

TO: The Sycamore Plan Commission

FROM: Bill Nicklas
City Manager

DATE: February 6, 2008

RE: February 11, 2008 Plan Commission Meeting

The Plan Commission agenda has five action items and three workshop items.

I Action Items

A. Consideration of a Petition from Milan Krpan for a Final Plat of Krpan's Thanks America Commercial Subdivision, Phase Three.

The attached plat would give more definition to the commercial development of lots in the vicinity of Gateway Drive and Dosen Drive, east of IL Rt. 23. In February 2007, the Plan Commission recommended and the City Council approved a concept plat for the development of this prime area for both commercial office and light manufacturing. A copy of that concept plat is attached. The proposed final plat for Phase Three slightly re-configures Lots 11 and 12 to accommodate the interest of a major medical clinic and generally defines 17 lots which could be offered for sale in this growing subdivision. With the exception of Lots 8 and 24, which would be zoned "M-1" Light Manufacturing, all of the other lots would be zoned "C-3" Highway Business District.

A favorable Plan Commission recommendation is requested.

B. Consideration of a Final Plat for the Plank Commercial Center at the Northeast Corner of Plank Road and Illinois Route 23.

DeKalb Clinic Chartered, an Illinois Corporation, has petitioned for approval of the attached plat. The plat describes the DeKalb Clinic property at the northeast corner of the intersection of Plank Road and IL. Rt. 23. The proposed plat has two major features:

- The delineation of ingress/egress easements for Lots 1, 2 & 3 of the 19.01-acre development area;
- The resolution of ingress and egress to the "notch" parcel roughly in the middle of the Plank Road frontage which is not currently annexed. A 66-foot ROW is shown on the common boundary of Lot 2 and the un-annexed parcel;

- The provision of a utility easement along the entire Plank Road frontage and the right-of-way along the frontage of the un-annexed “notch” parcel to assure a path for future sewer, water and storm extensions along the north side of Plank Road.

John Wills of Christopher Berke Engineering West will be on hand to answer any questions about the proposed plat. A favorable Plan Commission recommendation is requested.

C. Consideration of a Vacation of Easement for Lots 91 and 92 of the Country Estates Unit of the Heron Creek Planned Unit Development.

John and Lynn Knepper, the owners of Lots 91 and 92 of the Country Estates Unit of the Heron Creek subdivision, have petitioned for the abandonment of a drainage and utility easement that follows the common lot of the two lots in the preliminary plan and final plat for this area of the Heron Creek subdivision. In the course of the development of this phase, the City and private utilities have identified other paths for their underground or overhead infrastructure. The Kneppers are currently constructing a single family home on Lot 91 and have purchased the west half of Lot 92 to use for geothermal borings to heat their home in a “green” fashion. Another property owner to the east has purchased the east half of Lot 92. At this time, the private utilities have approved the vacation of the easement and their approval has been documented by the City Engineer. The vacation of the remaining drainage easement by the City would complete the vacation of easements and permit the Kneppers to proceed with the further development of their new home.

A favorable Plan Commission recommendation is requested.

D. Consideration of a Petition from Mike Conro to Rezone the Property at 224 May Street from “M-1” Light Manufacturing District to “R-2” Two Family Residence District.

Considerations “D” and “E” arise from the same homeowner concern: the inability to make certain residential improvements on lots which have always been used for residential purposes, but which are zoned “M-1” Light Manufacturing District. As the attachment shows, Mr. Conro owns a single family home on May Street, adjacent to an area that has been dedicated to industrial uses for generations. The zoning of the condominium properties to the east of and behind the property is “R-3” Multiple Family Residence District. The property to the south owned by Mr. Hardesty (see Item E, below) is likewise zoned “M-1” but the properties further south and along W. Exchange Street are zoned “R-2” Two Family Residence District.

As his attached letter indicates, Mr. Conro wishes to build a detached garage. The City’s Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) does not permit residential garages in industrial zoning districts. A rezoning of the property to “R-2” would allow such construction. Such a rezoning would also be consistent with the residential zoning of other nearby or contiguous properties, without threatening the legitimacy of the light manufacturing zoning and uses to the north.

A favorable Plan Commission recommendation on this point is requested.

