

Village President

Jennifer Konen

Village Administrator

Scott Koeppel

Village Clerk

Tracey R. Conti



Village Trustees

Matthew Bonnie

Sean Herron

Heidi Lendi

Sean Michels

Michael Schomas

James F. White

**MINUTES
VILLAGE OF SUGAR GROVE
BOARD MEETING
AUGUST 20, 2024, 6:00 P.M.
ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL CENTER, ROOMS A, B, AND C
45783 ILLINOIS 47, SUGAR GROVE, IL 60554
SUGAR GROVE, IL 60554**

1. Call to Order

President Konen called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

Trustee Herron led the pledge of allegiance

3. Roll Call

The Village Board meeting was held in person at Waubensee Community College Academic and Professional Center on August 20, 2024.

Present: President Jennifer Konen, Trustee Sean Herron, Trustee Matthew Bonnie, Trustee Michael Schomas, Trustee Sean Michels, Trustee James F. White, and Trustee Heidi Lendi

Absent: None

Additional Attendees: Village Administrator Scott Koeppel, Finance Director Anastasia, Public Works Director Merkel, Community Development Director Danielle Marion, Community Development Director Michael Cassa, Police Chief Pat Rollins, Attorney Laura Julien, Village Clerk Tracey Conti, TIF Attorney Kathy Orr, and Geoff Dickinson from SB Friedman Development Advisors, LLC

President Konen explained that several business items must be addressed before the Public Hearing for the Annexation Agreement of Sugar Grove LLC, which concerns the property at I-88 and IL-47. During the hearing, everyone will be allowed to make a public comment and will be given three minutes. Any documents for the Board should be placed in the box next to the podium, and staff will ensure that the documents are shared with the Trustees.

4. Public Hearing

a. Annexation Agreement Amendment – Hannaford Farms (Lot 79)

Community Development Director Danielle Marion explained that once the filer fee is paid, a public hearing is held for every lot in Hannaford Farms. This process amends the Annexation.

This agreement releases the owners of any responsibility since the fee in lieu of development has been paid.

The public hearing closed at 6:02 p.m.

5. Appointments and Presentation

None

6. Airport Report

Tony Speciale presented the airport report, stating that parking lot paving will begin in mid-September. A contract for the quad perimeter roadway is currently in the works. Airfield maintenance is ongoing, and the Solar Panel Project is making progress. Paperwork for all these projects, including the new hangar, is currently being done. Trustee Lendi inquired about FAA approval for the use of solar panels; Tony clarified that it is still pending FAA approval.

7. Public Comment on Scheduled Action Items

None

8. Consent Agenda

- a. Approval: Minutes of the July 16, 2024, Village Board Meeting
- b. Approval: Vouchers
- c. Approval: Treasurer's Report
- d. **Resolution:** Authorizing an Expenditure – IML Conference Attendance
- e. **Resolution:** Approving Sidewalk Replacement Program – Wilson & Sons
- f. **Resolution:** Approving Pavement Marking Program – Preform Traffic Control Systems, Ltd.
- g. **Ordinance:** Amending Village Code; Title 3, Chapter 7 – Tobacco Products: Illinois Vaping Law
- h. **Ordinance:** Text Amendment: Title 12, Chapter 11 - Subdivision Standards
- i. **Ordinance:** Adopting Engineering Manual

Trustee White requested that the Resolution Authorizing and Expenditure – IML Conference Attendance be removed from the Consent Agenda.

Motion by Trustee Schomas, second by Trustee Herron, to approve the Consent Agenda as presented except for Item d.

Ayes: Schomas, Herron, White, Michels, Lendi, Bonnie; Nays: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None. MOTION CARRIED

Trustee White stated that he would abstain from the vote on Item d. because he will attend the IML Conference. Trustee Lendi explained that she doesn't favor this because she feels money shouldn't be spent on a hotel when commuting is an option.

Motion by Trustee Schomas, second by Trustee Herron, to approve a Resolution Authorizing an Expenditure – IML Conference Attendance.

Ayes: Herron, Bonnie, Michels, Schomas; Nays: Lendi; Abstain: White; Absent: None. MOTION CARRIED

9. General Business

a. Ordinance: Approving Annexation Agreement Amendment – Hannaford Farms (Lot 79)

Danielle Marion mentioned that this is the next step in releasing the residents from any future obligations after payment of the fee in lieu of development.

