 persons per single family detached home and 2.25 persons per two-bedroom townhouse, the overall land requirement is 24.93 acres ( $3.5 \times 568 = 1,988$  plus  $2.25 \times 80 = 180$ , or a total of 2,168, at 11.5 acres per 1,000 population, the total is  $2.168 \times 11.5 = 24.93$ ). Since *the developer is not asking for a “credit” for the 18.9 acres donated, and is offering to provide the park space fully built rather than in a raw shape*, it is not likely that the District will expect the developer to donate additional acreage. The Board will review the developer’s proposal on January 20.

If the negotiation is carried forward on the basis of the cash value of dedicated land per the ordinance, the developer’s credit would be 18.9 times \$75,000 = \$1,417,500. The dedication required by the District in this instance would be 24.93 acres, with a value of \$1,869,750 according to the impact fee ordinance ( $24.93 \times \$75,000 = \$1,869,750$ ). The developer would typically “owe” 6.03 acres, or \$452,250. But since the developer in this case is donating the land and saving the District the “credit”, the developer is actually contributing a net value of \$965,250 if all of the proposed donated land is accepted by the District.

**At the Plan Commission meeting of January 12, the Park District’s president and representative to the Commission, Larry Steczo, voted to recommend approval of the B&B project.**

8. The developer shall donate a 4.55-acre site at the northwest corner of the development, abutting Whipple Road, for a future City water tower.
9. The developer shall contribute \$750 per lot or a value of \$426,000 ( $568 \times \$750$ ) to the City to offset the cost of future City services to the development.
10. Roadways. The developer will be responsible for all improvements to Lindgren Road to the easternmost portion of the Sycamore Creek Phase One frontage. Lindgren Road will be reconstructed to urban standards along this stretch, with a width that is 35 feet measured from the backs of the facing curbs.
11. Bike Paths. The developer has the option of building standard sidewalks along both sides of Lindgren Road, or creating a 10-foot wide bituminous bikepath/sidewalk with an additional five feet of dedicated right-of-way to create a sufficiently wide parkway. A series of additional 10-foot wide paths will course through the subdivision (see the preliminary plat) to afford connections for walkers or bicycle enthusiasts with the public and private parks, as well as the original Sycamore Creek planned development to the south. In all, 3.9 miles of bikepaths will be constructed according to the plan.
12. Recapture. The intersection on Plank Road that is roughly half-way between the realigned Lindgren Road and Moose Range Road will be the subdivision’s main entrance. It will also serve as a major outlet for contiguous land areas over time. Accordingly, the developer will be allowed to recover 25% of the intersection costs from the developers of the Wallis/Mapes farms and 25% from whomever develops the 284-acre Wolfenburger parcel to the east.

13. Signals. The developer will also pay a pro rata share of any signal costs, when warranted, at the main subdivision entrance at Plank Road (Springfield Street). The cost will be determined by the percentage of traffic generated by the development at the intersection.
14. Water and Sewer main extensions. Section 7 details the developer's responsibility for water and sewer main extensions. To avoid the surcharging of City sewer mains with storm water before houses are weather-tight, Section 7.7 recapitulates the City's new policy of requiring builders to use sewer ejector units in basements if they wish to connect the building drain to the City system in the early stages of construction.
15. Variations. There are no proposed variations from City policies or practices.

#### The Traffic Study

A traffic study performed by Kenig, Lindgren, O'Hara, Aboona, Inc. of Rosemont is attached. The study overestimated the number of townhomes, but that will make it more conservative for our purposes.

A steady growth in traffic volume in the seven years prior to the development's first homes has been added to the base figure, and the projection takes the study to 2012, when new home construction would likely be steady. Most of the subdivision streets are minor streets, but there are several collector roadways designed to bring the traffic to the entrance/exit at Plank Road (Springfield Street). Not surprisingly, the southern portion of the development with the larger number of units is projected to generate the greatest share of the trips per day, and the principal activity will be at the new intersection with Plank Road (Springfield Street).

Because the new intersection will also serve development to the east and west of the B&B development area, and since the level of traffic from such sources will not be known for many years, an intersection design study would be premature, but will be required before signals are warranted. Such a study would have to take into account any traffic going to and from the future school site.

While trips associated with the proposed development can be predicted with some reliability, the deferral of the starting date for new permits certainly makes the prediction of ancillary trips more challenging. City Engineer John Brady will be prepared to discuss the report on February 2.

