

MINUTES
September 19, 2017
Committee of the Whole
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.

Vice-Chair Wolff called the meeting to order at 7:30pm.

1. Roll Call

Members Present: Ald. Russotto, Stark, Chanzit, Wolff, Salvati, O'Brien, Callahan, Meitzler, Mallay, Uher, and Cerone

Members Absent: Chair Brown; Aldermen Atac, McFadden

Also Present: Deputy Chief Shawn Mazza, Batavia Police Department; Laura Newman, City Administrator; Mark Schuster, Legal Counsel; Scott Buening, Director of Community Development; Drew Rackow, Planner; Joel Strassman, Planning and Zoning Officer; Jeff Albertson, Building Commissioner; Anthony Isom, Administrative Assistant to the City Administrator; Chris Cudworth, Communications Coordinator; Sue Peterson, Plan Commissioner; and Jennifer Austin-Smith, Recording Secretary

2. Approve Minutes for August 22, and 29, 2017

Motion: To approve the minutes from August 22 and 29, 2017

Maker: Chanzit

Second: Uher

Voice Vote: 11 Ayes, 0 Nays, 3 Absent
Motion carried.

3. Items to be Removed/Added/Changed

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

4. Approval: A Policy Directive on Public Comments for Items that ARE on the Agenda (Scott Buening 9/15/17)

Stark summarized the memo. The Committee discussed setting a time limit for items that are on the agenda. Schuster stated that the law prefers that you establish a policy but if you waive it from time to time or make adjustments for particular circumstances you could consider that. To have no policy is not the preference. You should have an official policy as a starting point so that everyone understands what your rules are for public comment. Chanzit asked if the policy is we have the authority to establish limits if limits are needed but the default is that there are no limits. Newman stated that what you are codifying is the right to establish limits. Its not that you are setting a limit for all future meetings, you are just codifying the right to set a limit. Schuster stated that it sounds like that is the preference of the Committee.

Motion: To allow for a five minute time limit for this ordinance

Maker: Salvati

Second: Mietzler
Voice Vote: 9 Ayes, 2 Nays, 3 Absent
Motion carried.

The nays were O'Brien and Chanzit.

5. Matters From the Public (For Items NOT on Agenda)

There were no matters from the public for items not on the agenda.

6. Ordinance 17-60: Surplus Property PD (D/C Mazza 9/13/17) CS

Motion: To recommend approval of Ordinance 17-60: Surplus Property PD
Maker: Callahan
Second: Cerone
Voice Vote: 11 Ayes, 0 Nays, 3 Absent
Motion carried.
CONSENT AGENDA

7. Ordinance 17-59: Amendment to the Zoning Map for a Planned Development Overlay District (JLS 9/14/17) CD

Strassman overviewed his September 14, 2017 memo to the Committee of the Whole (COW) titled "Campana Mixed Use Redevelopment, 901 North Batavia Avenue, Evergreen Real Estate Group, applicant. Ordinance 17-59: Amending the Official Zoning Map for a Planned Development Overlay District. Resolution 17-103-R: Approving Final Plat of Subdivision for Campana Building." Strassman reported that the Plan Commission was not convinced that the issues regarding effects to the surrounding area would be to the level that it should not be approved. Strassman stated that there would be a change in traffic from what there is today, largely because the building is 60% occupied. If the building were occupied by non-residential units at 100% occupancy, Evergreen's engineer assessed that the traffic would likely be greater than it would if occupied by residential.

The Committee began discussion on the project. Wolff stated that a concern is the stormwater management for this property. Strassman stated that the applicant has representatives that could address that but for approval of the Zoning Entitlements, staff does not require final engineering. Final engineering would be part of the building permit review process and they would need to demonstrate compliance with the stormwater management code for permits issued. The Committee discussed traffic, ingress and egress, and flooding concerns. Callahan expressed concerns with the land banked parking and once developed where would the stormwater go. O'Brien stated that the flooding in our community is a quality of life concern that he would like to have the applicant address. Callahan stated that we should look into the eventualities of the land banking and stormwater detention. The Committee discussed parking. Strassman stated that there is a section in the ordinance that allows staff to perform a parking audit at any given time, particularly when there is a change in residential use.