Motion by Trustee Herron, second by Trustee Schomas, to approve an Ordinance Approving Annexation Agreement Amendment – Hannaford Farms (Lot 79).

Ayes: Herron, Schomas, Michels, White, Lendi, Bonnie; Nays: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None. MOTION CARRIED

b. Resolution: Approving Copier Lease

Matt Anastasia pointed out that the lease for the Konica Minolta copiers at Village Hall, Public Works, and the Police Department will expire in September 2024. Seven responses were received for the RFP, with Konica offering the best deal for four new machines under a single lease and a 60-month rate lock on service costs.

Motion by Trustee Herron, second by Trustee Schomas, to approve a Resolution Approving Copier Lease, subject to attorney approval.

Ayes: White, Schomas, Michels, Lendi, Herron, Bonnie; Nays: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None. MOTION CARRIED

c. Resolution: Approving the Purchase of Additional Body-Worn Cameras

Police Chief Rollins explained that, according to the Safety Act, all officers must wear body-worn cameras by January 1, 2025. Although the department deployed cameras in January 2023, they realized they would need more to meet the deadline. To address this, they plan to purchase seven additional cameras. Director Anastasia secured a \$14,000 grant to help cover this expense.

Motion by Trustee Schomas, second by Trustee Herron, to approve a Resolution Approving the Purchase of Additional Body-Worn Cameras.

Ayes: Schomas, Herron, Michels, White, Lendi, Bonnie; Nays: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None. MOTION CARRIED

d. Ratification/Resolution: Approving an IGA with ILEAS for the DNC Mobile Field Force Team

Police Chief Rollins stated that the Democratic National Convention is taking place in Chicago. The City of Chicago, in collaboration with the Illinois Law Enforcement Alarm System (ILEAS), requested additional support. An officer from the Village, who is part of the Mobile Field Force, was deployed to Chicago on August 16, 2024. An intergovernmental agreement needed to be signed for this deployment, and the Village seeks ratification of this agreement. The costs for the officer's deployment will be reimbursed to the Village.

Motion by Trustee Schomas, second by Trustee Bonnie, to approve a Ratification/Resolution Approving the IGA with ILEAS for the DNC Mobile Field Force Team.

Ayes: Schomas, Bonnie, Michels, White, Lendi, Herron; Nays: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None. MOTION CARRIED

10. Discussion Items

a. Architectural Services – Police Department Improvements (Cordogan Clark)

Administrator Koepfel explained that the Village Board had previously hired Williams Architects for a police station remodeling project. After reviewing Williams' final presentation, staff found that none of the plans met the budget or needs, and they were uncomfortable recommending them. Staff now proposes hiring Cordogan Clark for a more detailed assessment and new concept plans.

Brian Kronewitter from Cordogan Clark, who has experience with several police department projects, assured that his firm could meet the village's goals within budget, offering more detailed options and renderings.

Trustee Lendi questioned why we're not working with Williams to refine their plans instead of incurring additional costs with a new firm. Administrator Koepfel stated that Williams could be revisited if the Board decides to do so. Trustee White and President Konen noted that Williams' plans did not meet budget or needs.

Mr. Kronewitter committed to reviewing Williams' work and addressing budget concerns. Trustee Michels opposed the extra expense, while Trustee Bonnie favored starting with Cordogan Clark if Williams' plans were unsatisfactory. Trustee Lendi asked about the availability of CAD documents from Williams, which might affect Cordogan Clark's work. President Konen noted that the previous space analysis with Williams did not align with the budget.

Trustee Schomas emphasized that the Village should own all intellectual property from projects moving forward.

President Konen requested staff to answer Trustee Lendi's questions and return the matter for further discussion under General Business at the next regularly scheduled Board Meeting.

b. Text Amendment: Solar – Alternative Installer Certification for Plan Review

Danielle Marion explained the proposed solar text amendment for solar regulations and zoning. The amendment suggests adding an ICC certification as an alternative to the current NABCEP PV Installation Badge requirement for solar installers. Some solar companies and residents have objected to this requirement, finding it unreasonable. The Plan Commission held a public hearing on July 17, 2024, to discuss this but did not recommend approval due to concerns about resident protection. Staff is now seeking feedback from the Board on whether to prepare an ordinance for approval.

President Konen asked speakers to approach the podium if they had public comments about the solar amendment.