#### The Fiscal Impact Study

The attached fiscal impact study takes a more conservative approach than previous studies. Both the School and City impact fee revenues are shown but are not included in the calculation of net operational revenues. This approach may be no less controversial than the previous approach of mixing operational and capital revenues to depict a composite of the "basket" of benefits yielded by a development. For instance, it can be argued that developmental funding for land acquisition and school construction allows for cost-shifting within the school organization that is not credited by the taxpayer or

District. The same might be said of City capital expenses. However, the revised impact analysis should shed some of the confusion surrounding the application of impact fees.

The attached spreadsheet suggests the fiscal impact of the single-family home construction on both the City and the School District. For comparison, the North Grove Crossing analysis is presented, with revisions of the type described above.

There are two key ingredients in estimating the impact of the B&B contributions: the offsetting value of the donated school site and the voluntary contribution per unit. The extraordinary value of the voluntarily donated land—about \$2.9 million—plus the free rough grading of the lot and the creation of stormwater detention offsite more than offset any shortfall in the net income/expense calculation.

The City Manager met with Superintendent Bob Hammon on Tuesday, December 30, to discuss the proposed project and its fiscal impact. In that meeting, Dr. Hammon stated that he had “no problem” with the B&B proposal from a financial standpoint, and believed it was consistent with the preference in the District’s recent “Development Notebook” for larger developments that could work with the District to meet infrastructure needs. **During the Plan Commission meeting of January 12, John McBride, the School Board’s representative, agreed that this development conformed with the premises of the District’s development guidelines and voted to recommend approval.**

#### Recommendation

**The City Manager and City staff recommend the Council’s approval of the Plan Commission recommendation at the next regular Council meeting of February 2, when this matter will return on second reading.** The proposed annexation agreement and development plan epitomize good long-term planning in the following ways:

- The agreement and plan are consistent with the City’s Comp Plan and Northeast Sub-Area Plan, and all locally-adopted codes and ordinances;
- B&B promises a pace of development that conforms to our best judgment about the moment when new residential development could be absorbed without straining local operational services. This can be seen by referring to the development timeline attached to this agenda. The year 2010 is the first year that the projected annual permit pace will be reduced to a level that is consistent with the resources of the City and other local taxing bodies.
- The developer promises extraordinary fiscal contributions that will more than make the School District, Park District, and City whole.
- The developer will provide additional amenities--e.g. private parks, bikepaths, the conservation of undeveloped open spaces-- that will enhance the quality of living for residents within the subdivision and those who might visit our community.

There is an additional intangible reason which cannot fairly count as heavily as the aforementioned factors but is certainly on the minds of public employees: the B&B firm has a long track record of doing what it promises on paper, and doing it well. From City employees who test the underground piping to Park employees who work with the

firm in planning and creating park space, the general opinion is that the developer delivers.

As our community has extended its planning timeline five to ten years into the future, the City staff have asked ourselves the following question: in 2010, when many of the current elected and appointed public officials are gone, and when the projected wave of new permit activity resulting from our inventory of lots has crested and subsided, what are the talents and contributions we want from a residential development firm? Our unreserved answer is: those typified by B&B Development.

**G. Ordinance No. 2003.82—An Ordinance Annexing the 366-Acre Development Known as Sycamore Creek, Phase Two in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First Reading Only.**

The City Manager recommends that the Council receive and file this matter on first reading only, for the reasons stated under Agenda Item F, above.

**H. Ordinance No. 2003.83—An Ordinance Concerning the Recommendation of the Plan Commission With Regard to a Petition From John L. Castle Builders, LLC for a Preliminary Plat of Heron Creek Townhomes Planned Unit Development, Unit Two, in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.**

The annexation of the Sycamore Creek subdivision in August 2002 included a small area of 4.45 acres that was zoned and designated for townhouses. This area was a fragment separated from the major portion of the Sycamore Creek P.U.D. by the future right-of-way for the extension of Airport Road. The area was also directly east of a 7.6-acre townhouse area in the Heron Creek P.U.D. under development by John Castle Builders. As the Council will recall, Mr. Castle was required to provide access easements to the 4.45-acre parcel in the Sycamore Creek subdivision as a condition of the acceptance of the final plat for the adjoining townhouse development.

