

**SYCAMORE CITY COUNCIL**  
**AGENDA**  
August 21, 2006

**City Council Committee Meetings**

No Meetings Are Scheduled

.....

**Regular City Council Meeting**  
**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 Regular City Council Meeting of August 7, 2006.
  - B. Payment of the Bills for August 21, 2006.
  - C. Plan Commission Minutes for the Meeting of July 10, 2006.
7. **PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS, COMMUNICATIONS, AND BILLS.**
  - A. Presentation of Letters of Commendation to Police Officers Steve Elbrecht, Marshall Flynn and Steve Watry, as well as Firefighter/Paramedic Dan Marcinkowski, and Paid-On-Call Firefighters Dustin Ruby, Gene Listy and John Swedberg for their meritorious service at the fire scene on Sandberg Drive on the morning of August 1, 2006.
  - B. Sycamore Economic Development Commission member Rose Trembl will introduce Ken Hirschbein of Hirschbein Trophies and Engravables, who will describe his firm's products and services.
  - C. Presentation by R.A.M.P. (Regional Access & Mobilization Project, Inc.) representatives regarding the not-for-profit agency's mission and services.

D. Presentation by Michelle Donahoe, executive director of the Sycamore Historical Society and Museum.

**8. REPORTS OF OFFICERS**

**9. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

**10. PUBLIC HEARINGS--None**

**11. ORDINANCES**

**A. Ordinance No. 2006.19—An Ordinance Requesting Permission from the Illinois Department of Transportation to Close Illinois Route 64 from Governor Street to Sacramento Street from 7:00 P.M. Until 8:30 P.M. on Wednesday, September 27, 2006 To Allow for the Sycamore High School Homecoming Parade in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.**

The attached ordinance requests IDOT's permission to close a portion of IL. Rt. 64 for the Sycamore High School Homecoming parade on September 27, 2006. City Council approval is recommended.

**B. Ordinance No. 2006.20—An Ordinance Declaring Wednesday, October 25, 2006 Through Sunday, October 29, 2006 as Pumpkin Festival in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.**

Ordinances 2006.20, 2006.21, 2006.22, 2006.23 and 2006.24 can be taken in omnibus fashion. All relate to the annual Pumpkin Festival and together accomplish the following:

- a) Establish the dates for the annual festival (October 25, 2006 through October 29, 2006);
- b) Seek IDOT's permission for the closing of IL Rt. 64 for the Road Run and the Pumpkin Parade, at different times, on October 29, 2006; and
- c) Authorize the use of two City parking lots during the festival week.

City Council approval is recommended.

**C. Ordinance No. 2006.21—An Ordinance Requesting Permission from the Illinois Department of Transportation to Close Illinois Route 64 from Governor Street to Sacramento Street Between 9:00 A.M. and 10:00 A.M. on Sunday, October 29, 2006 To Allow for the "Road Run" as Part of the Pumpkin Festival in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.**

See Ordinance 2006.20.

**D. Ordinance No. 2006.22—An Ordinance Requesting Permission from the Illinois Department of Transportation to Close Illinois Route 64 from Governor Street to Sacramento Street from 12:00 Noon Until 5:00 P.M. on Sunday, October 29, 2006 To Allow for the Pumpkin Festival Parade in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.**

See Ordinance 2006.20.

**E. Ordinance No. 2006.23—An Ordinance Authorizing the Use of City Parking Lot #3 at the Corner of Sacramento Street and State Street for a Carnival to be Held from Wednesday, October 25, 2006 Through Sunday, October 29, 2006 in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.**

See Ordinance 2006.20.

**F. Ordinance No. 2006.24—An Ordinance Authorizing the Use of City Parking Lot #1 at the Corner of Somonauk Street and Elm Street for a “Kiddee Carnival” to be Held from Wednesday, October 25, 2006 Through Sunday, October 29, 2006 in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.**

See Ordinance 2006.20.