Apart from the basic issue of whether to rezone the property or not, Mr. Conro has also asked for relief from one of the key guidelines for the sizing of detached garages. He proposes to build a garage that would accommodate two vehicles and a small personal workshop. Mr. Conro would raze his existing garage first. The proposed size of the new garage—968 square feet (approximately 28 feet by 35 feet)—exceeds one of the allowances in the UDO for detached garages. Section 6.2.1.D.4 of the UDO allows detached garages in residential zoning districts to have a maximum area of 1,200 square feet or eight percent (8%) of the lot area, whichever is less. Mr. Conro’s lot is roughly 50 feet by 165 feet and the access to his present garage is over a shared driveway. Although in proximity to a large industrial garage to the north, the size of the proposed garage would rival the footprint of his home and be out of scale with the proposed residential look which is the basis of this rezoning request. Plan Commission support for this variation is not recommended.

E. Consideration of a Petition from Bruce Hardesty to Rezone the Property at 220 May Street from “M-1” Light Manufacturing District to “R-2” Two Family Residence District.

Mr. Hardesty has also requested the rezoning of his property from “M-1” Light Manufacturing to “R-2” Two Family Residence District. As with Mr. Conro, Mr. Hardesty is interested in razing his present detached garage, which is legal non-conforming, and building a new detached garage, but the “M-1” regulations do not permit such a residential structure. The proposed “R-2” zoning would be compatible with the zoning of the adjacent properties to the south. A favorable Plan Commission recommendation is requested.

Mr. Hardesty has not requested an allowance for a garage size that exceeds the key parameters for size in the UDO.

II Workshop Items

A. Consideration of a Concept Plan from Dr. Steve Glasgow for the Development of the Fowler Farm.

At the last regular Plan Commission meeting on January 14, in the context of a general discussion of the “rural residential” planning area of the 2003 Land Use Map, the Commission listened to a proposal from Dr. Steve Glasgow. Dr. Glasgow is interested in developing a “conservation” community on the Fowler Farm, which is situated west of Motel Road and is not presently contiguous with the Sycamore corporate limits (see the attached concept plan). Within the City’s planning area, along the Brickville Road corridor and extending westward to the South Branch of the Kishwaukee River, single family housing has been established with a rural character within the DeKalb County political jurisdiction. In this unincorporated area, the low density single family housing has been developed with individual wells and septic tank absorption fields, utilizing township road designs that feature ditches to carry storm water runoff.

When the 2003 Land Use Plan was adopted, it was believed that “rural residential” lots contiguous with the corporate limits might be annexed incrementally when owners of

low-density, estate-sized detached single family homes chose to abandon their wells and septic fields and connect with municipal water and sewer systems. Additionally, it was considered possible that small undeveloped areas might be annexed for such rural subdivisions at the City's planning edge, based on a case-by-case evaluation of the comparable impacts and benefits for the community. It was intended that any new development proposal should demonstrate compatibility with existing development, and larger lot sizes or nestled home designs with a lower gross density than current norms of subdivision development were anticipated.

The attached concept plan depicts a 41-acre parcel containing six house lots ranging from 2.4 acres and 12.6 acres, for a gross density of 0.15 units per acre. Several outlots are dedicated to common space such as a horse arena and stables, a landscaped entrance, and storm water detention. Among the planning issues for Plan Commission discussion are the following:

- a) Planning jurisdiction. The Fowler farm is not contiguous to the City's corporate limits but is within the City's mile-and-a-half planning jurisdiction. The City's inclusion of the rural residential subdivisions in the 2003 Land Use Plan was primarily intended to offer an opportunity for contiguous County-zoned parcels to connect to City utilities through an annexation process, and not to proactively expand the City's corporate boundaries to the northwest. The County land use plan has not allowed scattered residential subdivisions for several decades, in order to conserve farm land and to reduce the impact on County services that may be required by remote residential units. According to the County plan a minimum of 40 acres is required to plat one new single family residence.
- b) Utilities. Sanitary sewer cannot be extended by gravity means. Public water can be extended but no looping of the main would be possible, diminishing the quality of the public water that would flow through a public main extended to the property.
- c) Roadways. The concept plan proposes private roads for the subdivision. While this approach relieves a future public street maintenance and snow plowing bill within the proposed subdivision, the City would be responsible for maintenance of the intervening roadways--sections of Motel Road and Brickville Road--connecting the subject parcel to other parcels that would need to be annexed to establish contiguity. As the intervening annexations would occur, the City would become the principal agency for snow plowing and routine maintenance rather than Sycamore Township. The City does not presently have the operating resources to provide such remote service.
- d) Open space. The plan would feature large conservation areas.
- e) Bikepaths. The concept plan does not indicate whether bike paths are planned to connect the proposed subdivision to other bikepaths in the Stonegate or Heron Creek developments, but it is assumed such pathways could be incorporated in a more developed plan.

Plan Commission direction is requested.

B. Consideration of a Concept Plan for the Development of the Walters & Cambier Farms Located North and West of the Intersection of Peace Road and Brickville Road.

