

VILLAGE OF HAMPSHIRE PLAN COMMISSION

JANUARY 22, 2018

AGENDA

CALL TO ORDER: TIME: 7:00 PM

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

ROLL CALL / ESTABLISH QUORUM.

MINUTES: Review and approve minutes from last meeting.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Election by plan commission members of treasurer, and “such other officers as may in their judgment be necessary,” pursuant to §6-14-4(B)(1) of the Village Code.
2. Consideration of Findings of Fact concerning Petition to Establish Planned Residential Development for that part of Tuscany Woods Subdivision lying outside of Unit 1 thereof, and sometimes referred to as “Unit 2,” by a zoning amendment in part from R-2 Single Family Residential Zoning District and in part from R-3 Two-Family Residential Zoning District, filed by Hampshire Property, LLC; together with review of a Preliminary Development Plan for the subject property, all pursuant to §6-18-8 of the Village Code.

OLD BUSINESS: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT: All persons wishing to make public comment must sign in prior to the start of the meeting. Time shall be limited to a maximum of five (5) minutes for each speaker and not more than thirty (30) minutes total.

NEXT MEETING DATE: TBD

ADJOURNMENT.

VILLAGE OF HAMPSHIRE PLAN COMMISSION

IN RE:

PETITION OF HAMPSHIRE PROPERTY, LLC TO ESTABLISH A PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT FOR CERTAIN PROPERTY IN THAT PART OF THE TUSCANY WOODS SUBDIVISION LYING OUTSIDE OF UNIT 1 (AND SOMETIMES REFERRED TO AS “UNIT 2”), BY RE-ZONING THE PROPERTY IN PART FROM R-2 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICT AND IN PART FROM R-3 TWO-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICT IN THE VILLAGE, AND FOR APPROVAL OF A PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE SUBJECT PROPERTY.

FINDINGS OF FACT

In regard to the Petition of Hampshire Property, LLC, as owner, requesting a zoning map amendment for certain property in the Village, in part from R-2 Single Family Residential Zoning District and in part from R-3 Two-Family Residential Zoning District to establish a Planned Residential Development District for the property, and for approval of the proposed Preliminary Development Plan, the Plan Commission having considered the petition, and the testimony and evidence submitted at a public hearing, the Plan Commission FINDS as follows:

1. A Petition requesting a zoning map amendment for certain property in the Tuscan Woods Subdivision, lying outside of platted Unit 1 thereof (and sometimes referred to as “Unit 2”), located in part north of IL 72 at or near Romke Road in the Village, and in part south of IL 72 at Romke Road, and legally described as attached hereto on Exhibit “A,” to establish a PRD Planned Residential Development for the following property, and requesting approval of a proposed Preliminary Development Plan, has been duly filed with the Village Clerk:

SEE ATTACHED LEGAL DESCRIPTION

PINS: 01-23-300-006; 01-23-400-007; 01-26-100-015; 01-26-100-016; 01-26-200-013; 01-26- 300-004; and 01-26-100-009.

Common Address: That part of the Tuscan Woods Subdivision lying outside of Unit 1 thereof, as platted by Doc. No. 2006K139816, in the Village of Hampshire, Kane County, Illinois, and located generally north of Jake Lane, and east of Runge Road, and also located south of IL 72, and west of Romke Road, in the Village.

2. A Public Hearing on the Petition was conducted by the Plan Commission at a its meeting held on January 9, 2018.

Village of Hampshire / Plan Commission
Tuscany Woods / Planned Residential Development

3. Notice of Public Hearing on said Petition was published in the Daily Herald newspaper on December 22, 2017.

4. Notice of the Public Hearing was also posted on the property not less than fifteen (15) days prior to the public hearing.

5. At the public hearing, Mr. Thomas Burney, attorney for Petitioner, addressed the Plan Commission regarding the request for zoning amendment. Ten (10) members of the public commented on the Petition.

6. The subject property consists of 284 ± acres, on which a total of 360 Single Family Residences and 30 duplex structures would be constructed.

7. The subject property is currently governed by a certain Development Agreement, dated September 2, 2004, and recorded in the Office of the Kane County Recorder as Doc. No. 2004K156704, between the original owner(s) and the Village.

8. The Subject Property is located within the Facilities Planning Area (“FPA”) of the Village, and will be served by Village utilities for sewer and water.