Mike Renner, Principal with Ericson Engineering, addressed the Committee regarding stormwater. Right now the plan in front of you shows 23,347 square feet of impervious area. The City of Batavia (COB) ordinance has adopted the County's ordinance that says anytime that you exceed 25,000 of net new impervious area then stormwater detention is triggered. The plan with the banked parking does not trigger the stormwater detention and that is why when presented to the Plan Commission it was a plan that did not provide stormwater detention because it is not required by the ordinance. Once it is exceeded, then all of the areas of the site drainage areas would have to be reviewed and approved by the agencies with respect of stormwater detention. He stated to keep in mind that Kane County and the COB have one

ordinance requirement for stormwater and the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) has a separate requirement for stormwater. Depending on which tributary we are talking about will determine which ordinance we have to meet. Block stated this plan does not include the sidewalk west of the property and does include the new sidewalk proposed along Fabyan Parkway. Renner clarified that the plan does not include land-banked parking. Once the land banked parking is built then the stormwater requirements for all entities would have to be met. The detention could be met through various methods including above ground storage, open detention basin, underground stormwater detention (tank, pipes), swales, or best management practices. Block stated that their intention through the design phase of this project is to fully design both the base case, the 206 parking spaces, and the full land banked parking. There will be a fully worked out stormwater design for both of those and we will present that to the COB for review of information. The detailed design would happen at the design phase and those would become available on record.

Callahan asked about the amenities if land banked parking is implemented. Block answered that the Plan Commission has requested if we do the full land banked build out that they identify a new location on the site for the soccer field and the tot lot and they would need to do that as part of the full design. The challenge is that there is historic preservation standards and the State and Federal levels are concerned about putting things in the front of the building. Uher asked what this would look like for the residents if land banked parking is developed. Block stated that the tot lot would dimensionally still be able to fit in the back corner of the property. The soccer field could be painted onto the front lawn with removable goals.

The Committee discussed the parking, elevators, and energy efficiency in the building. Block stated that the energy code is different for a rehabbed building versus a new construction building. Block discussed the HUD policy on housing credits and utility allowance. Block discussed the intergovernmental agreement with the Aurora Housing Authority to help provide some subsidy to some portion of these units, site-based waiting list, and the Affirmative Fair Housing Marketing Plan. Block explained they plan to market first in Batavia and then the tri-cities area and expect to fill up the building and keeping it leased just by marketing in Batavia and the tri-city area.

The Committee discussed the occupancy of the building and utilities. Block stated that their business interest is aligned with their investors in that we have made certain covenants with them and we need to keep the units occupied at a certain level. Mietzler asked about the utilities and expressed concern that the price of utilities might price some people with low-income out of this building. Dennis Langley, architect, discussed the heating and cooling system and how they plan to increase the efficiency of the building. A graphic was shown to the Committee showing how the heating and cooling would be used in the units.

O'Brien asked how long they intend to keep the building if they are losing money. Block answered that they are not anticipating losing money for this building. They have a covenant with IDHA and their investors to hold this building for a minimum of fifteen years and there is an extended use agreement, which would require a period of affordability for thirty years. The systems are designed to ensure that the improvements on the building would last at least fifteen years with capital reserves. The institutional investors see these as safe, conservative investments because that is how they are designed. Federal tax policy is being used to bring dollars to this in combination of the Federal Historic Tax Credit and some other resources, that is the alternate source of investment and those investors are not chasing the same type of returns as standard institutional equity of a project and that is the fundamental reason why this approach is the best chance this project has in order to bring this building back. Block addressed the concerns with the application process. There were a few mistakes and they are not perfect but they do not believe they were fraudulent approaches. They were the result of coordinating a professional team for a

complex project. He discussed how the historic tax credits works with the Committee. Stark read a letter from the Preservation Partners and asked that the copy be placed onto the record.

The Committee opened the floor for public comment.

Guy Prisco addressed the Committee and submitted a petition from Holmstad residents. He read the preamble of the petition, 'the undersigned residents of the Holmstad Covenant Retirement Community petition the City of Batavia Mayor and Aldermen to reject the proposed Evergreen Campana development as being unsuitable for basic human living needs and therefore detrimental to the orderly development of the local area and to the long term viability of the Holmstad Retirement Community.' Prisco reviewed the September 17, 2017 memo to the Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Batavia, Illinois titled 'Reasons the Holmstad Community has petitioned the Batavia City Council to reject the proposed Evergreen Campana development.' The concerns addressed in the memo were the value and future occupancy of the Holmstead, proposed layout of the Campana project is unfit for human habitation with no suitable windows. The memo was placed on the City's website with the Campana project documents. Prisco asked for more time to complete his comments after all public testimony was given at tonight's meeting.