Local commercial developer John Pappas will present a concept plan for the future residential development of the Walters & Cambier farms, to be known as Vellagio Estates and located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Brickville Road and Peace Road. This 95.61-acre site was earlier considered for residential development by the Plan Commission on March 8, 2004 and July 11, 2005. On each occasion concept plans were presented by Dave Fagenal, a principal of R.A. Fagenal Builders. At the July 2005 meeting, the city staff raised questions about the following topics in particular:

- a) lot sizing,
- b) drainage impacts,
- c) traffic impacts at the intersection of Peace and Brickville Roads as well as the development entrance on Brickville, and
- d) the buffering of the larger lots to the west edge of the proposed development site.

At the July 2005 meeting the Commission also took up the question of the timing of the first permits for such a development. Since that Commission review, the timing of first permits in new residential subdivisions has been governed by the provisions of Ordinance 2005.60, approved on November 21, 2005. A copy of that legislative framework is attached.

The concept plan proposed by Mr. Pappas has the following key features:

- Land use. Low density detached single family housing featuring 138 single-family lots with lot sizes from 1/3 acre to ½ acre.
- Density: 1.443 units per gross acre.
- Access. Two principal access points are proposed: the main entrance at Brickville Road and a connection with Stonegate Drive which leads to Frantum Road. The tangent at which the main entrance meets Brickville Road is on a curved section of the road. To “square” the main entrance with Brickville Road, the entrance would need to be shifted west, resulting in the removal of Lot 112.
- Storm water detention: a large pond is proposed at the west edge of the property extending to the intersection of Brickville and Motel Roads.
- Availability of public utilities. The public water supply can be extended with looping through the Stonegate project. Sufficient sanitary sewer line capacity exists to serve the subject property.
- The buffering of adjacent uses. Aside from Lot 112 at the west side of the Brickville entrance, all lots are separated from existing homes by open space or detention. At the east edge of the property, townhouses from the Stonegate development will eventually abut the rear yards of Lots 17, 17, 18 and 19. Along the greater part of the west, north and east sides of the proposed development, no future residential development can be served by the City’s remaining sewer line capacity.
- Park facilities. Aside from the detention area and entry “rotary,” no recreational park space is shown on the concept plan.

Plan Commission direction is requested.

C. Consideration of a Rezoning Concept for Lot 12 of the Manor Unit 1 Subdivision.

Angelo Tsiagalidis is the owner of the Parkway Restaurant and the Wade Land Unit 1 subdivision, which is located at the northeast corner of East State Street and Kingsway Drive. The subdivision includes five lots (see the attached exhibit). Lot 13 and Lot 14 contain the restaurant and main parking area, respectively, and a portion of Lot 12 contains expanded parking. At the north end, Lots 10 and 11 are presently undeveloped but zoned “R-3” Multiple Family Residence District in conformance with the zoning on the west side of Kingsway Drive.

Mr. Tsiagalidis wants to rezone that portion of Lot 12 which has not been developed for parking and merge it with Lots 10 and 11 to create a larger space for multiple family development. He would like to build a five-unit and a three-unit apartment building on this re-subdivided area. There are a number of planning issues to consider:

- a) The allowable number of structures on a residentially zoned lot. Section 6.1.12A of the UDO allows only one principal building per lot in residential subdivisions unless part of a planned unit development (“P.U.D.”). The minimum area for a P.U.D. is 2 acres (Section 4.4.4G), and the proposed apartment area is smaller than 2 acres.
- b) Density. The land area for the proposed apartments is about 0.80 acres, resulting in a gross density of about 10 units per acre. The maximum allowable density for multiple family housing is 9 units per gross acre. If the right-of-way for Hollnick Drive is vacated (see below), the apartment area would be 0.95 acres, and the density would be 8.42 units per gross acre.
- c) Storm water detention. On-site detention is not shown.
- d) Floodplain delineation. The floodplain line runs approximately parallel with the west edge of the proposed interior parking lot. Hollnick Drive is a recorded right-of-way but no roadway has been built. The right-of-way should be vacated since it would fall within the floodplain limits and the City has no intention of building the platted street.
- e) Access. It appears that the garages for the five-unit and three-unit buildings would be approached from the interior of the site, as the Plan Commission prefers, rather than “front-loaded” with access to Kingsway Drive.
- f) Guest parking. No guest parking is shown. The City would require an additional .75 off-street parking spaces per unit, in addition to what appear to be garage spaces on the plot plan (see attached).
- g) Buffering of uses. Additional space needs to be dedicated for a landscape buffer between the proposed residential property and the commercial property to the south.

Plan Commission direction is requested.