9. Access to the Subject Property is from IL 72 via Romke Road and Runge Road; and also from the west via Jake Lane and Century Drive.

10. The subject property is part of of Tuscany Woods Subdivision, and lies adjacent to Tuscany Woods, Unit #1, which has been developed with single family residences, and townhomes, in the period from 2004 – 2017.

11. The existing zoning and land use in the area of the proposed development is as follows:

North	IC&E Railroad; and in part, Village F-1 Farming; in part, R-2 Single Family Residential Zoning District, and in part, County F-Farming.
East	In part, Village R-1 Single Family Residential Zoning District; and in part, County F-Farming.
South	County F Farming,
West	In part, Village R-2 Single Family Residential Zoning District; and in part, R-3 Two-Family Residential Zoning District.

12. The trend of development in the area is residential with a mixture of housing types, including single family, duplexes, and townhouses. The most recent development has been in Tuscany Woods, Unit #1, adjacent to the Subject Property.

13. The proposed zoning is generally consistent with the 2004 Comprehensive Plan of the Village.

14. The Plan Commission has considered the extent to which the Petition and the proposed Preliminary Development Plan, and each of them, complies with the objectives and standards set out in Article XVIII: Planned Residential Development, of the Village Zoning Regulations, as follows:

6-18-5: Objectives:

A. Planned Residential Developments must meet the following objectives:

1. Aid in sustaining property values in the Village.
2. Provide appropriate access to and from adjacent arterial roadways.
3. Foster varied but harmonious architecture among all residential structures; and between residential structures and adjacent commercial structures.
4. Provide such variety of residential types as is necessary and advisable for the economic vitality of the Village.

B. Planned Residential Developments will be expected to utilize design guidelines based on smart growth, traditional neighborhood design, and/or conservation design principles, to the extent reasonably practicable.

6-18-6: General Provisions: * * *

B. Standards: The following standards shall apply to review and approval of a Planned Residential Development; provided, however, the Plan Commission may recommend, and the Village board may approve, such exceptions from these standards as are determined appropriate to achieve one of the objectives of sub-section 6-18-5(A) of this Article:

1. Unified Control: The proposed Planned Residential Development shall be under unified control.
2. Comprehensive Plan: The proposed Planned Residential Development shall strive to conform to the land uses, intent, and spirit of the Village Comprehensive Plan.
3. Compatibility: Uses proposed for a Planned Residential Development shall be compatible with surrounding land uses.
4. Subdivided: Preliminary and Final plats of subdivision shall be submitted.

5. Yards: The yards required along the periphery of a Planned Residential Development shall be at least equal in depth to those prescribed by the regulations which would otherwise apply to the type(s) of use proposed for the Planned Residential Development. The Village may approve greater setbacks from the boundary line of a Planned Residential Development when determined necessary to protect the privacy of residents in either an existing, or any other proposed, subdivision.

6. Landscaping: At a minimum, the proposed Planned Residential Development shall conform to the landscaping requirements set forth in Chapter 7: Subdivision Regulations, of this Code. The Village may approve landscaping features in excess of said standards where determined necessary to achieve the objectives set forth in this Article.

7. Trails: Paths and/or trails for hiking, biking, equestrian or other use should be constructed in residential areas, and as connections to natural features. In addition, paths and/or trails should be provided for convenient access for pedestrians between residential areas.

8. Public Streets:

- a. Except as provided in sub-section (B)(8)(b) of this section, all streets shall be publicly dedicated, and constructed in accordance with applicable standards contained in the Village's Subdivision Code, as may be amended from time to time.
- b. The Village may approve reduced rights of way or pavement width in residential areas if it is determined to be appropriate to foster the rural character of the subject area, to preserve natural features, or for other good reason.
- c. In any residential areas, cross-connections to adjacent tracts of land, and to existing road stubs, should be provided.

9. Vehicular Access: Points of vehicular ingress and egress to the Planned Residential Development site shall be designed to maintain the safety and operational efficiency of the Village's streets. Cross access (at least, by road stubs) between the Planned Residential Development and outside properties shall be provided where feasible.

10. Size of Development: The minimum size for a Planned Residential Development is fifty (50) acres.

11. Underground Utilities: All utilities (including electric, telephone, gas and cable television) shall be installed underground.