It is no surprise that Mr. Castle is the logical interested party to pursue the purchase and development of the 4.45-acre site at the northwest edge of the Sycamore Creek development. The continuation of his type of townhouse style will be consistent with the established look of the area and will result in a looped access arrangement that serves the present and future townhouses well. The attached plat depicts such an access plan as well as guest parking (24 spaces at .96 spaces per unit, vs. the required .75 spaces). The townhouse units are configured so the garages do not face Plank Road or Airport Road. The interior streets (Nancy Court and Delores Lane) will be privately owned and maintained by the homeowner's association.

The Plan Commission reviewed this item on January 12 and recommended its approval by a vote of 11-0. City Council approval of the Plan Commission recommendation is requested.

**I. Ordinance No. 2003.84—An Ordinance Concerning the Recommendation of the Plan Commission With Regard to a Petition From Kevin and Sandra**

**Wynn for an Annexation Agreement, Rezoning and Preliminary Plan for the Planned Development of Prairie Ridge Townhomes at 2075 Coltonville Road in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.**

Kevin Wynn, owner of Wynn's Freight Service in Sycamore, appeared before the Plan Commission in a public hearing on January 12 to present his plan to annex the five-acre site that has been the home of Total Lawn Care at 2075 Coltonville Road, to raze the structures on site, and to develop the site for attached townhouses in the \$150,000 to \$170,000 price range. The parcel is presently within the jurisdiction of the County of DeKalb. Immediately to the east there are several parcels within Sycamore's jurisdiction that are zoned "M-1" Light Manufacturing. To the south, the zoning is a mix of residential and commercial.

The attached preliminary plan has the following features:

- Nine, 4-unit buildings for a total of 36 units on a 5.25-acre site, or a gross density of 7.17 units per acre.
- The units would be served by privately owned and maintained streets.
- A total of 27 guest parking spaces are provided, or .75 spaces per unit. The minimum expectation has recently been around .75 spaces per unit (e.g. Roncon; Castle, etc.).
- A detention area is located at the northwest corner of the property.
- Sidewalks are to be provided along the Coltonville Road frontage.
- No open space for organized recreation is shown.
- There is a 25-foot setback from the west and east parcel lines.

The Plan Commission reviewed this annexation agreement, preliminary plan, and petition for annexation at its regular meeting of January 12. The Commission voted 10-0-1 (McBride abstaining) to favorably recommend the matter to the Council. City Council approval of the Plan Commission recommendation is requested.

**J. Ordinance No. 2003.85—An Ordinance Annexing the 5.02 Acre Prairie Ridge Townhome Development at 2075 Coltonville Road in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.**

If the City Council votes to approve the annexation agreement and townhome development plan brought by Mr. and Mrs. Wynn, the approval of this annexation ordinance is required, under the terms of that agreement and the preliminary plan. The Plan Commission voted 11-0 in favor of annexation. City Council approval is recommended.

**K. Ordinance No. 2003.86—Approving a Storm Sewer Easement Agreement With Castle Bank Trust No. 2169, Shirley Overton, and the City of Sycamore.**

The City Council may be aware that Mr. Adshade has been before the Plan Commission on a number of occasions since February 2000 to work out a plan for the development of an annexed and zoned 6.17-acre "infill" site at the corner of Brickville and Freed Roads. His last appearance was on August 11.

In the Commission's consideration of the development potential for this 6.17-acre parcel, and in its review of specific and various development proposals from Mr. Adshade and others in recent years, one of the principal issues has been the stormwater detention and drainage. The logical stormwater release from the detention area would cut across the adjacent Overton property in the approximate location of two existing drain tiles. While this is an engineering solution, it would pose a practical and financial hardship for Mrs. Overton, who recently improved the black top driveway surface leading to the rear of her property. An alternative path would be through the Brickville Road right-of-way. However, Mrs. Overton's property runs to the centerline of the adjacent Brickville Road.

Mr. Adshade's attorney, Ron Klein, the City Engineer, and the City Manager met with Mrs. Overton and her son in November to find common ground for a storm sewer easement that would serve Mr. Adshade without compromising any of the concerns of Mrs. Overton about disruption to her property, or abuse of her prerogatives as property owner. The attached easement agreement is the result.

According to the easement, the storm line would run within the Brickville Road right-of-way and that portion of Mrs. Adshade's property running to the centerline of the roadway. To accomplish this, Mrs. Overton would grant a perpetual non-exclusive easement to the City of Sycamore. Mr. Adshade, at his sole expense, would install the storm sewer and all related appurtenances. Upon approval by the City Engineer, the City would assume repair and maintenance responsibility for the publicly-dedicated sewer line, as it typically does with other dedicated storm mains. In addition, any damage to the adjacent yard areas within Mrs. Overton's property during the construction period would be repaired at the sole cost of Mr. Adshade.