1. Mike Rayburn spoke in favor of the ICC Certification for solar installers

2. Christine Peterson spoke in favor of the ICC Certification for solar installers

Trustee White was open to changes regarding solar panel installer certifications. Trustee Michels inquired about the ICC Certification, and Danielle Marion explained that while the Village previously accepted only ICC Certification, the Board had added the NABCEP PV Installation Badge due to concerns about the ICC process, which involves only five installations without quality review. An expert confirmed ICC Certification as a reputable alternative to the NABCEP PV Installation Badge.

Trustee Lendi wanted details on the NABCEP PV process, and Danielle Marion noted it is more stringent. Trustee Schomas expressed concerns about undermining the Plan Commission's vote and requested more information on the certification differences.

President Konen expressed concerns about residential safety and competitive disadvantage, seeking more information from Danielle Marion. Village Administrator Scott Koeppel mentioned that the NABCEP PV requirement was introduced on May 2, 2023. President Konen requested that this issue be revisited at the next regularly scheduled Village Board meeting under general business.

11. Public Hearing

a. Annexation Agreement of Sugar Grove LLC. Property at I-88 and IL-47

1. Judy Childres spoke against the Annexation Agreement
2. Kim Tee spoke against the Annexation Agreement
3. Larry Jones spoke in favor of the Annexation Agreement
4. Casey More spoke against the Annexation Agreement
5. Laura Turpin spoke against the Annexation Agreement
6. Bill Myers spoke against the Annexation Agreement
7. Brian Dalle spoke in favor of the Annexation Agreement
8. Perry Elliott spoke against the Annexation Agreement
9. Carol Green spoke against the Annexation Agreement
10. Monica Hubble spoke against the Annexation Agreement
11. Bob Raimondi spoke against the Annexation Agreement
12. Mike Powers spoke in favor of the Annexation Agreement
13. Dave Pollak spoke against the Annexation Agreement
14. Dan Nagle spoke in favor of the Annexation Agreement
15. Marie Johnson spoke against the Annexation Agreement
16. John Coia spoke in favor of the Annexation Agreement
17. Julia Fewes spoke against the Annexation Agreement
18. Jaden Chada spoke against the Annexation Agreement
19. Dale Essling spoke against the Annexation Agreement
20. Lisa Essling spoke against the Annexation Agreement
21. Eric Schoedl spoke against the Annexation Agreement
22. Tim Slamans spoke against the Annexation Agreement
23. Linda Ray Sacket spoke against the Annexation Agreement
24. Christine Peterson spoke against the Annexation Agreement

25. Brittney Hoeskins spoke against the Annexation Agreement
26. Molly Riemer spoke against the Annexation Agreement
27. Carolyn Anderson spoke against the Annexation Agreement
28. Carrie Stricker spoke against the Annexation Agreement
29. Jim Wilhelm spoke in favor of the Annexation Agreement
30. Ashlyn Slamans spoke against the Annexation Agreement
31. Shelia Albano spoke against the Annexation Agreement
32. Melinda Bossinga spoke against the Annexation Agreement
33. Dave Socket spoke against the Annexation Agreement
34. Randi Olson spoke against the Annexation Agreement
35. Jera Piper spoke against the Annexation Agreement
36. Joshua Piper spoke against the Annexation Agreement
37. Victor Genesy spoke against the Annexation Agreement
38. Dorothy Carlson spoke against the Annexation Agreement

The Public Hearing closed at 8:31 pm.

Break at 8:31 pm, return at 8:51 pm.

Roll Call

Present: President Jennifer Konen, Trustee Sean Herron, Trustee Matthew Bonnie, Trustee Michael Schomas, Trustee Sean Michels, Trustee James F. White, and Trustee Heidi Lendi

Absent: None

12. Presentation

a. The Grove Development – Sugar Grove LLC

Jennifer Cowan, representing Crown Community Development, provided an overview of The Grove, a master-planned community. Key points include:

- **Location and Size:** The Grove spans 760 acres near the I-88 and Route 47 interchange.
- **Land Use:**
 - **Residential:** Includes single-family detached homes, attached homes (townhomes, paired villas), and active adult communities.
 - **Commercial/Retail:** Varied retail and office spaces.
 - **Industrial/Data Centers:** For data centers, distribution, and office use.
 - **Public Amenities:** A town center, green spaces, trails, and a future village hall site.
- **Community Features:**
 - **Town Center:** Includes a walkable commercial area, village hall, village green with event spaces, park with recreational facilities, and farmers market.
 - **Trails and Green Spaces:** 200 acres of open space, over 5 miles of trails, and 70 acres of tree groves.

