

# VILLAGE OF HAMPSHIRE PLAN COMMISSION

## MINUTES February 22, 2021

A meeting of the Village of Hampshire Plan Commission was convened at 7:05 p.m. by Chairman Bryan Mroch. Present in person were Chairman Mroch, and Commissioners L. Rapach; A. Neal, and K. Swanson. Commissioners W. Rossetti and T. Wetzel participated in the meeting via video or telephonic conferencing. Village President J. Magnussen, Village Manager Jay Hedges (in person), assistant to the Village Manager, Josh Wray, were present; and Village Attorney Mark Schuster attended via video conferencing.

On motion by A. Neal, seconded by L. Rapach, the minutes of the meeting of February 8, 2021 were approved by vote of 5 aye, 0 nay.

The first order of business was to consider the the Petition of Hampshire East LLC (Crown) for zoning amendment for certain property to be annexed to the Village and added to the Oakstead Development, to classify the new property in the Planned Residential Development Zoning District, together with the Application of Hampshire East, LLC (Crown) for approval of a revised Preliminary Development Plan for the Oakstead Community in the Village. The matters were taken together for purposes of taking public comment and questions at the public hearing.

Mr. Dan Olsem appeared for the Petitioner, and introduced the Petition for the Commissioners. He was accompanied by: C. Naatz, R. Olson/Weber Planning; D. Gauger/engineer; and V. Mosca/environmental consultant. Mr. Olsem explained that Crown had acquired an additional 59 ± acres (a portion of the Weseman Farm), and desired to add it to its existing Planned Residential Development known as Oakstead Community in the Village. A new elementary school would be constructed on an 11-acre site (on the new territory) to be conveyed to CUSD-300. Mr. Olsem also briefly reviewed the history of the Oakstead Development and approvals for the development obtained in 2005. Mr. Olsem introduced Mr. Rich Olson/Weber Planning, to review the proposed modifications to the original Preliminary Development Plan for the Oakstead Development.

Mr. Olson stated that he had been retained to take a “fresh look” at the former plan, and to incorporate the new territory into the overall plan for the development, now comprised of about 550 acres. He considered the topography of the site and its natural features. The development would consist of some 797 single-family dwellings, and 216 Active Adult ranch-style townhomes. Mr. Olson mentioned the following features of the proposed, revised Preliminary Development Plan for the Oakstead Development:

- A spine road, to be landscaped
- Pods A through S throughout the proposed development, for differing types of dwelling units, and with entry monuments.
- Open space areas, some dividing the residential pods
- Preservation of stands of oak trees
- Planting of 1,000's of new trees

- Park spaces in each Pod.
- Walking pathways
- A school site
- Detention areas, some with 'overlooks' into open spaces.

Members of the public made comments as follows:

Questions were raised by a few persons about the stormwater run-off and drainage in the area. Mr. and Mrs. Pickle, Lane Burnidge, and Barbara Burton inquired about stormwater management planning for the Oakstead Development. The Pickle Farm and the Burnidge Farm are located to the northeast of the Oakstead Development between the school site and the church site. The Burton property is on the north side of Big Timber Road just east of Lakewood. They noted that their properties are subject to periodic flooding, and it is not uncommon for water to flow over and across Big Timber Road from south to north; and that the culverts and bridges in the area may not be adequate to handle additional run-off caused by development of the subject property.

The response was that Oakstead would take in water from any farm tiles to the west, run stormwater through its own storm sewer system into three detention ponds, and then release the water at a restricted rate (in accordance with the Village and County Stormwater Regulations) into the Lakewood storm sewer system, discharging to the northwest. Stormwater run-off from Oakstead would not be channeled into drain tiles on the neighboring farms. Therefore, stormwater runoff should not be increased for any of the questioning parties.

It was also noted that there is an existing floodplain through the Crown property, running west to east and continuing onto the Pickle and Burnidge farms. This floodplain will be left in a natural state, and water from that floodplain area may continue to affect the Pickle and Burnidge properties, as it always has.