The approval of this easement does not involve the approval of any plan for the development of the 6.17-acre site owned by Mr. Adshade. The review of any such development plan must first be accomplished at the Plan Commission level, with a referral and ultimate action by the City Council. Action on this easement only establishes one of a number of preconditions to the ultimate approval of such a plan, and is necessary prior to further Plan Commission review.

City Council approval of the attached easement is recommended.

## 12. RESOLUTIONS

### **A. Resolution No. 446—Supporting the Adoption of the DeKalb County Unified Comprehensive Plan.**

The Council will recall that all fourteen of the County's municipalities agreed in the spring of 2002 to work together to create a unified comprehensive plan for DeKalb County. The meeting ground has been the monthly gathering of the DeKalb County Regional Planning Authority, at which the City Manager is typically the City of Sycamore's representative. In this process, all county municipalities have revised their plans, and these plans have been formatted to fit a larger document that reflects the

details of the individual plans and weaves them together at their mile-and-a-half planning boundaries.

The county-wide land use plan is now complete. The City of Sycamore's revision of June 2003 is incorporated in that document. Each municipality will consider a similar resolution that memorializes the group effort, and establishes the document as a matter of public record for all interested parties to view. City Council approval is recommended.

### **13. CONSIDERATIONS**

#### **A. Consideration of a Preliminary Administration Report on the Proposed FY2004-2005 General Fund Budget.**

Projections of General Fund, Water Fund, and Sewer Fund revenues and expenditures for Fiscal Year 2004-2005 have been prepared for the Council's review and direction. The following brief report summarizes these projections.

#### **I. General Fund**

##### Revenues

On the revenue side, the following assumptions have provisionally been made for the General Fund for the fiscal year beginning May 1, 2004:

1. No new taxes or fee increases other than those (e.g. water user fees; refuse fees) already enacted.
2. As in each of the last seven years, the increase in the annual City property tax levy has been constrained to result in a decrease in the City's property tax rate. The general portion of the levy (including debt service) will be \$1,476,125, or \$29,268 less than the general levy in 1999!
3. Based on Department of Revenue projections, the per capita local share of state income tax proceeds is expected to rise to \$72.80, an increase of 7.4% over the FY04 budget level of \$67.80 per capita. Nevertheless, this per capita level of funding will remain lower than the FY2003 budget level of \$73 per capita. This assumes that the state legislature does not change the formula for this important revenue-sharing program in the Spring legislative session.
4. Commercial expansion such as the re-opening of the former Kmart site and a full year of revenue from the new Bemis foreign car dealerships should generate about \$60,000 in new sales tax revenue in FY05.
5. Based on year-to-date trends and a month-by-month comparison with the past three fiscal years, our overall sales tax revenues are projected to rise by about \$113,350 (3.87%) over FY03 levels. We have not returned to buoyant economic times: in FY02, the annual increase for the combination of home rule and sales tax revenues over FY01 was \$660,236.
6. The modest rise in sales tax revenues vis-à-vis FY04 will be offset by continuing strong restaurant/bar and telecommunication tax revenues which exceeded FY04 expectations.
7. Annexation fees will drop precipitously, partly because of the pre-payment of most future obligations by developers before the new \$3,000 per acre fee went into effect

on December 31, and partly because no major annexations are expected after May 1.

As a matter of caution, it is worthwhile to note that the revenue estimates that can be derived from trends established in the first eight months of this fiscal year are suggestive but far from absolutely reliable. For example, sales tax revenues (excluding restaurant/bar and telecommunication taxes) make up 35 percent of the overall General Fund revenues but are collected by the state and remitted to local governments at least two months after they are incurred. This means that the recent December tax warrants reflect purchases in October. In other words, the impact of consumer spending in the key months of November and December is not yet known.