- **Development Areas:**
 - **Area 1:** Residential only, with 60- and 70-foot lots for single-family homes.
 - **Area 2:** Mixed residential, including detached and attached homes.
 - **Area 3:** Mixed-use, split into two sub-areas with specific regulations. Includes pedestrian-oriented commercial spaces, residential, and civic uses.
 - **Area 4 (Grove Park):** Focused on data centers, distribution, and commercial uses, with a 3.5 million square feet cap on industrial space and enhanced landscaping.
 - **Area 5:** Commercial/Retail, Fueling Station, Office, Multi-Family Residential and Senior Residential.

Exhibits and examples of the various residential types, amenities, and landscaping were presented.

To view the entire presentation, please visit: [Village of Sugar Grove Board Meeting 8-20-24 - YouTube](#). The presentation begins at 2:52:39.

13. Discussion #2

a. Introduction of I-88 and IL-47 Approving, Designating, and Adopting TIF Ordinances

Finance Director Matt Anastasia reviewed the three ordinances required for TIF approval. Trustee Michels asked if SB Friedman Exhibit C was part of the ordinance, and Anastasia confirmed it is an exhibit of the approving ordinance. Trustee Lendi inquired whether the other ordinances would need approval if the eligibility ordinance failed, and Anastasia stated all three must be approved for the TIF to proceed. Trustee Michels questioned why this was considered a redevelopment project, to which Attorney Kathy Orr explained it was due to terminology in the TIF Act. Trustee Lendi expressed concerns that the project may not meet TIF requirements and that such a TIF should be carefully examined. Trustee Michels asked about limits on the number of TIFs a municipality can have, and Attorney Kathy Orr clarified that there is no limit.

b. I-88 and IL-47 TIF Redevelopment Agreement

Trustee Michels questioned why some developer responsibilities are included in the TIF. Matt Anastasia explained that these are TIF-eligible expenses and not mandatory for Board approval. Michels also asked about removing these expenses, and Anastasia stated that would be addressed in the Redevelopment Agreement (RDA).

Michels inquired about the 8% taxable and 6.8% tax-exempt interest rates, to which Anastasia explained that these rates depend on bond counsel and must be certified by a consultant. Anastasia added that the RDA includes payment triggers and that the language is aligned with previous annexation agreements.

President Konen and Jennifer Cowan discussed the need for more detailed provisions in the RDA, particularly regarding park design and ADA compliance. Cowan assured that the details would be finalized in collaboration with the Village and the Park District.

Trustee Michels questioned why the design and implementation of a large water storage tank are included in the TIF, and Anastasia explained this was part of the developer's proposal. However, changes could be made if requested. Trustee Lendi also raised concerns about the location of the water treatment plant near a residence, with Cowan noting it was based on engineering needs but could be reconsidered.

Trustee White asked about water main extensions and whether costs would be recaptured. Cowan explained that the TIF covers backbone infrastructure, not internal site improvements and that future developers would bear the costs. Trustee Michels inquired about sewer service and recapture agreements, with Cowan clarifying that these are separate from the TIF.

Further discussions included the Village's financial obligations under the TIF, potential impacts on local schools, libraries, and fire departments, and the possibility of non-residential development impacting the TIF's financial structure. Matt Anastasia confirmed that the Village's obligation is capped at \$109 million, plus interest, based on certified expenses. Trustee Bonnie asked about the TIF's \$350 million budget, with Anastasia clarifying that this amount covers the entire TIF's lifetime, not just the developer's request. Trustee Lendi asked about the third-party review, which would likely be SB Friedman. This portion of the discussion concluded with details on mass grading and its triggers to minimize interest and ensure timely development.

Matt Anastasia reviewed the agreement, highlighting the distinction between taxable and tax-exempt rates. He noted that the most recent tax-exempt bond in Illinois was issued at a 7% rate in 2023 and clarified that the village does not pay a penalty for opting for tax-exempt financing, as it reduces overall costs through TIF revenue notes. The Village will not issue general obligation bonds for this project; instead, it will rely solely on TIF revenues. Developers can submit reimbursement requests of at least \$1M twice a year, which will require cost certification. Anastasia discussed the substantial completion timeline to help manage interest payments and noted that 100 certificates of occupancy would trigger TIF revenue note issuance, prioritizing principal payments.