Wesley Brazas questioned the effect of the development on the local aquifer. The response was that Crown had funded the construction of a new well, and the Tamms Farm water tower, to provide sufficient water supply and distribution capacity for the entire Oakstead property. The deep well operated by the Village should have no effect on the performance of the shallow wells in the area. Also, Crown had reviewed the recent Kane County Aquifer Study, and found that only a small portion of the Oakstead Development was within an area identified by the study as one of concern.

Barbara Burton asked if local roads would be widened to 200 feet ROW as a result of the Crown Development. The response was that improvements for the entrance from Big Timber Road at Ridgecrest Drive would be completed with additional turn lanes, and that Crown was unaware of any general plan to widen the right-of-way of either Big Timber Road or US Highway 20 to 200 feet width. Such plans would be under the purview of KDOT or IDOT, respectively.

A question was asked, if the church site would have a direct access to Big Timber Road? The response was that Crown is committed to allowing a church at this site, unless the dedicating party abandons its request; and any access to Big Timber Road for the site would be determined by KDOT.

Wesley Brazas asked about a number of reports, and whether they had been “updated”, to wit: a traffic plan; a water supply plan; and a financial plan. The response was that a traffic plan is under review with the Village; there is no water plan; and there is no updated financial plan.

Barbara Burton asked what would be the impact of leveling the Oakstead site, including removal of all the trees; and has a study been done? The response was that there was no study. In particular, as to the Pod J as shown on the Preliminary Development Plan, the response was that Crown would remove “as few trees as possible” behind that Pod. Ms. Burton commented that since trees hold water, removing trees would increase the rate of runoff.

Ms. Burton inquired whether Crown had filed a new endangered species report. The response was that IDNR had signed off on the premises as to endangered species.

Ms. Burton inquired if there would be a special service area imposed on the residences in this development? The response was “no.”

Ms. Burton inquired if the Village would use eminent domain to acquire right-of-way for any road projects. The response was that the Village would not, but that the County might do so for any project for widening of Big Timber Road.

Ms. Burton inquired about traffic on Big Timber Road, especially student drivers and whether any study had been done. The response was that Big Timber Road is a County Road in general, and any studies of the frequency of accidents would have been done by KDOT.

Ms. Burton inquired about the size of trees to be planted by Crown on the site. The response was that it had not yet been concluded, or decisions made about new plantings, but that Crown typically planted trees of 2.5” diameter.

Ms. Burton asked if materials related to the proposed Preliminary Development Plan could be deposited at the public library for public review. The response was that the Village would set that up.

Commissioners commented as follows:

Mr. Wetzel asked about trees to be removed from the site. The response was that a survey had been done, but there was no specific count of trees to be removed as of yet.

Mr. Rapach asked if the revised plan called for changes to the access points for the development; and that if any new access points were to be added, a further amendment would be required.

Mr. Neal noted that the property would drain to the north, into the Lakewood system, and should help the neighbors who were present to comment and question the applicant at the meeting.

Mr. Rapach asked to confirm that access to the school site was via the roadway into Oakstead, aligning with Ridgecrest Drive / Lakewood entrance. The response was “Yes.”

On motion by A. Neal, seconded by L. Rapach, to close the public hearing, the vote was 5 aye, 0 nay. Motion passed. The public hearing was closed at 8:26 p.m.

On motion by A. Neal, and seconded by T. Wetzel, to recommend approval of the Petition for Zoning Amendment, to classify the newly acquired property to be added to the Oakstead Community in the Planned Residential Development Zoning District, the vote was 5 aye, 0 nay. Motion passed.

On motion by L. Rapach, seconded by A. Neal, to recommend approval of the proposed revised Preliminary Development Plan for the entire Oakstead Community, the vote was 5 aye, 0 nay; Motion passed.

On motion by K. Swanson, seconded by T. Wetzel, to authorize the Chair to report these results to the Village Board of Trustees, the vote was 5 aye and 0 nay. Motion passed.

On motion by A. Neal and seconded by L. Rapach the meeting was adjourned at 8:52 p.m., the vote was 5 aye, 0 nay.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Ken Swanson  
Secretary

DRAFT