Josh Bailey Green, pastor and member of the Fox River Valley Initiative, addressed the Committee. The Fox Valley Initiative consists of 35,000 residents in the Fox Valley that strongly supports increasing affordable housing in this region. On May 2nd of this year and Evergreen presented a proposal to this Committee and over the past 140 days the City has received written and verbal input to the Plan Commission (PC) and Historic Preservation Commission (HPC). By following these processes it has resulted in a recommendation to the Committee of the Whole (COW) to proceed with this proposal. During that process, the developer has worked with the City and staff to respond to questions and concerns and where possible make adjustments to the plan. This includes donating land to the future potential improvements to the intersection saving taxpayer money and eliminating potential red tape if the proper entities were to pursue eminent domain. For those interested in an expedient path toward improving a very dangerous intersection it seems that clearing the path for this project is the most expedient way to help that process along. Others in support for this project include AID, Batavia Interfaith Food Pantry, Fox Valley Preservation Partners, League of Women Voters, numerous churches and people who need this type of housing. There is no question that affordable housing is much needed in this area. This proposal for the redevelopment of the Campana property is the best hope to preserve this vital cultural landmark while bringing much needed affordable housing to the Fox River Valley.

Scott Sutterlin, Geneva resident, stated that sticking the residents of Batavia and Geneva with an 80 unit low income housing is unfair to tax payers but would be a disaster for the community in many ways. It is not the job of the government to provide food and housing for people on a regular basis. There is no money for that. The State of Illinois and our federal government are in debt. Are we to expect the federal government to take out another loan and pay interest on that loan to build something that people really should be providing for themselves. If there is a need for housing, you go out and work for it. Should we stick our children with this type of debt. Should we always rely on the government to solve our problems for us. This is not sustainable. Individual responsibility should remain with the individual, not with another party. Paying partial rent, subsidizing rent does not teach people to be responsible in the real world. In the real world rents are much higher. He questioned where is the incentive for people to change their life around when such subsidies are available. This is a core issue that is never talked about. It feels good to build housing for people but in the real world it really does not work. Everyone has a choice in life to work hard or not, save their money or not, have children or not. Subsidizing is not fair to taxpayers and rarely helps those who need help. You cannot help people permanently by doing for them what they could and should be doing for themselves. He has also heard that the reason that this is being pushed is for diversity and social engineering. Unreported but the fact is that people have been selling their houses

at huge losses and moving away from diversity for decades. He has done the same himself from Chicago. He goes by what people do rather than what people say because there are a lot of hypocrites. We don't need diversity just for the sake of diversity. He asked for those in support of this project to drive to any location that has fifty units or more of low-income housing and ask yourself if you would like to live next door. He understands that the developers would like to make some money. Homeowners need to keep their family and property values secure. There are many houses in the immediate area of Campana that would be devastating to their property values, and he speaks from experience as a realtor. The government should not burden homeowners and that is part of the problem. Encouraging people to be more responsible is better.

Emily Ericson discussed code modifications. She read Section 1.02 Chapter 1 of the Zoning Code. She is concerned about the amount of variances that Evergreen is requesting and if approved what precedent would be set for future developers in businesses within Batavia. It is clear that three out of the ten modifications Evergreen is requesting are in direct correlation to funding and their ability to finance the project. For instance, the wireless communication antennas. It is in Batavia's City Code that cell phone antennas should not be allowed on residential buildings. Why is Evergreen asking to make this exception, because without the revenue from the antennas the investors would not see this project as financially attractive. The next modification requested is the decrease in the number of parking spaces from 301 to 206. Why doesn't Evergreen just put in the number of parking spaces required since that is your code and they have the space for it. To make the 301 spaces they have to rely on the parking impact and as Mr. Block has noted several times, that lot construction might lead to costly stormwater management so again making this project less financially worthwhile. Another modification requested for financial reasons is the decrease in the 25% required first floor space in existing building adjacent to the street for retail, entertainment and eating and drinking. She believes that the City is already dealing with this scenario with the One Washington Place project as they are asking to replace the first floor retail with more residential units in an attempt to offset the higher than expected cost. Other modifications have to do with the historic nature of the building. Evergreen is forced to meet the state and local historical preservation standards or they will lose their historic tax credits. We have been told by Mr. Block several times that without these tax credits the project would not move forward. If financial hardship is grounds to get relief from Batavia's Zoning Code then how will this new standard be applied. She questioned who would get to qualify for this exception: business owners, future developers, homeowners. Where and how do you draw the line. If these exceptions are approved the precedent would be set for any future developer, business owner or even a homeowner to ask for relief from Batavia's Zoning Code so that they might also financially afford whatever project they are seeking to do.