Trustee Michels raised concerns about verifying the projected \$340M tax increment and the necessity of the TIF, given the high residential demand. Geoff Dickinson confirmed that independent projections were based on comparable properties. He emphasized that significant infrastructure costs necessitated the TIF. Jennifer Cowan mentioned that the south side of the project requires \$45M in infrastructure improvements.

Trustee Schomas requested a detailed breakdown of project costs by area to be shared before the next meeting. At the same time, Trustee White emphasized ensuring the appropriate number of lots is allocated across the project.

The discussion continued and focused on the number of lots in the project, with Trustee White ensuring adequate distribution across the property. Trustee Bonnie inquired about TIF and its implications for residents, prompting Anastasia to explain that the development will not affect the Village's current revenue and expenses. The TIF funds generated will reimburse

the developer for costs, with no upfront expenses for the Village. Other taxing bodies will continue to receive taxes based on current land value. Still, during the 23-year TIF period, they will not benefit from new taxes generated by the development, although they can still raise their levies based on CPI.

Trustee Michels expressed concerns that the TIF could strain resources for police and fire services, indicating that current TIFs have historically helped developers without distributing excess funds. The discussion included the impact of TIF districts on taxing bodies and service provision.

Trustee White inquired about the eligibility requirements for a TIF district. Attorney Orr clarified that the development must align with the Village's Comprehensive Plan, which it does since the property would be newly annexed and contiguous. Geoff Dickinson addressed concerns about the area's blight status, explaining that an engineering study indicates runoff from the site contributes to flooding in the watershed, meeting TIF standards for vacant land. He emphasized that the Redevelopment Plan complies with TIF regulations, although the Board has the final say.

Trustee Herron questioned why different firms have reached conflicting conclusions about TIF eligibility. Dickinson explained that SB Friedman conducts thorough research and takes responsibility for their findings, affirming their commitment to truthfulness and legal compliance. Trustee Lendi expressed skepticism about the area's blighted status per the TIF intent and noted a meeting with EEI reinforcing her view.

The discussion also touched on potential funding for the school district. Attorney Orr mentioned that increased student enrollment due to the project could qualify the school for additional State funding. President Konen highlighted that new development generally leads to increased school funding.

Recess of Meeting

Motion by Trustee Schomas, second by Trustee Herron to recess the meeting until Thursday, August 22, 2024, at 6:00 p.m. and to resume the discussion at number 13. c.

Ayes: Schomas, Herron, Bonnie, Michels, White, Lendi; Nays: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None. MOTION CARRIED

**VILLAGE OF SUGAR GROVE BOARD MEETING
AUGUST 20, 2024, MEETING CONTINUED ON
AUGUST 22, 2024, 6:00 P.M.
WAUBONSEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL CENTER, ROOMS A, B, C, AND D
45783 ILLINOIS 47, SUGAR GROVE, IL 60554
SUGAR GROVE, IL 60554**

Call to Order

President Konen resumed the August 22, 2024, Village Board Meeting and called the meeting to order at 6:01 pm.

Pledge of Allegiance

Trustee Schomas led the pledge of allegiance.

Roll Call

The Village Board meeting was held in person at Waubonsee Community College Academic and Professional Center on August 22, 2024.

Present: President Jennifer Konen, Trustee Sean Herron, Trustee Matthew Bonnie, Trustee Michael Schomas, Trustee Sean Michels, Trustee James F. White, and Trustee Heidi Lendi

Absent: None

Additional Attendees: Village Administrator Scott Koepfel, , Public Works Director Merkel, Community Development Director Danielle Marion, Community Development Director Michael Cassa, Police Chief Pat Rollins, Attorney Laura Julien, Village Clerk Tracey Conti, and Michelle Piotrowski from EEI.

b. I-88 and IL-47 TIF Redevelopment Agreement - cont'd

Trustee Bonnie asked Michell Piotrowski to clarify the EEI Study regarding how the watershed qualifies for the TIF based on flooding contributions. Michelle explained that she focused on whether or not surface water from the area contributes to downstream flooding, which is the specific question she was asked and what is stated in the TIF Statute. While she noted that flooding does occur in the Blackberry Creek Watershed, she emphasized that her study did not analyze the extent or specific locations of flooding. Trustee Schomas confirmed that this is the minimum requirement under the Statute.