12. Tree Replacement: The Petitioner should evidence substantial compliance with the Village's tree replacement policy.

13. Preliminary Approval: Preliminary approval of a Planned Residential Development

by the Village board shall be null and void, in the event that the Petitioner has failed to submit for and diligently pursue approval of a Final Development Plan for at least one phase of the proposed development within twelve (12) months of the date of approval of the Preliminary Plan.

14. Completion: Construction of the Planned Residential Development shall be substantially completed within the period of time proposed by the Petitioner and established in the development ordinance, provided, the Petitioner may request and the Board of Trustees may approve an extension of time for good cause shown. In general, each phase of a Planned Residential Development should be completed within two (2) years of the date of approval of the final plat for such phase; the Board of Trustees may allow a longer time, when the scope or complexity of the development may require it.

15. Compliance with Zoning or other Codes and Ordinances: Where there is a conflict between the provisions of this Article and any other provision or provisions of this Code, the provisions of this Article shall prevail. Except as otherwise set forth herein, all other applicable Village Code provisions shall apply to the Planned Residential Development.

16. Exceptions: The Plan Commission may recommend, and the Village board may approve, exceptions to the standards and criteria set forth in this Article when determined by the Village to be necessary to achieve the planning objectives set forth in this Article.

* * *

A. Open Space/Greenbelt: Open space shall be provided for Village residents in the form of parks, greenbelts, open space and recreational facilities, consistent with regulatory and policy directives of the Village and the provisions of this article.

1. Unless otherwise recommended by the Plan Commission and approved by the Village board, or unless otherwise provided by annexation agreement, not less than forty percent (40%) of the land within a Planned Residential Development shall be designated as open space, greenbelt and/or recreational facilities.

* * *

10. Not less than thirty percent (30%) of the total open space of any Planned Residential Development shall be unencumbered by environmental resources such as wetlands, streams, floodplains, floodways, creeks, or the like that render such space unusable for active recreation purposes. Conversely, not more than seventy percent (70%) of the total open space of any Planned Residential Development shall consist of an area or areas encumbered by such environmental resources.

B. Density Shift: Density within designated areas of a Planned Residential Development

may be established taking into consideration open space and/or recreational facilities provided under this section, subject to the limitation that in no event shall the maximum density in the development exceed 1.75 dwelling units per acre of the total gross area of the entire development.

C. Lot Size; Density: For purposes of calculating density, and unless otherwise recommended by the Plan Commission and approved by the Board of Trustees, actual lot size shall be as provided in the ordinance approving the Planned Residential Development. Provided, notwithstanding the above, the Plan Commission may recommend and the Board of Trustees may require minimum lot sizes that are larger than the minimum otherwise specified elsewhere in the Village zoning regulations, if in the sole judgment of the Village, deemed necessary or advisable to achieve the objectives of the comprehensive plan or those of this article.

D. Design: Dwellings in all Planned Residential Developments shall be designed to blend with the landscape of which they are a part. Both visual and acoustical privacy for residents shall be provided by means of site and architectural design. The Village may establish architectural controls as guidelines and standards for Planned Residential Developments. (Ord. 05-02, 2-10-2005)

15. The proceedings at the public hearing were recorded by certified shorthand reporter, and a transcript thereof, with all comments and questions raised at the public hearing, has been or will be filed with the Village Clerk.

16. Additional Findings (if any):

- a) It was suggested that the Developer re-locate the proposed duplex units shown on the Preliminary Development Plan at a location adjacent to Ruth Park to the 40-acre parcel on the south side of IL 72; and replace those duplex units with single family residences at the location by the Park.
- b) Members of the public expressed concern about future traffic on Century Drive / Johnson Drive in the adjacent White Oak Subdivision; and it was noted that a northern extension of Runge Road to connect with the proposed roadway in Tuscany Woods Unit #2 would require removal of a large stand of old oak trees; and construction of some other connection to Jake Lane may be blocked by wetlands. It was the consensus of the Commission that the trees should not be removed.