**G. Ordinance No. 2006.25—An Ordinance Concerning the Recommendation of the Plan Commission With Regard to a Petition from Camden Crossing LLC for a Special Use Permit for the Purpose of Permitting the Re-Subdivision of Twenty-Four Duplex Lots for the Sale of Attached Single Family Dwellings on Separate Lots with a Common Wall Agreement. First and Second Reading.**

At its last regular meeting of August 14, the Sycamore Plan Commission heard a petition from Camden Crossing LLC for a special use permit to authorize zero lot line duplex lots. The Camden Crossing subdivision was originally annexed and zoned in November 2000. On July 15, 2002 (Ordinance 202.21) the City established the position of plat officer to administratively process minor re-subdivisions to permit the sales of duplex and townhouse units with common lots in fee simple. Because this authority was not in place when the Camden Crossing PUD was approved, a special use permit is needed to authorize the sale of the attached duplex units in that subdivision. The final plat for these duplex lots was approved by the Council on November 15, 2004.

The Plan Commission considered the request and voted 12-0 to recommend the Council’s approval of the petition. City Council approval of the Plan Commission recommendation is requested.

**H. Ordinance No. 2006.26—An Ordinance Concerning the Recommendation of the Plan Commission With Regard to a Petition from Camden Crossing for Approval of a Final Plat for the Gardens of Camden Crossing P.U.D. in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.**

On November 15, 2004 the City Council approved a final plat for the entire 41.12-acre residentially-zoned parcel behind the commercial frontage lots abutting the northwest corner of Peace Road and Il Rt. 23. The parcel was originally annexed and zoned for townhouses in November 2000. The final plat approved in November 2004 did not depict the townhouse area, which was simply shown as lots 68 and 69. Other features were delineated in detail, such as the following:

- a. A total of 183 housing units of all types, including 43 single-family detached units, 48 duplex units, and 92 townhomes.
- b. A density of 4.45 dwelling units per gross acre (6 units per acre is permitted).
- c. A total of 74 guest parking spaces in the townhouse area, or .8 guest spaces per townhouse.

- d. A public park dedication toward the north end of the plan, comprising 2.56 acres.
- e. A private park parcel of 1.33 acres.
- f. A 10-foot wide pedestrian and bike path linking residents to the commercial frontage and future growth to the west.
- g. Privately-owned and maintained roadways and parking areas within the townhouse area.

The townhouse layout turned garage openings away from the public streets, as preferred by the Plan Commission and Council. The developer also agreed to install a natural screen of evergreens to the south and a continuous landscaped berm on the east border, with breaks at the location of the extra parking spaces.

The proposed population of this plan has already been included in the City's "timeline" for the build-out of existing subdivisions and has been included in the School District's development notebook. Because this subdivision was annexed in 2000, it does not fall under the growth management regulations adopted in November, 2003 (Ordinance 2003.65) or November 2005 (Ordinance 2005.60), but periodic increases in impact fees and other City fees can be passed along at the time of permitting.

The attached plat shows the townhouse area in detail. The townhouses have basements and typically comprise 1,930 square feet with attached, two-car garages. Photocopies of elevation views are attached.

The Plan Commission reviewed this petition on August 14 and recommended its approval by a vote of 12-0. City Council approval of the Plan Commission recommendation is requested.

**I. Ordinance No. 2006.27—An Ordinance Concerning the Recommendation of the Plan Commission With Regard to a Petition from Naheed Siddiqui for the Annexation of Property at 2212 Coltonville Road and Rezoning to “R-3,” Multiple Family Residence for a Six-Unit Apartment Building in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.**

At their August 14 meeting, the Plan Commission also considered a petition from Naheed Siddiqui for the annexation and rezoning of his 0.636 acre parcel at 2212 Coltonville Road. Mr. Siddiqui owns a single family home on the parcel. The house is presently within the County's planning jurisdiction and is nestled in close proximity to a number of multiple family structures. Immediately east of the subject parcel is the Richport apartment complex and the Stonehenge apartments are two lots to the west. Immediately to the west of the subject property there is another single family dwelling.