Matt Baldwin, Allen Drive, stated that he sent a letter to all of the aldermen as well. He is a civil engineer by trade. He has concerns about drainage and retention, site engineering of the parking, access limitations, and proposed roadway safety improvements. He feels that this project has been so divisive in many ways because it seems as though, up to this point, the City has established several new precedents of approval along with experiences at the PC level and making several concessions in the current plan, especially items in historical preservation. He requests that the City develops a comprehensive design for the site that addresses the existing issues, access, safety, parking lot expansion, connector road, and drainage design. He does not see that in the current plan. He is hopeful that the Council will not entertain a vote to approve the site plan and project without understanding the implication and feedback from KDOT, IDOT, and County stormwater. The plat that is being considered for approval does not include the full fifty feet of right-of-way along Fabyan requested by KDOT in a letter dated 7-26. The resolution is worded that KDOT has reviewed and approved the right-of-way and was dated 7-25, which is a day before their comments came out. He contacted KDOT himself and was informed that they have not seen or approved this plat. KDOT has asked for 50 feet and they are only allotted 15 feet. Baldwin asked that the Council clarify that before approval. Also, Kane County has not submitted any formal comments about the access,

stormwater, and roadway. He feels that designated turn lanes are important for this property since you could feel cars bearing down on you when making a turn on Fabyan. The ordinance for retention states that 25,000 square feet of redevelopment triggers the need for retention, not net new impervious area. He has spoken to the Kane County Stormwater group and you do not get credit for the aggregate parking lot.

Joe Keefer reported that Mr. Block stated he would address his questions and concerns brought up on August 16th. He looks forward to hearing that at the next City Council meeting and he takes that as a good first step forward at being a good neighbor. He stated that HUD has not had a chance to review this and the reason is that Kane County has not had a chance to finalize their environmental assessment and that was supposed to be done in June. He suggested that the Council wait to see what HUD has to say about the site before you make any decisions. There is a person who has retained a company to do a real estate appreciation analysis for surrounding neighborhoods and would focus on Evergreen properties and like neighborhoods and that should be done in the next two weeks. Keefer asked for proof or documentation that there would be a site based waiting list. He would like to see a formal agreement between the Aurora Housing Authority and Evergreen. He asked that this be sent back to the PC if you don't want to reject this straight away. There is no doubt in his mind that people should not be living in this location. A thirteen-year-old girl would have no privacy in a unit where there are holes cut out of the wall. Is there a premium of space around here so that buildings be converted into living space no matter what the cost. He does not think so. A working mother who works midnights would have trouble getting sleep in that place. He asked that the applicant put up shades at least. Batavia can settle for its own standards in its own community instead of letting business capitalize on the needs of the poor. The bottom line is, he believes that the City cares more about repairing or reusing a building than it does about the needs of the poor. It wants to clean something up that the current owner should have been caring for instead of following its own code and focusing on those in need of housing. There is a wealth of more tax credits to build twice as much housing from the ground up. This housing would have balconies, windows, doors in bedrooms, no holes in walls, certified code, and walls that are made of something that does not warm to 120 degrees or let sunlight in whenever the sun is up. The building does not look perfect so we are going to use taxpayers' money to build an abnormal and very poor quality place to live.

Rob Byrnes submitted petitions that simply state they are against this development. He asked why does Batavia's staff and engineers know better than Kane County and why do they think they do not have to follow the law. He shared that he met with the Kane County stormwater engineers and learned that Batavia is not following the Kane County stormwater ordinance and the engineer for the developer is not following the Kane County stormwater ordinance. This is very disturbing. He also learned they way they do detention calculations. They are on a gross basis, not a net basis. He stated that the City needs to do detention now. He is very concerned about drainage, specifically illegal drainage onto his land. He asked isn't the City of Batavia supposed to protect him. He added that there are other correspondence going on between Kane County and Batavia and Batavia has agreed not to meet with Kane County.