ACTION(S)

A. On motion by T. Wetzel, seconded by W. Rossetti, to recommend to the Zoning Board of Appeals approval of the Petition for Zoning Amendment, in part from R-2 Single Family Residential Zoning District and in part from R-3 Two-Family Residential Zoning District, to establish a Planned Residential Development for the part of Tuscany Woods Subdivision lying outside of Unit #1, subject to removing the duplex units from the area north of IL 72 by Ruth Park, converting that area to single family residences, and re-locating the duplex units to the area south of IL 72, the vote of the Plan Commission was 4 aye - 0 nay, as follows:

William Robinson	<u> x </u>	_____
William Rossetti	<u> x </u>	_____
Ken Swanson	<u> x </u>	_____
Timothy Wetzel	<u> x </u>	_____

B. On motion by T. Wetzel, seconded by W. Rossetti, to recommend to the Zoning Board of Appeals approval of the Preliminary Development Plan for the part of Tuscany Woods Subdivision lying outside of platted Unit #1, subject to removing the duplex units from the area north of IL 72 by Ruth Park, converting that area to single family residences, and re-locating the duplex units to the area south of IL 72, the vote of the Plan Commission was _____ aye - _____ nay, as follows:

William Robinson	<u> x </u>	_____
William Rossetti	<u> x </u>	_____
Ken Swanson	<u> x </u>	_____
Timothy Wetzel	<u> x </u>	_____

It is accordingly the recommendation of the Plan Commission that the Petition to Establish a Planned Residential Development, for the part of the Tuscany Woods Subdivision lying outside of Unit #1 (and sometimes referred to an "Unit 2") be X approved with conditions / _____ denied.

And, it is accordingly the recommendation of the Plan Commission that the Petition for approval of the Preliminary Development Plan for said Planned Residential Development be X approved with conditions / _____ denied.

Dated: January 22, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

VILLAGE OF HAMPSHIRE
PLAN COMMISSION

By: _____
William Robinson
Chair

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

THAT PART OF SECTIONS 26 AND 23 , TOWNSHIP 42 NORTH, RANGE 6 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN IN THE VILLAGE OF HAMPSHIRE, KANE COUNTY, ILLINOIS, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 26; THENCE NORTH 00 DEGREES 00 MINUTES 48 SECONDS WEST ON AN ASSUMED BEARING ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 26 A DISTANCE OF 1313.02 FEET FOR THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE CONTINUING NORTH 00 DEGREES 00 MINUTES 48 SECONDS WEST ALONG SAID WEST LINE, 1326.74 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 26; THENCE NORTH 00 DEGREES 00 MINUTES 55 SECONDS EAST ALONG THE WEST LINE OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 23, 1184.86 FEET TO THE SOUTH LINE OF THAT PROPERTY CONVEYED ACCORDING TO DOCUMENT NUMBER 2006K007545; THENCE SOUTH 89 DEGREES 56 MINUTES 57 SECONDS EAST ALONG SAID SOUTH LINE, 1916.50 FEET TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID PROPERTY CONVEYED BY SAID DOCUMENT NUMBER 2006K007545; THENCE NORTH 00 DEGREES 03 MINUTES 03 SECONDS EAST ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID PROPERTY CONVEYED BY SAID DOCUMENT NUMBER 2006K007545, 50.00 FEET TO THE SOUTHERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF THE CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE, ST. PAUL AND PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY; THENCE SOUTH 89 DEGREES 56 MINUTES 57 SECONDS EAST ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE, 742.05 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVATURE; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY RIGHT OF