Mr. Siddiqui is requesting the annexation of his parcel and its rezoning to “R-3” Multiple Family Residence district in order to develop a six-unit apartment building on the property. After legal review, the property would not be subject to the provisions of Ordinance 2005.60, approved in November 2005, which defers any permits until January 1, 2010. In this case, there is no subdivision of property. The project would be subject to the City's Unified Development Ordinance, which establishes a minimum lot area of 25,200 square feet for a six-unit. The subject parcel has about 27,700 square feet.

The Plan Commission considered this petition and voted 12-0 to recommend its approval. City Council approval of the Plan Commission recommendation is requested.

**J. Ordinance No. 2006.28—An Ordinance Concerning the Recommendation of the Plan Commission With Regard to a Petition from Todd Weaver to Rezone the Property at 132 Sabin Street from “C-2,” Central Business District to “R-3,” Multiple Family Residence District in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.**

Mr. Weaver wishes to build an apartment building on the subject property at 132 Sabin Street. Presently, the lot has the anomalous zoning of “C-2” Central Business District and is a prime candidate for a rezoning, both in terms of the surrounding uses and the anachronistic existence of “Central Business” zoning so remote from the downtown business core. The neighborhood has a mix of uses including single family, multiple family and commercial uses. Neither the petitioner nor the neighbors would desire the range of commercial uses allowed in the “C-2” zoning district by right. It is also safe to say that the neighborhood would be improved by any compatible plan for redevelopment that removed the two vacant and dilapidated buildings that existed on the site until recently.

If the rezoning is approved, the number of units in the proposed apartment building would depend on the required yard setback and parking requirements for multiple family residence buildings. The site’s dimensions are 78.8 feet along Sabin Street and 128 feet along Swanson Street for a total area of 10,086 square feet. The parcel is a corner lot, with two required front yard setbacks. The allowable building footprint, if all legal setbacks are observed, is shown on the attached plot plan. The buildable area is further reduced by the off-street parking requirements of the UDO. The off-street parking requirement for three or more units is two off-street spaces per dwelling unit plus .75 guest spaces. If a four-unit building was proposed, for example, eleven off-street parking spaces would be required, inclusive of any garage spaces. It appears that, at most, four one-bedroom apartments could be developed.

During the Plan Commission discussion, the owner of the single-family home to the east presented mounted photos of the property when it contained the two vacant and dilapidated residences that once housed four families. His concern was that the erratic parking and building maintenance issues of the past would be replicated if this property was re-developed for multiple family use. The Commission’s consensus was that the removal of the former buildings and the construction of one new structure, in accordance with the City’s newer and more stringent off-street parking requirements, would improve the neighborhood. By a vote of 9-3, the Commission recommended the Council’s approval of this rezoning request.

City Council approval of the Plan Commission recommendation is requested.

**12. RESOLUTIONS--None**

**13. CONSIDERATIONS**

**A. Consideration of a Report from the Ad Hoc Architectural Review Committee Regarding Façade Grant Applications.**

The ad hoc Architectural Review Committee (“ARC”) met on August 8 to review two grant applications. This report summarizes the grant requests and the Committee’s recommendations.

The first application was jointly submitted by Jamie Zinkann and Scott and Sheri Prutton, owners of the Sycamore Winery. The property in question is 322 West State Street, which the owner, Mr. Zinkann, has leased to the Pruttons for their retail wine business. The façade of this property is similar to that of 330 West State Street. The applicants want to replicate the Victorian cornice and frieze design of their near neighbor, and to install some exterior architectural light fixtures similar to those installed last year at the Ben Franklin store. Copies of photographs showing these features are attached. The applicants will invest in \$8,970 worth of improvements, and have requested a grant of \$4,500. The ARC reviewed the request and unanimously recommended the Council’s support.