Jamie Tate suggested taking a step back and consider doing something like stormwater, traffic, basic engineering with the site and development and entitlement. Moving forward, it should be considered that engineering be done with entitlement, which is common in other communities. IDOT has not given comments yet. She is not sure how it is being presented that everyone is in agreement with the comments. She has not seen any comments back from IDOT yet and the KDOT letter has a lot of comments. She would think that those at least need to be addressed or you put in contingent to your approval that compliance with any comments from IDOT is what the City of Batavia would like to see. She has comments as well about the site plan that has not been addressed. One in particular was the movement of the trucks in the back. She has questions on the Comprehensive Plan and the mixed-use designation. There seems to be so much discussion on should this be residential. There is a lot of concern about light and natural air and all that has to do with quality of life in residential living. Yes, this is a mixed-use

designation but does that mean that mixed use has to be residential. It could be mixed commercial and industrial. It does not necessarily need to be residential. She asked who was involved in the Comprehensive Plan in 2007 that designated this property as Mixed Use. She wondered if they wanted to have mixed use to be considered as residential. She stated that maybe this should be reconsidered, that was ten years ago, and maybe that type of use does not work for this building now that we have had a project that has come this far and has been studied this far. She suggested taking a step back to consider whether or not this building should be residential or mixed use. Just because it is zoned that does not mean that was what was approved for that area. She stated that this process is moving too fast. There are unresolved issues from KDOT, IDOT, and stormwater and you are looking into approving this tonight. She asked that the process is slowed down and the unanswered questions get resolved before we move forward.

Sandra Pintsak, Allen Drive, asked about the Standard Occupancy Policy and how many people could occupy one unit based on the square footage. She has never heard what the maximum number of people would be in this proposed project. Is it 350 or is it 400? Buening answered that they have not calculated that actual number, the developer has their own maximum number of people. Pintsak shared that she heard from a Fox River Valley Initiative member that Evergreen Real Estate Group had offered the Fox River Valley Initiative 20 credits, not people. She asked the Council what the Fox River Valley Initiative really believes that Evergreen is going to do for them and how many people are 20 credits. Is it 20 people or 20 units. She asked how many of these units are going to be handicap equipped. She asked that the Council vote for a final sketch on what they are going to build and not what might be built further down the road. She asked the Council to look at the full picture before making a vote.

Jacob Szafranski, Batavia resident, shared that he has a family member who suffered a disability due to a car accident and nearly lost their life. Costs and affordability of housing is important and he is in support of affordable housing and for safety. A 2015 study out of Stanford studied communities well suited for subsidized housing and found "the net analysis revealed higher income areas which exceeded the poverty threshold that new buildings often lead to a net loss in the community...where in lower socio economic communities that were building subsidized housing it was seen to be an asset to the community". He does not feel that this project is well suited for Batavia. He shared that he had the opportunity to take care of people who have lost their lives due to vehicle accidents. Traffic is the highest causes of violent and traumatic death in this country. We are trying to make the community adopt something that does not seem well suited for many reasons. There are far more questions about this development than there are answers. Evergreen should be showing the City how projects such as theirs has benefited other communities like Batavia.

John Hunter, Allen Drive and works out of the Campana building, addressed the Committee. During the course of the PC and HPC meetings, collectively those of us that oppose this project have submitted a plethora of information, calling in question many aspects of this project. Citizens have uncovered misleading statements, incorrect information, discrepancies, and other questionable items. It seems that much of the information has been falling on deaf ears as they have been presented at the meetings. In some cases, largely disregarded or even buried. It is disappointing because you decision makers are not getting all the information that we have uncovered. Only having three minutes to present our information makes us truncated and not able to give you the full picture. Some of the topics we are looking at are the parking, the traffic, stormwater, building issues, school impact, crime and home values. It is important for all of you to consider all aspects of this project, however uncomfortable it might be. This project in particular seems to be more about profit than about preservation. We have seen during the course of these meetings there has been give and take and compromise when it comes to the historic aspects of this project and we have seen things that would permanently change the primary view of this building. We are concerned about that. If we are looking at the historic preservation standpoint then we should preserve as

much of the primary view as we can. He agrees that our communities need to incorporate affordable housing within our boundaries but it should not be in this format. This is not a suitable place for people to be living. It seems that the density and layout of this building makes it not suitable for human habitation. He urged the Council to vote against this project and allow us to come up with a better solution as residents and as you the Council to come up with a better solution to better serve the proposed residents of the Campana project and make it so that it is better for everyone involved.