For reference, here are some historic General Fund revenue numbers:

FY98-99 (actual)	FY99-00 (actual)	FY00-01 (actual)	FY01-02 (actual)	FY02-03 (actual)
\$6,612,370	\$7,170,939 (+558,569) +8.5%	\$7,237,239 (+66,300) +1%	\$7,820,749 (+585,510) +8.1%	\$8,084,211 (+263,462) +3.37%

Expenditures

In FY05 we anticipate a 25% increase in health insurance costs (most of which will be borne by the General Fund, with contributions from the Water and Sewer Funds), and a sizeable increase in budgeted worker comp costs (\$60,000) to cover as yet unresolved claims from earlier fiscal years. The Fire department’s target number shows the greatest single departmental increase (\$177,713), with an estimated \$113,621 associated with the two new hires (assuming full family health insurance coverage, life insurance, etc.). In FY05 we will spend \$100,000 less on incentives since we satisfy the three-year grant allocation to Menard in April, 2004.

The principal spending assumptions for the General Fund in FY05 are as follows:

- a) two new firefighters will be hired after May 1;
- b) a new part-time custodian will be hired after May 1;
- c) a building inspector/engineering assistant will be hired after September 1;
- d) wage and salary increases will incorporate union contractual increases and management pay increases;
- e) some funds for contractual engineering assistance (\$10,000) will be added to the Engineering department budget to help with FY05 capital projects;
- f) commodities and contractual services will be generally frozen at FY04 levels, with the exception of upward revisions to meet our insurance requirements (noted in the General Fund Support budget), utility costs, etc.;
- g) there will be no increase in the General Fund contingency account;
- h) we will not hire an MPA intern for the second straight year.

Our unfunded General Fund or operational spending priorities include the following:

- the hiring of a police officer (\$60,650 including benefits and assuming full family health coverage);

- the hiring of an MPA intern (\$15,000 with no paid benefits other than worker comp coverage);
- the hiring of a planner (\$67,500 including benefits and assuming full family health coverage).

## **II Water and Sewer Funds**

### Water Fund

Water user fees were increased in June 2003 to finance the installation of treatment facilities at two existing wells (Well #6 and Well #8), and at the new Well #9 on Airport Road, to comply with the EPA's permanent radium standard of 5 pCi/L. The City has been assured of assistance from the Illinois EPA in terms of a long-term, simple interest loan at a low rate to help finance these improvements. The treatment plan involves the filtering of well water through a zeolite (Z-88) media and will not involve the softening of the City's water or the discharge of radium to the City's sanitary sewer system.

It is estimated that the total annual additional cost for Wells 6, 8 and 9 will be about \$462,000 once all improvements are completed. To fund the debt service for these improvements, the Council was obliged to impose rate increases over a two-year period. The City Council raised the water bill for the average residential user from about \$30 every two months to about \$39 on May 1, 2003, and authorized a further increase to about \$49 every two months for the average residential user beginning on May 1, 2004. This will result in an annual increase of about \$54 in the first year, and an additional \$60 in the second year, or \$114 over a two-year period.

Included in the proposed Water Fund budget is the hiring of an additional laborer. This new hire would be funded from natural revenue growth from new development. The extra hands and manhours will provide additional flexibility to keep pace with increasing demands for new connections, meter reading, repairs in established neighborhoods, mandated cross connection prevention, mapping of utility extensions, etc.

### Sewer Fund

No increase in sewer fees is proposed. However, the future needs of the treatment system will be a sharper focus of the Public Works Superintendent and the City Manager, and system improvements and related revenue will be reviewed. Specifically, the capacity of the present system and projected capacity needs will be studied in-house in anticipation of a consultant contract in FY06 to study options for plant expansion. According to EPA guidelines, the capacity of the present plant is calculated according to a trendline of gallons treated. Because of a considerable amount of infill and infiltration, that trend registers higher in periods of unusual rainfall, and lower in periods of less than average rainfall. Within this EPA framework, the official notion of the percentage of plant in use is about 50-55%. However, in recent years we have witnessed lower than average rainfall, and thus relatively less infill and infiltration. Efforts undertaken by the City to repair cross connections and to remedy infiltration, as

in the case of the substantial improvements on main lines beneath IL Rt. 64 and 23, contribute to this favorable trend. Nevertheless, the Superintendent's intuition is that in a period of average or higher than average rainfall and infiltration, the plant would be running at about 70-75% capacity, given the rise in new homes over recent years. This level of capacity utilization approaches the threshold where public facility managers would normally look to a professional study of the present and future needs of the plant and the system.

City Council direction is requested.

**B. Consideration of an Administration Request for a Closed Session to Discuss Collective Bargaining Matters.**

**14. APPOINTMENTS**

**15. ADJOURNMENT**