WAY LINE, BEING A CURVE TO THE RIGHT, HAVING A RADIUS OF 5751.33 FEET, CHORD BEARING SOUTH 83 DEGREES 20 MINUTES 37 SECONDS EAST AND ARC LENGTH OF 1326.15 FEET TO THE EAST LINE OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 23; THENCE SOUTH 00 DEGREES 07 MINUTES 39 SECONDS EAST ALONG SAID EAST LINE, 1074.29 FEET TO THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID SOUTHEAST QUARTER; THENCE NORTH 89 DEGREES 48 MINUTES 41 SECONDS EAST ALONG SAID SOUTH LINE, 660.04 FEET TO THE EAST LINE OF THE WEST HALF OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 26; THENCE SOUTH 00 DEGREES 16 MINUTES 58 SECONDS EAST ALONG SAID EAST LINE, 1315.21 FEET TO THE SOUTH LINE OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 26; THENCE SOUTH 89 DEGREES 48 MINUTES 16 SECONDS WEST ALONG SAID SOUTH LINE, 661.32 FEET TO THE WEST LINE OF THE EAST HALF OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 26; THENCE SOUTH 00 DEGREES 13 MINUTES 38 SECONDS EAST ALONG SAID WEST LINE, 1265.32 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 89 DEGREES 47 MINUTES 51 SECONDS WEST, 630.25 FEET TO THE EAST LINE OF TUSCANY WOODS UNIT 1 ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED AS DOCUMENT NUMBER 2006K139816; THENCE NORTH 04 DEGREES 30 MINUTES 20 SECONDS WEST ALONG SAID EAST LINE, 50.14 FEET; THENCE NORTH 04 DEGREES 05 MINUTES 00 SECONDS EAST ALONG SAID EAST LINE, 1380.86 FEET TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID TUSCANY WOODS; THENCE SOUTH 89 DEGREES 47 MINUTES 51 SECONDS WEST ALONG SAID NORTH LINE, 754.24 FEET TO THE EAST LINE OF ROMKE ROAD AS DEDICATED BY SAID DOCUMENT NUMBER 2006K139816; THENCE NORTH 00 DEGREES 12 MINUTES 09 SECONDS WEST, 141.57 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVATURE; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY ALONG A CURVE TO THE RIGHT HAVING A RADIUS OF 385.00 FEET, CHORD BEARING NORTH 44 DEGREES 47 MINUTES 51 SECONDS EAST AND ARC LENGTH OF 604.76 FEET TO A POINT OF TANGENCY; THENCE NORTH 89 DEGREES 47 MINUTES 51 SECONDS EAST, 409.15 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVATURE; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG A CURVE TO THE LEFT HAVING A RADIUS OF 465.00 FEET, CHORD BEARING NORTH 83 DEGREES 32 MINUTES 49 SECONDS EAST AND ARC LENGTH OF 101.46 FEET; THENCE NORTH 04 DEGREES 05 MINUTES 04 SECONDS EAST, 84.37 FEET; TO THE NORTH LINE OF SAID ROMKE ROAD; THENCE WESTERLY, ALONG SAID NORTH LINE, ALONG A CURVE TO THE RIGHT HAVING A RADIUS OF 385.00 FEET, CHORD BEARING SOUTH 81 DEGREES 43 MINUTES 57 SECONDS EAST AND ARC LENGTH OF 108.38 FEET TO A POINT OF TANGENCY; THENCE SOUTH 89 DEGREES 47 MINUTES 51 SECONDS WEST, 409.15 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVATURE; THENCE SOUTHWESTERLY, ALONG SAID NORTH LINE, ALONG A CURVE TO THE LEFT HAVING A RADIUS OF 465.00 FEET, CHORD BEARING SOUTH 44 DEGREES 47 MINUTES 51 SECONDS WEST AND ARC LENGTH OF 730.42 FEET TO A POINT OF TANGENCY; THENCE SOUTH 00 DEGREES 12 MINUTES 09 SECONDS EAST, 141.57 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 89 DEGREES 47 MINUTES 51 SECONDS WEST, 554.51 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVATURE; THENCE NORTHWESTERLY ALONG A CURVE TO THE

RIGHT HAVING A RADIUS OF 310.00 FEET, CHORD BEARING NORTH 66 DEGREES 33 MINUTES 51 SECONDS WEST AND ARC LENGTH OF 255.79 FEET TO A POINT OF TANGENCY; THENCE NORTH 42 DEGREES 55 MINUTES 33 SECONDS WEST, 237.98 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVATURE; THENCE WESTERLY ALONG A CURVE TO THE LEFT HAVING A RADIUS OF 390.00 FEET, CHORD BEARING NORTH 66 DEGREES 33 MINUTES 51 SECONDS WEST AND ARC LENGTH OF 321.80 FEET TO A POINT OF TANGENCY; THENCE SOUTH 89 DEGREES 47 MINUTES 51 SECONDS WEST, 263.57 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVATURE; THENCE SOUTHWESTERLY ALONG A CURVE TO THE LEFT HAVING A RADIUS OF 590.00 FEET, CHORD BEARING SOUTH 64 DEGREES 01 MINUTES 34 SECONDS WEST AND ARC LENGTH OF 530.76 FEET TO A POINT OF TANGENCY; THENCE SOUTH 38 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 18 SECONDS WEST, 309.48 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVATURE; THENCE WESTERLY ALONG A CURVE TO THE RIGHT HAVING A RADIUS OF 260.00 FEET, CHORD BEARING SOUTH 64 DEGREES 00 MINUTES 14 SECONDS WEST AND ARC LENGTH OF 233.69 FEET TO A POINT OF TANGENCY; THENCE SOUTH 89 DEGREES 45 MINUTES 10 SECONDS WEST, 246.72 TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING. IN THE VILLAGE OF HAMPSHIRE, KANE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

