

MINUTES
August 17, 2016
Plan Commission
City of Batavia

PLEASE NOTE: These minutes are not a word-for-word transcription of the statements made at the meeting, nor intended to be a comprehensive review of all discussions. They are intended to make an official record of the actions taken by the Committee/City Council, and to include some description of discussion points as understood by the minute-taker. They may not reference some of the individual attendee's comments, nor the complete comments if referenced.

1. Meeting Called to Order for the Plan Commission

Chair LaLonde called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

2. Roll Call:

Members Present: Chair LaLonde; Vice-Chair Schneider; Commissioners Gosselin, Harms, Joseph, and Peterson

Members Absent:

Also Present: Joel Strassman, Planning and Zoning Officer; Drew Rackow, Planner; and Jennifer Austin-Smith, Recording Secretary

3. Items to be Removed, Added or Changed

There were no items to be removed, added or changed.

4. Approval of Minutes: July 20, 2016, Plan Commission Minutes

Motion: To approve the minutes from July 20, 2016, Plan Commission minutes

Maker: Joseph

Second: Schneider

Voice Vote: 6 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 Absent

All in favor. Motion carried.

5. Public Hearing: Multiple Family Building at 1600 West Wilson Street, SJR Inc Applicant

- **Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map Amendment from Public Facilities and Institutional to Residential 8 to 15 dwelling**
- **Establishment of a Planned Development Overlay District in a R4 Multiple Family Residential, Medium Density District**
- **Design Review for New Residential Building**

Motion: To open the public hearing

Maker: Schneider

Second: Joseph

Voice Vote: 6 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 Absent

All in favor. Motion carried.

Rackow reviewed the memo from August 12, 2016 titled "Public Hearing: Multiple Family Building at 1600 West Wilson Street, SJR Inc, Applicant. Comprehensive Land Use Map Amendment from Public Facilities and Institutional to Residential 8 to 15 Dwelling Units Per Acre. Establishment of a Planned Development Overlay District in a R4 Multiple Family Residential, Medium Density District. Design Review for a New Residential Building, SJR, applicant." The proposed project would have 8 two bedroom and 4 one bedroom units. Each unit would have a one car garage and one parking place in a driveway. Driveways would need to be modified to permit full access to the driveway and parking stall for each unit.

Arney Silvestri, Silvestri Custom Homes, 234 Planters Row, Geneva, representing SJR Inc., addressed the Commission. He explained that the design takes advantage of the street frontages by orienting the building to two streets. Chair LaLonde asked for an overview of the materials he plans on using for the building. Silvestri described the building materials to the Commission as well as passed around a color sample of the architectural design shingle. The roofing would be weathered wood color. The siding color would be natural clay with white trim and white vinyl windows with grids. He passed around the natural clay color sample. The balconies would be wolmanized wood with black metal spindles.

Joseph expressed her concern about the parking. She stated that oftentimes the garages are used for storage. Silvestri stated that they have 9x10 storage areas designed in the building as well as the single car garages are longer than standard. LaLonde stated that he shares the same concern with parking that staff brought up. Silvestri stated that he is willing to work with staff to ensure that everyone gets what they need.

Chair LaLonde opened the floor for public comment and swore in all those who were going to speak.

Thomas Wilson, 56 Spuhler Dr. stated that the whole block is all four units and the developer wants to put in a twelve unit building. He asked where are they going to put the snow from plowing. He stated there are going to be more than 24 cars there. People will block the other garage doors.

Craig Crawford 15 Feece Dr. shared that he lives directly across the street from the unit. He stated that he has a number of concerns. He is concerned that the building will house "transient" residents. This is transient population is near our high school. Batavia has history of crime problems with apartment complexes. Parking is a concern. The number of small garages in the same vicinity could be hazardous. If one person stored something improperly and there was a fire this would be a large problem. He asked if any traffic studies have been done, especially on Randall. The number of accidents in this neighborhood is quite large for a fairly small neighborhood. He asked the City to upgrade the traffic light timing on Randall and Main and Randall and Wilson. There are people trying to make those lights because they back up so badly and would like to know if there are accident statistics. Spuhler and Feece have speeders, especially during the school year. As a resident that worries him. There is a lot of litter on Wilson and there is no investment in living in the City by transient residents. He is concerned with creating a noise issue in the neighborhood. If you move that many people it almost has to increase the noise. He would like to keep the sense of the neighborhood and noted that Batavia

does not have a great history of civic planning. We have a closed border city. Why would we want to increase the density? That is clearly a curiosity of planning. Mid-day traffic in downtown Batavia is a nightmare and especially when school is in session. This would exasperate that. The whole street is four flats and why would we want a larger building is beyond him. Snow removal is also a concern. The City does not do snow removal on adjacent lots. He asked would this property have snow removal. The additional users on the street would increase the difficulty navigating Independence. Between the speeding and the potential for crime, this development is something we should be concerned about. He asked if a feasibility study has been done and if so, distribute it, and if not it should be done. He needs to know more than just the information shared at tonight's meeting. He has concerns that the building would not match the neighborhood. He would request that everyone in that neighborhood be mailed with a transcript of this hearing and have a chance to respond. A plat of the property should also be distributed and have another hearing to have a decision as a community. He would not want this in the area where his kids stand and wait to catch the bus.

Diane Anderson 16 Spuhler Dr. stated she lives directly across the lot being referred to this evening. She is worried about the value of her house. She stated that the market is rebounding and now her home value would go down again. The traffic is now bad and would be even worse with this development.

