

SYCAMORE CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA
February 2, 2004

City Council Committee Meetings

No Meetings are scheduled.

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 Workshop Meeting of January 19, 2004;
 - B. Approval of the Minutes for the City Council Meeting of January 19, 2004;
 - C. Payment of the Bills for February 2, 2004.
7. **PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS, COMMUNICATIONS, AND BILLS.**
 - A. Consideration of a Presentation by the Sycamore Economic Development Commission Featuring Floor-to-Ceiling.
Sycamore Economic Development Commission member Berni Schelkopf will introduce Doug Reifsteck of Floor-to-Ceiling, 2439 Bethany Road, to give a brief overview of the company's products and services.
8. **REPORTS OF OFFICERS**

9. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

10. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Public Hearing on the Proposed Sycamore Creek, Phase Two Planned Unit Development.

In view of the public interest in the proposed annexation and development of the 366-acre Sycamore Creek P.U.D., a public hearing will be held to give all interested parties an opportunity to speak. For further details on the proposed development, please see Ordinances 2003.81 and 2003.82, below.

11. ORDINANCES

A. 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 to “R-1” One Family Residence District and “R-3” Multiple Family Residence District, 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. Second Reading.

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, known as Sycamore Creek Phase Two, was forwarded by the Plan Commission for City Council approval by a vote of 10-1. Ken Blood, the principal with the firm of B&B Development L.P., requested the Council’s consideration of this matter on first reading only on January 19, as he expected to be out of town on that date. The proposed planned unit development is now before the Council on second reading.

The following information was presented to the Plan Commission and is offered for the Council’s review:

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 to suggest 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. However, since (a) this development proposal can be seen as an extension of Sycamore Creek in style, layout, and amenities, (b) the two

development areas are under common ownership, and (c) 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, excluding 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 the School Board for a four-bedroom house (see Ordinance 2003.87, below), the school impact fee revenue from this development would yield an additional \$2,847,384 (\$5,013 x 568). Assuming the proposed fee of \$5,013 per four-bedroom home is enacted on February 2, it will represent an increase of \$2,149 (75%) 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 \$8,021. Given this assumption, it would be more realistic to assume that the development might conceivably generate an additional \$4,555,928 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. As is customary, when the Park Board took up this matter at its regular meeting on January 20, it deferred action pending a Council vote on the matter of annexation. The Board has scheduled a second look for February 17, after the Council has considered the annexation petition.

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.

The Council will note that 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 whoever 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.

As a further prudent measure, the base figure assumes a steady growth in traffic volume on Plank Road in the seven years prior to the development's first home permits, 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 proposed School impact fees 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 (which does not include the value of impact fees).

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. 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.

City Council approval is recommended on second reading.

B. Ordinance No. 2003.82-- An Ordinance Annexing the Property Known as Sycamore Creek, Phase Two in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. Second Reading.

If the City Council approves Ordinance 2003.81, the City Manager recommends that the Council approve the attached ordinance, which separately considers the actual annexation of the proposed Sycamore Creek Phase II development for recording purposes.

C. Ordinance No. 2003.87--An Ordinance Amending Title 10, "Subdivision Regulations," Chapter 3, "Design Standards," Section 4, "Criteria for Cash Contribution in Lieu of School Site Dedication," of the City Code of the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First Reading.

The City Council last revised School impact fees in April 2002. In view of the dramatic rise in the price of developed acres since that time, the School District has proposed revisions in the impact fees charged for a variety of residential housing units. The District's proposal is summarized in the attached letter, dated January 14, 2004, from Jim Dombeck to Mayor Swedberg, and in the attached ordinance draft.

The following system of fees incorporates the School District's new parameters for the number of acres required for middle school and high school levels, the number of students per type of housing (the same as in 2002), the adjusted price per acre of land (\$110,000). The present fee levels are in parentheses in the table below:

Per Unit Fee	2 Br	3 Br	4 Br	5 Br
Detached Single Family	736 (431)	2,947 (1,556)	5,013 (2,864)	3,886 (2,047)
Attached Single Family	698 (565)	1,303 (860)	2,659 (1,693)	
Apartments	713 (424)	1,935 (1,213)		

Here's the math:

Example: 3 Bedroom Detached Single Family Dwelling

Grade K-5 $\frac{.369^*}{550^{**}}$ x 15^{***} x 110,000^{****}= \$1,107.00

Grades 6-8 $\frac{.173^*}{750^{**}}$ x 30^{***} x 110,000^{****}= \$ 761.00

Grades 9-12 $\frac{.184^*}{1500^{**}}$ x 80^{***} x 110,000^{****}= \$1,079.00

Total: **\$2,947.00**

*=Estimated ultimate school-aged population per dwelling unit (local data);

**=Maximum enrollment per school type (local data);

***=Acres required per type of school (per School District);

****=Established per acre land value (\$110,000).

The price per acre of \$110,000 is computed as follows: take the average cost of a ¼ acre lot (\$55,000), extrapolate the price per acre (\$220,000), then discount that price by 50% for utilities and infrastructure, and the result is \$110,000.

Since the general public has not had an opportunity to review or debate the proposed impact fee level, a first reading is recommended. The City Manager recommends favorable Council action at the next regular meeting of February 16.

D. Ordinance No. 2003.88—An Ordinance Amending Title I, “Administration,” Chapter 10, “Personnel Rules,” Section 16, “Group Insurance” of the City Code of the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.