The second application was jointly submitted by Dawn and Don Sukach and Don Paulsen. They are interested in replacing the twelve second-story windows on this iconic downtown façade. In 2005, these propertyowners received grant money (\$11,459) to repair the cornice and frieze that runs horizontally across the top of the State Street façade, a façade which traverses four buildings. The total estimated cost of the replacement of the twelve windows, minus any interior trim and wall repairs, is \$38,245.00. The ARC voted unanimously to recommend this larger grant in order to complete a renovation which has been targeted since 2003, and which was instrumental in prompting the façade program years ago.

The guidelines for the downtown façade program limit grants to \$5,000 per building over a two-year cycle. In this case, if the Council wishes to support the ARC recommendation regarding the Cooper/Paulsen building, it would need to depart from the guidelines. The ARC and the City Manager recommend such a departure. If the City had established a downtown TIF district or a special downtown redevelopment fund as neighboring communities have done, it would have the resources to target one or two properties each year for matching grants of a size—and for a purpose—as proposed in this instance. The Cooper/Paulsen building is architecturally unique and located at the heart of the downtown area. The grant application was initially made by the owners of the Cooper building—the Sukachs—who wanted to replace their three windows. Ironically, the appearance of the Cooper/Paulsen façade would be peculiarly and negatively affected by a grant-supported project that only replaced 3 of the 12 windows.

City Council approval of the ARC recommendations is requested. If both recommendations are supported, the funding would be as follows:

330 West State:	\$4,500 (13-8418)
239, 245, 249, 303 West State:	\$15,500 (13-8418)
	\$22,745 (22-8625)

**B. Consideration of a Police Department Report on Several Parking Bottlenecks in the First Ward.**

In June, Alderman Maness asked the Police department to review the posted parking restrictions on a number of neighborhood streets in the First Ward. The concern was the ability of emergency vehicles as well as other motorists to pass in both directions. In some instances, permitted parking on both sides of certain streets would not afford such two-way movements.

Of course the Police department enforces the traffic codes as they are written, but also from time to time recommends changes either in the interest of public safety, or to remedy inconsistencies in the codes, or both. There are certain general parameters laid out in the City's parking regulations, which can be found under Title 6, "Traffic," Chapter 2, "Parking Regulations." One very applicable standard is the minimum road width (Section 6-2-1, L). The City code establishes a minimum road width of eighteen feet (18') "at any place where the standing of a vehicle will reduce the usable width of a roadway for moving traffic." On some neighborhood streets in the First Ward, this standard cannot be met by the current posted parking arrangements. The following "bottleneck" areas are noted for the Council's reference:

- Lincoln Street, from the curve at Kishwaukee Drive west bound approximately 150 feet. The Police department recommends the prohibition of parking in this location, and the placing of "No Parking Between Signs" on both sides up to the point where Lincoln Street widens to the west.
- Locust Street. The 200, 300 and 400 blocks have a width of approximately 25 feet so when vehicles are parked on both sides there is less than 13 feet of clearance for two-way traffic, far below what the ordinance provides. The Police department recommends a prohibition of parking on at least the hydrant side (west side).
- Walnut Street. In the 100, 200, 300 and 400 blocks the same issues exist as on S. Locust Street. Parking is recommended on one side only.
- Kishwaukee Drive. Between State Street and Lincoln Street parking is permitted intermittently on the east side. In the stretch between State Street and High Street, parking is permitted on the west side but "No Parking" might be contemplated, although it might adversely affect one residence between Elm Street and High Street. Moving south toward Lincoln Street, the roadway is quite narrow and previous Councils have enforced "No Parking" on curves between signs. Parking limited to one side may be a better solution, but which side? Or, alternate side parking might be considered. A prohibition on parking on both sides between High Street and Lincoln Street would adversely affect too many homes without adequate guest parking.

City Council direction is recommended.

**C. Consideration of an Administration Request for a Closed Session to Discuss Personnel Matters.**

**14. OTHER NEW BUSINESS**

**15. APPOINTMENTS**

**16. ADJOURNMENT**