Trustee Lendi inquired about the watershed's extent and potential future developments, acknowledging that mitigation efforts would be necessary to address any additional flooding risks. Michelle confirmed that the entire area contributes to downstream flooding, except for the area near the tollway with detention facilities. Concerns about whether additional detention or retention areas could alleviate flooding were raised, but Michelle stated that the study did not cover that detail.

Discussions among trustees touched on the Kane County Stormwater Ordinance and the legislative intent of the TIF Act. Trustee Lendi expressed skepticism about the property's TIF eligibility, while President Konen noted the area's historical flooding issues and emphasized the need for effective water management. Ultimately, Trustee White remarked that the TIF is being used to encourage development despite concerns about flooding, and Trustee Lendi reiterated that the TIF should address blighted conditions, and she didn't feel this met the qualification.

Trustee Herron inquired about the TIF Revenue Projection in the SB Friedman Document, seeking detailed information on the School District's funding—specifically the amount, timing, and sources. Administrator Koeppel clarified that school tuition payments are capped at 25% of residential units based on the number of students added. This figure, submitted annually to the State of Illinois, pertains only to TIF funds and excludes other payments. Herron also asked about eligible TIF items for the school district. Koeppel responded that funding can be allocated for capital needs affecting the school district if there is a mutual agreement between the developer and the Village. Trustee Lendi confirmed that commercial developments do not fund the school district; only residential homes with school-age children contribute under the cap. She noted that there could be significant additional funding from a potential commercial boom without the TIF. President Konen added that the development would not happen without the TIF.

The Village Board had a lengthy discussion regarding the TIF and grading. Trustee Lendi asked to see Crown's Soil Boring Report.

Trustee Michels expressed concerns about ad valorem taxes, recalling previous negative experiences and wanting to ensure that developmental costs don't burden homeowners if projects stall. Administrator Koeppel explained that the initial subdivision would divide the property into five areas as outlined in the PDD and annexation agreement, which includes specific rules for each area.

Michels inquired about the absence of a concept plan, to which Koeppel clarified that the PDD and Regulating Plan serve that purpose and may need updates. Michels also questioned the phasing and timing of plans in the RDA, suggesting an increase in the number of phases, while Jennifer Cowan from Crown Community Development stated that the number of phases is reasonable for a smaller development.

Michels sought clarification on what "phases" entails, with Cowan indicating that the specific phases had not yet been defined but would be included in the annexation agreement. Koeppel acknowledged that a significant amount of time could elapse before planning phases.

Trustee Lendi raised concerns about interpreting "similar use" within the PDD, and Koeppel confirmed that the Community Development Department would make such decisions. Michels asked why a lack of similar use is considered a minor change, to which Koeppel referred to his memo recommending language changes.

On IDOT access from Route 47, Cowan stated that access for Area 2 would be submitted later, with interim access provided through the development due to slow IDOT approvals. Michels raised concerns about limited open space requirements, advocating for an increase in Area 1, which has just under 15%. He also requested the total land cash contribution calculations for parks or schools.

Trustee White noted changes in the wording of the RDA, while Trustee Michels expressed concerns about water demand from the annexation agreement, particularly if a data center is built and additional wells are needed. Koeppel explained that any defaults could be remedied within a reasonable timeframe, including drilling new wells. Attorney Julien confirmed the annexation agreement includes specific obligations and timelines for water improvements. Michels highlighted that data centers may require multiple wells, which could delay approval. Koeppel indicated the annexation allows for nine PE per acre in Area 4, with Cowan clarifying that this amount is distributed across different areas, potentially allowing ten PE per acre on the north side.

c. Property at I-88 and IL-47 Property Subdivision (Sugar Grove LLC.)

Danielle Marion explained that Sugar Grove, LLC is seeking approval for a final plat to subdivide approximately 760 acres into nine parcels, which will later be developed into smaller lots. The Plan Commission reviewed this proposal on August 12, 2024, had no concerns, and recommended approval. Staff is requesting direction to prepare the resolution for the final plat. Trustee White inquired about a review by EEI, which confirmed that the final plat has been reviewed and includes their comments. Marion stated that the approval would depend on EEI and the Village Engineer's feedback. Trustee Lendi noted that the division is for regulatory purposes within the Planned Development District (PDD), ensuring clarity on zoning and allowable uses in different areas. Cowan emphasized that this approach prevents confusion regarding what can be developed and where.

d. Property at I-88 and IL-47 Planned Development District (Sugar Grove LLC.)