AND ALSO:

THE NORTHEAST $\frac{1}{4}$ OF THE SOUTHWEST $\frac{1}{4}$ OF SECTION 26, TOWNSHIP 42 NORTH, RANGE 6 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, IN THE VILLAGE OF HAMPSHIRE, KANE COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

PINS: 01-23-300-006; 01-23-400-007; 01-26-100-015; 01-26-100-016; 01-26-200-013; 01-26- 300-004; and 01-26-100-009.

Common Address: That part of the Tuscan Woods Subdivision lying outside of Unit 1 thereof, as platted by Doc. No. 2006K139816, in the Village of Hampshire, Kane County, Illinois, and located generally north of Jake Lane, and east of Runge Road, and located south of IL 72, and west of Romke Road, in the Village.

VILLAGE OF HAMPSHIRE PLAN COMMISSION

Meeting
January 8, 2018

A meeting of the Village of Hampshire Plan Commission was called to order on January 8, 2017 at Hampshire Village Hall at 7:00 p.m. Present was Chair William Robinson, and members Timothy Wetzel, William Rossetti, and Ken Swanson. No one was absent. A quorum was present.

The Commission next took up for the matter of public hearing on the Petition filed by Hampshire Property, LLC to establish a Planned Residential Development in the Village, including a Zoning Map Amendment to re-zone the property in Tuscany Woods Subdivision lying outside of platted Unit J#1 (also referred to as Tuscany Woods Subdivision, Unit #2), in part from R-2 Single Family Residential Zoning District, and in part from R-3 Two-Family Residential Zoning District, to Planned Residential Development Zoning District, and for re-subdivision of the territory comprising Unit #2 in accordance with a proposed Preliminary Development Plan.

On motion made by W. Rossetti, seconded by T. Wetzel, and approved by unanimous vote, the public hearing was opened at 7:03 p.m.

The Village Attorney recited that notice of this public hearing had been published in the Daily Herald newspaper on December 22, 2017; and that a Certificate of Publication is on file with the Village Clerk.

Mr. Thomas Burney, attorney for the applicant, recited that notice had been mailed to adjacent property owners, and he presented proof of mailing, and receipts for certified mail, to be filed with the Village Clerk.

Mr. Burney further recited that Notice had been posted on the property more than 15 days prior to the public hearing.

On motion by _____, seconded by _____, and approved by unanimous vote, the public hearing was closed at _____ p.m.

A certified shorthand reporter took a verbatim record of all testimony and evidence presented at the public hearing, including also the deliberations of the Plan Commission members thereafter, and will file a transcript of the public hearing with the Village Clerk in due course.

After discussion by the members of the Plan Commission, on motion by T. Wetzel, seconded by W. Rossetti, to recommend approval of the Petition to Establish a Planned Residential Development on the property in Tuscany Woods Subdivision lying outside of platted Unit #1 in the Village, subject to removing the duplex units from the area north of IL 72 by Ruth Park, converting that area to single family residences, and re-locating the duplex units to the area south of IL 72, the vote was 4 aye and 0 nay. Motion passed.

On motion by T. Wetzel, seconded by W. Rossetti, to recommend approval of the proposed Preliminary Development Plan for said Planned Residential Development, subject to removing the duplex units from the area north of IL 72 by Ruth Park, converting that area to single family residences, and re-locating the duplex units to the area south of IL 72, the vote was 4 aye and 0 nay. Motion passed.

The minutes of the meeting of the Plan Commission held on October 9, 2017 were read, and on motion made by T. Wetzel, seconded by W. Rossetti the minutes were approved by vote of 4 aye, 0 nay. Motion passed.

There was no other business to come before the Commission.