Mark Larson 6 Spuhler Dr. stated he lives directly across the street from the proposed development. Property value is the number one issue. It would not help the property value to have a building like that in that on the property. Apartment buildings would not help the property values in the neighborhood. Additional parking would be needed. On-street parking is only available on the resident side of the street. When the football team is doing well the streets are all full. He asked what is the potential rental of these units. If it is a year-to-year lease it might help. He asked if this goes through how long it would take for construction. When he has visitors going to his house for the holidays, where he pays property taxes, would they have to fight for a parking spot.

Randy Castor 26 Spuhler Dr. stated he is adjacent and south of the proposed building. This land has been vacant since 2007. He was hoping that it would be built similar to what the Martin's built on the block. This building is too big for the lot. The setback requirements would have to be changed to fit a car in the front. He asked the developer if he could have built a 4 to 6 unit building on this land.

Commissioner Schneider commented that this building is very large for the area. He asked if the applicant has a plan b for this development.

Kate McCracken, 1001 East Main Street, St. Charles. representing the applicant, stated that this property was declared surplus from the City. Bids were accepted and taken and SJR was the successful bidder. If the City were willing to reduce the purchase price as part of the bid there would be a corresponding reduction in the building's size. This is a unique site since there are three frontages and the property is bounded by commercial and office. Typically in a land planning context, that is the type of property that is appropriate for a buffer type of development. These are intended to be long-term leases. The longer the rental period the better it is for

ownership. Year to year or longer is always the number one objective for any community. This is not a series of apartment buildings. There would be six units on one frontage and six units on the other to keep it consistent with the adjacent usages. SJR would be willing to consider a reduction in the density with a corresponding reduction in the bid that was accepted by the City. McCracken stated that, for the record, they have agreed with all of staff's recommendations for the adjustments and conditions.

Chair LaLonde asked for discussion from the Commission. Schneider stated that he does not think this building would fit and he would not like to live across from it. Joseph agreed that it is too big a building for this area. Snow and parking could be an issue. She would like to see the density reduced. Peterson agreed. She stated that the design is wonderful for that neighborhood. She thinks that we made too many considerations for this plan. This type of building is in a residential area of 4 unit buildings and here it would be 12. Strassman stated that this property, zoned R4, would allow up to nine dwelling units whether it is in one building or a combination of buildings. Peterson stated that we are giving a lot of latitude with the setbacks to conform to the Comprehensive Plan. Gosselin stated that a smaller building would pose fewer problems and could better with the R4. LaLonde concurs that it is too much building for this size of property. He could understand some leniency of setbacks. He suggested a smaller building with parking on Independence so that the frontage would better fit with the neighborhood on Spuhler.

Silvestri stated that R4 is nine units and we are asking for twelve. The higher density is to offset the costs for labor and materials. If you do more density you could make the things work. It was all about cost. When you add up the fees and load them into the price of the property the City was asking for and the cost of the building that is where we came up with this building. This is a matter of making the numbers work. He is not opposed for a nine unit or an eight unit building.

Schneider asked them to go back and talk to the City staff to make that decision. Schneider stated that this public hearing should be continued to get discussion going with staff.

Silvestri stated that we might need some setback relief to add parking to one side or slide the building and easements due to the electrical box. He may come back with nine or eight units.

Strassman asked the Commission if they would be willing to consider any density above what the R4 District allows and/or any relief to building bulk requirements. The Commission generally agreed that greater density is not preferred, but they may consider relief to bulk requirements. LaLonde stated that he would certainly consider that. LaLonde asked when the developer would like to reconvene the public hearing. Silvestri requested sixty days. Strassman asked Silvestri to change the date on the notice signs for the next public hearing date of October 19, 2016.

Motion: To continue this public hearing to October 19, 2016

Maker: Joseph

Second: Harms

Roll Call Vote: **Aye:** LaLonde, Schneider, Gosselin, Harms, Joseph, Peterson

Nay:

6-0 Vote, 0 Absent, All in Favor. Motion carried.

**6. Public Hearing: Zoning Map Amendment for Sections of the Illinois Prairie Path, Kane County Forest Preserve, Owner, City of Batavia, Applicant
Open and Continue to September 21, 2016**

Strassman reported that there was insufficient notice and staff is requesting the Commission continue this public hearing to complete the notice.

Motion: To open and continue the public hearing to September 21, 2016
Maker: Joseph
Second: Schneider
Voice Vote: 6 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 Absent
All in favor. Motion carried.

7. Other Business

Strassman reported staff received an application for an age-restricted and income-restricted housing development on Hawks Drive west of Walmart. This is proposed to be an 81 unit with one live-in manager on the property. This building was contemplated when the property was annexed in 2011. The public hearing could potentially be scheduled for September 21st.

Strassman reported that the former Aldi store at Main St. and Randall Rd. is proposed to become a body shop. This would require rezoning of the property. There is a possibility of changing the zoning on the adjacent property to allow for the development of symbiotic businesses.

Schneider asked if anything was going forward with the old Avenue Chevy. Strassman answered that nothing has been submitted.

Joseph asked if there was any interest in the Golden Corral. Strassman stated that the City has received no applications for that property.

Strassman reported that the City is progressing with Shodeen for the 1 North Washington project. Dunkin Donuts is progressing through the permit process.

Harms asked about the proposed Blue Goose grocery store. Strassman stated that he has no further information.

8. Adjournment

There being no other business to discuss, Chair LaLonde asked for a motion to adjourn the Plan Commission. Peterson moved to adjourn the meeting, Schneider seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 8:21pm.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Jennifer Austin-Smith