Danielle Marion explained that an application was received for a map amendment for a Planned Development District (PDD) covering 760 acres for a mixed-use development contingent on annexation. The Plan Commission held a public hearing on August 12-13, 2024, focusing on the development district and subdivision regulations. The proposed site is at the I-88 and Rt. 47 interchange and aligns with the Village's Comprehensive Plan.

Public concerns were raised regarding traffic, air and light pollution, soil quality, water usage, rezoning standards, and noise. The Commission asked Crown Community Development to provide soil condition studies, which they agreed to do. Discussions included the sufficiency of the population to support commercial development, potential flexibility for residential use, transition zones, and the establishment of homeowner's associations. There were also concerns about a fueling station possibly becoming a truck stop, which Crown addressed by prohibiting certain services.

The Commission proposed additional standards for accessory dwelling units and changed the classification of recycling facilities and heavy manufacturing to special use. Crown Community

Development accepted many of the conditions and adjustments suggested by the Commission. Ultimately, the Plan Commission recommended approval of the PDD and subdivision variances, with specific conditions, including incorporating findings from a traffic study by HR Green. Staff recommended clarifying that the PDD would govern over the Village Code and sought direction for preparing an approval ordinance.

The Board's discussion clarified that the Planned Development District (PDD) is indefinite, while the Annexation Agreement is set for 20 years. There was consideration of adding restrictions to the PDD, with the understanding that the more restrictive provisions between the PDD and Village Code would apply, though this would not affect areas three and four. Concerns were raised about how future issues might impact zoning, with the possibility of revising the PDD if the Village adopts less restrictive regulations. Trustee White suggested that Crown Community Development could request minor changes if the Village makes such adjustments. Administrative Koepfel noted that any changes would apply to areas one and two. Trustee Lendi expressed concern about the limitations on changing the PDD, except in the case of State or Federal law changes. It was emphasized that revisions to building codes would still need to be followed, though zoning would remain unchanged.

The Village Board meticulously reviewed the PDD Regulating Plan and discussed concerns and revisions with Crown Community Development and each other. During the discussion the Village Board requested several changes that were agreed to by the developer.

Break at 9:30 pm, return at 9:42 pm.

Roll Call

Present: President Jennifer Konen, Trustee Sean Herron, Trustee Matthew Bonnie, Trustee Michael Schomas, Trustee Sean Michels, Trustee James F. White, and Trustee Heidi Lendi

Absent: None

The Village Board continued reviewing the PDD and discussed revisions with staff, Crown Community Development, and each other.

Recess of Meeting

Motion by Trustee White, second by Trustee Schomas, to recess the meeting until Tuesday, August 27, 2024, at 6:00 p.m., the location to be determined, but expected to be at Waubensee or Village Bible Church, subject to availability, and to resume the discussion at number 13. d. on the agenda.

Ayes: White, Schomas, Herron, Bonnie, Michels, Lendi; Nays: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None. MOTION CARRIED

To view the entire meeting, please visit the [Village of Sugar Grove Board Meeting 8-22-2024 – YouTube](#).

**VILLAGE OF SUGAR GROVE BOARD MEETING
TUESDAY, AUGUST 27, 2024
(CONTINUATION OF AUGUST 20, 2024 MEETING
THAT WAS FURTHER CONTINUED ON AUGUST 22, 2024)
AT 6:00 P.M.
VILLAGE BIBLE CHURCH
847 IL-47, SUGAR GROVE, IL 60554**

Call to Order

President Konen resumed the August 20, 2024, Village Board Meeting and called the meeting to order at 6:01 pm.

Pledge of Allegiance

Trustee White led the pledge of allegiance.

Roll Call

The Village Board meeting was held in person at Village Bible Church on August 27, 2024.