On June 16, 2003, the City Council passed Ordinance No. 2003.22, which amended the section of the City Code that deals with group health insurance. This amendment was necessary in order to clarify exactly what type of medical insurance benefit is available to City retirees as well as to clarify the relative benefit costs borne by the City and the retired employee. Since the passage of this ordinance, a new conundrum has come to light that requires further definition to unequivocally resolve who is entitled to continued medical benefits.

The original ordinance read as follows:

“those employees who retire after twenty years of service, and if hired before May 1, 1982, shall remain covered under the same health insurance policy as active employees, at the City’s expense, until their death. In the event of the death of any employee within the foregoing time periods, the subsection 1(a) shall be construed to give *the surviving spouse* continuing insurance with the premiums paid by the City until his/her death or remarriage as the case may be” (emphasis by this author).

Since, as with other items not specifically defined in this brief ordinance, the definition of “surviving spouse” was not elaborated upon, more than one interpretation has arisen. Based on the institutional record of the Council discussion in 1982 and anecdotal

evidence, it appears that the authors of this ordinance viewed the surviving spouse to be the man or woman who was married to the employee on the date the employee retired from City service. The understanding in the attached ordinance is consistent with this interpretation. Therefore, upon the passage of this amendment, only the spouse who is married to the employee at the time of his or her retirement will be entitled to a City-paid medical benefit for life or until remarriage. If a retired employee who is eligible for a lifetime medical benefit marries or remarries after leaving City employment, he or she will be able to add his or her new spouse to the City's medical plan, but the entire cost of the new spouse's coverage will be the responsibility of the retiree. In accordance with the Illinois Pension Code, upon the death of the retired employee, the spouse may continue to stay on the medical plan, again at his or her own expense, only if he or she is entitled to receive a survivor's benefit from the deceased employee's pension plan. If the spouse is not entitled to a survivor's benefit, he or she may continue coverage through COBRA (currently 36 months).

Without this definition of "surviving spouse", the City could potentially be responsible for providing insurance for life to several different spouses of one employee. We do not believe that this was the intent of the Mayor and the City Council who originally enacted this ordinance.

The amendment to this ordinance also clarifies which group of retirees is entitled to City-paid life insurance benefits at retirement. This benefit will be available only to those retirees who are entitled to city-paid medical benefits for life.

City Council approval is recommended.

12. RESOLUTIONS--None

13. CONSIDERATIONS

A. Consideration of an Administration Recommendation to Upgrade the Entry-Level Standards for Firefighter.

For several years, Fire Chief Bill Riddle has worked closely with members of the Sycamore Fire Department to plan for new staff and new facilities for the department in the years ahead. One of the matters that has been the focus of their attention in recent planning meetings has been the most appropriate entry-level qualifications for persons who will be the next generation of firefighters and officers. The operative question is: what levels of education and experience should be the pre-requisite for full-time employment? This matter has become more important since the department raised its level of emergency medical service to EMT-Paramedic (EMT-P) from EMT-Intermediate (EMT-I). Presently, the advertised minimum credentials for an entry-level firefighter in Sycamore are Firefighter II certification and EMT-Basic (EMT-B).

Naturally, the Sycamore Fire and Police Commission which hires all new firefighters shares the City's concern for making the best hiring decisions. At its organizational meeting on January 26, the Commission discussed the possibility of revising the minimum hiring credentials but stopped short of a recommendation, pending further

direction from the City Council. This agenda item is a direct result of that request for further direction.

After the present hiring list expires in August of this year, Fire Chief Riddle recommends that the Council and Commission upgrade the minimum EMS pre-requisite to EMT-P. There are pros and cons to this approach, but the Chief feels strongly that the positives would outweigh the negatives. Perhaps the best argument for staying with the City's present EMT-B standard is the assumption that talented and eager young male and female candidates without paramedic training and certification could potentially be strong leaders in the department, if given the opportunity to raise their skills while a member of the department. This has been the City's position in the past.

A number of financial and personnel concerns now press our management and firefighters toward a higher standard. Here are some reasons for upgrading the hiring standard:

- a) Chief Riddle estimates that the City's cost of paramedic certification would be around \$25,000 per firefighter. This includes the filling of the firefighter's slot with an off-duty firefighter at overtime pay whenever the paramedic candidate is in class or on training runs. Such filling is unavoidable with the minimum staffing of the department, and would need to continue for a year or more as the new firefighter progressed through the paramedic program. The \$25,000 estimate also includes the direct costs for the combined hospital and junior college programs, including books.
- b) The training process can take from one year to 18 months, depending on whether the candidate can fit into a class schedule upon hire. After certification, it would take a varying amount of on-the-job experience before the new paramedic could gain a level of professional confidence comparable to that of other members of the department.
- c) From a wage perspective, a certified paramedic gets an annual bonus of \$2,000 but otherwise entry-level firefighters with or without certification would receive the same base rate of pay.
- d) In the event a Sycamore firefighter leaves for a firefighter position elsewhere after the City has trained him or her, the City would be out the cost for the paramedic certification.

Operationally, these concerns are real enough. As we try to keep to a strategic goal of progressive annual hiring to staff a future fire station on the City's north side, we will need to constrain our spending and explore alternatives that include the prospect of hiring only trained and certified paramedics.

City Council direction is recommended.

14. APPOINTMENTS

15. ADJOURNMENT