Steve Tate stated that you have a project with lots of ifs and very few constants. He makes decisions on facts. You are looking to bend a lot of rules to make something fit. Looking at windows this high to offer ventilation that goes nowhere. People will be living in lofts sixteen feet high and heat rises. He feels that the cooling of the building will be more important than the heating. With sunshine coming through glass block it's a giant greenhouse. He urged the Committee to at least take their time or vote no on this project.

John Fermanis, tenant of Campana, addressed handicap parking. The current handicap parking proposed impedes on the grass and some of the historic oval. He found out that the historic doors do not meet ADA compliance. They do not meet the law. The parking could be moved to the northwest quadrant where there would be no need for handicap ramps at the historic entrance. A heated ramp could be built in the back with brand new doors and everything could be new and up to standards without having to modify the historic entrance up front. He stated that he wanted the Committee to be aware that there are fourteen conditions from the SHPO in the COA that have to be met. The fact that the building is 60% occupied is always stated but no one states the \$60,000 plus a year that the cellular companies pay the owner. He continued that he spoke with a contractor who informed him that he was going to put a pond in the historic oval with an aerator. The current tenants in Campana do not use a lot of parking. The only business that uses a lot of parking is the mattress company and they have their own parking spaces.

Guy Prisco addressed the Committee to complete his statement. He continued that the third floor south apartments have no windows and inoperable skylights. A one-bedroom loft apartment on the east side of the building first floor has a much larger living and bedroom area than the two bedroom loft apartment. The two bedroom loft apartments living, dining and kitchen area are very small for two or three person families. Energy conservation requirements of the 2015 international energy conservation code adopted by the City of Batavia are not being met by the proposed construction. For example, the four-inch glass block has an R-value of 1.96, which is almost nothing. One inch insulated glass has an R-value of 3.06. The code requirement for new construction the R-value is 20 but he does not know what it is for an historic building. Considering that the exterior wall of a typical apartment is 70% glass block and 30% below sill windows and a small area of brick it is apparent that the proposed construction is deficient in installation by a factor of almost five. In other words, the proposed construction on the outer wall has only 1/5 of the insulating value required by energy codes. Such deficiency would result in excessively high costs in heating and cooling equipment and unaffordable operating costs. The parking is inadequate for the number of tenants. If the land banked area is used for parking than the recreational area would be lost. The proposed relocation of the cell phone antennae is another example of the abuse to the Campana's most historic feature, the tower. Many believe that allowing the placement of the antennas in the first place was a mistake and seen as an attempt to help the building owner receive additional income. Many wonder how these antennae were placed in the first place with Historic Preservation rules. The HPC missed the opportunity to correct the original mistake by not allowing the antennae to be placed on the tower. Increased traffic at a very dangerous intersection is also a major concern. The residents of the Holmstad have always been supportive Batavians in matters that serve the public welfare of all of our citizens. It was the support of the Holmstad residents that carried the vote for the Batavia library. The library is now the pride of all Batavians. Holmstad residents stand ready to support viable projects, even subsidized housing projects that truly serve the public welfare. The proposed Evergreen project does not serve the public welfare and should be rejected. Prisco distributed an article from the Wall Street Journal

titled “Kill the Loopholes, Including the One for ‘Low-Income Housing’” He read a highlight from the article ‘developers and investors, not the poor, benefit most from the credit. It should not survive tax reform.’

8. Resolution 17-103-R: Preliminary/Final Plat of Subdivision, Campana property, 901 North Batavia Avenue, Evergreen Real Estate Group, Applicant (JLS 9/14/17) CD

Motion: To table discussion on Ordinance 17-59 and Resolution 17-103-R to the September 26th meeting
Maker: Stark
Second: Callahan
Voice Vote: 11 Ayes, 0 Nays, 3 Absent
Motion carried.

9. Project Status

Newman reported on the following:

- Received late notice regarding IDOT work on Route 25, they are planning to prime Batavia Section on September 20th
- One Washington Place is being discussed with the developer and she will report to the Committee the results of the meetings

10. Other

Due to technical difficulties this meeting was no broadcast live on BATV but will be shown at a different time.

O’Brien asked that the IDNR report for the dam and the riverbank stabilization be placed onto COW agendas in the future.

11. Adjournment

There being no other business to discuss, Brown asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:36pm; Made by O’Brien; Seconded by Callahan. Motion carried.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Jennifer Austin-Smith