Present: President Jennifer Konen, Trustee Sean Herron, Trustee Michael Schomas, Trustee Sean Michels, Trustee James F. White, and Trustee Heidi Lendi

Absent: Trustee Matthew Bonnie

Additional Attendees: Village Administrator Scott Koeppel, Finance Director Anastasia, Community Development Director Danielle Marion, Community Development Director Michael Cassa, Police Chief Pat Rollins, Attorney Laura Julien, Village Clerk Tracey Conti, and Village Engineer Brian Schiber

e. Property at I-88 and IL-47 Planned Development District (Sugar Grove LLC.) cont'd

Trustee Michels asked for a report on the development from Teska. It was noted that the Community Development Director reviewed the document and included several comments in her report to the Plan Commission. It was again discussed and reviewed by the Plan Commission. Teska was hired to supplement the Community Development Department due to being short a person. Teska was not asked to review this specific development. Teska supported other projects because the Community Development Director spent a lot of time on this specific project. Trustee Michels stated that Teska should be reviewing this project. Jennifer Cowan from Crown Community Development noted that Crown Community Development consulted with Norris Design, who has worked with this type of town center walkable design. Norris Design came up with the town center standards designed for walkability and to accommodate outdoor dining. Trustee Lendi stated she would like to have seen the comparison between the code and the PDD to see the changes. Danielle Marion stated there were comparisons provided in her Board Report that might answer some questions.

The discussion continued with the PDD Area Specific Standards, Minor and Major Change Procedures, and Subdivision. The Board reviewed each section page by page, discussing concerns and revisions with staff, Crown Community Development, and each other.

Break at 8:32 pm, return at 8:50 pm.

Roll Call

Present: President Jennifer Konen, Trustee Sean Herron, Trustee Michael Schomas, Trustee Sean Michels, Trustee James F. White, and Trustee Heidi Lendi

Absent: Trustee Matthew Bonnie

f. Property at 1-88 and IL-47 Annexation Agreement (Sugar Grove LLC.)

Village Administrator Koeppel stated that Sugar Grove LLC submitted a petition for annexation and an annexation agreement to the Village of Sugar Grove on July 12, 2024. A public hearing for the annexation was conducted on August 20, 2024, with proper notification to the public, allowing interested parties to present their views.

The annexation agreement classifies the property as a planned development district (PDD) and outlines its subdivision into five distinct areas. A subsequent public hearing by the Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals reviewed the PDD and subdivision details, adhering to the existing policy during negotiations with the developer.

The Village has invested over \$500,000 in the interchange at Rt. 47 and I-88. The annexation aligns with the Village's policy and aims to secure a return on that investment. Additionally, the land uses stipulated in the annexation agreement, and the PDD is consistent with the Village's 2023 Comprehensive Plan, reinforcing the strategic vision for future development. Staff provided detailed highlights of specific sections and exhibits during the review process.

The village board thoroughly reviewed the annexation agreement, examining every clause and stipulation to ensure it aligns with the community's interests and long-term goals. During the meeting, board members engaged in in-depth discussions, scrutinizing the implications for infrastructure, zoning, and public services. Their careful analysis included input from legal advisors and community stakeholders, reflecting a commitment to transparency and collaboration. During the discussion the Village Board requested several changes that were agreed to by the developer. This diligent process underscores the board's dedication to making informed decisions that benefit the village and its residents.

14. Public Comment #2

1. Mike Roscoff commented against the development.
2. Dan Randle commented against the development.
3. Len Muller commented in favor of the development.
4. Jim Michels commented against the development.
5. Dominic Lombardo commented against the development.

6. Dale Essling commented against the development.
7. Perry Elliott commented against the development.
8. Lisa Essling commented against the development.
9. Unknown speaker commented against the development.
10. Jaden Chada spoke against the development.
11. Meria Rodriguez spoke against the development.
12. Ken Growman spoke against about the development.

15. Reports

- a. Staff - None
- b. Trustees - None
- c. President

16. Executive Session

- Personnel – 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(1)
- Litigation – 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(11)
- Property/Land Acquisition – 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(5)
- Sale of Property – 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(6)
- Review of Executive Session Minutes – 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(21)

17. Adjournment

Motion by Trustee White second by Trustee Herron, to adjourn the meeting at 12:44 am.

Ayes: White, Herron, Schomas, Michels, Lendi; Nays: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Matthew Bonnie. MOTION CARRIED

For those seeking detailed information about the recent discussions and decisions made by the Village Board regarding the Crown Community Development project, the meetings are available for viewing on YouTube. The recordings provide an in-depth look at the board's deliberations, including critical points raised by members and community input.

[Village of Sugar Grove Board Meeting 8-20-24 - YouTube.](#)
[Village of Sugar Grove Board Meeting 8-22-2024 – YouTube](#)
[Village of Sugar Grove Board Meeting 8-27-24 \(youtube.com\)](#)

ATTEST:

/s/ Tracey R. Conti
Tracey R. Conti
Village Clerk