On motion by T. Wetzel, seconded by W. Rossetti, and unanimous voice vote, the meeting was adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Kenneth Swanson
Secretary / Plan Commission

Questions from Oct. 2017 / Concept Plan review:

1. Mr. Small noted that the range of lots size would provide a better mix of housing types in this subdivision.
2. Commissioner Wetzel noted that there are smaller homes in Unit #1, and he would prefer larger homes to better protect property values in the village. Mr. Small noted that there would be no townhomes in Unit #2. He hoped that the Petitioner would sell the development to Wm. Ryan Homes, for example.
3. In regard to detention/retention ponds shown on the Concept Plan, it was asked if any had been constructed, and will they be wet bottom or dry bottom areas. Mr. Small responded that two of the ponds (wet bottom) had been built to date, in support of development in Unit #1; and the others will be constructed as part of the development of Unit #2 (and will be wet bottom).
4. Commissioner Wetzel inquired if Unit #2 will utilize infrastructure constructed for Unit #1; and if so, stated that residents of Unit #2 should make payments of special taxes (so as to reduce the payments due from current owners in Unit #1). Mr. Small responded that there is no SSA on Unit #2, because the owners paid off the special taxes/bonds for that area. Also, it was noted that wastewater from Unit #2 will be conveyed directly north and west without traveling through Unit #1. The developer will be responsible to construct the infrastructure needed for Unit #2.
5. There is a walking pathway depicted on the Concept Plan; Mr. Small noted that the developer would be responsible to construct a small portion (in the NE corner of the territory) and he did not know who would construct the pathway through Orris Ruth Park.
6. There is a natural gas pipeline through the subdivision. There is some "trigger point" (number of homes) at which the pipeline company will be required at its expense to improve the pipeline within the easement.
7. Commissioner Rosetti asked why Petitioner felt that this change in the development plan would be good for the village. Mr. Small responded that building out the stalled development area, and including a commercial tract, would be good for the village. The market calls for smaller lots; the younger generation prefers less yard to maintain. It also allows for infrastructure to be used more efficiently. It does not necessarily threaten property values.
8. Commissioner Wetzel asked why the commercial tract was only 4 acres in size. Mr. Small responded that he would be happy if the market called for a larger space; but his experience is that less and less commercial space is called for, given the rise of e-commerce.
9. Commissioner Wetzel noted that he believed people move to Hampshire to obtain more house for their money. Mr. Small noted that his company also owns a large tract of vacant land on the west side of Elgin, and no one has been interested in buying and developing it.
10. Commissioner Robinson noted that more homes are needed in Hampshire to attract needed commercial development. Also, the market now is for homes in the range of \$200,000 - \$300,000. He believed that this development by itself cannot restore property values to the former range of value.
11. There was discussion about how close together the houses would be on the smaller lots. Mr. Small explained that some might be 15' apart (7.5 on each side), and others would be 20' apart (10' on each side).
12. Commissioner Wetzel asked if the existing Development Agreement could be amended; the Village Attorney responded that amendments were possible, but would take agreement of the parties. No amendment to the Development Agreement would come before the Plan Commission, but any such amendment would be considered by the Board of Trustees.
13. Dr. Scarpino, local school board member, requested that the following information be provided to CUSD 300: 1) bedroom count for the development; 2) starting date for the development; 3) absorption rate for anticipated sales in the development; and 4) confirmation that the impact fees and transition fees due from the development

will not be waived by the Village. Mr. Small responded that he would not anticipate any development during then next two years; and that a estimate of bedroom count could be made now, but would ultimately depend on the builder. The Village Attorney and Village Engineer responded that a review of the Development Agreement would need to be done to answer regarding impact fees due from this development.

14. The Commission asked what Impact fees and transition fees would be due from the developer of Unit #2. A review of the original Development Agreement will be required.
15. In regard to Orris Ruth Park, there is no playground. It was asked, whose responsibility was it to construct the playground depicted on the Phase I Park Improvements Plan? Would this developer do it?
16. Ms. Schraw inquired as to why the Phase I Park Improvements had not been completed, according to plan; and asked what amount of funds for park purposes might yet be due from this development. She noted that Park District funds are limited. It was also noted that Orris Ruth Park had recently been conveyed to the Park District.
17. Ms. Schraw commented that she hoped that adequate parking would be provided for the duplex units, so as to avoid overflow parking in Orris Ruth Park.