

M. Werden, Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Roll Call

Present: B. Bucaro, C. Deveaux, J. Kapadoukakis, G. Koziol, J. Miaso, M. Sarwas, M. Werden

Absent: M. Hopkins

Also Present: Kristy Stone, Planning & Development Services Director and Daniel Harper, Village Planner

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made to approve the November 3, 2022 meeting minutes.

Motioned by: B. Bucaro Seconded by: J. Miaso

Roll Call

Ayes: B. Bucaro, C. Deveaux, J. Kapadoukakis, G. Koziol, J. Miaso, M. Werden

Nays: None

Abstain: M. Sarwas

The motion carried.

Public Forum

M. Werden opened the public forum. No one from the public came forward. **M. Werden** closed the public forum.



(#22-12) Southwind Business Park Lot 3

The petitioner, **Dean Kelley**, 621 5th Street, St. Charles came forward and was sworn in by **M. Werden**. **D. Kelley** stated that they are requesting a resubdivision of lot 3, the property at W. Bartlett Road and Route 25 for the proposed self-storage facility project. **K. Stone** these lots per the annexation agreement allow light industrial and commercial uses. **G. Koziol** this is an area that seems logical for this use and since there are no neighbors to complain that is a good thing. **B. Bucaro** are you focusing on any retail for lot 2 or any other type of business? **D. Kelley** I had a daycare user that was interested in part of that lot and an interested party for mixed use. I think it is going to be difficult to get retail because it is an interior lot and there is no exposure to W. Bartlett Road or Route 25. It could end up being light industrial. I do not think the market would support retail there at this time. There is residential development on the other side in South Elgin which will certainly help these businesses.

B. Bucaro made a motion to pass along a **positive recommendation** to the Village Board to approve case **(#22-12) Southwind Business Park Lot 3** for a Preliminary/Final Plat of Subdivision subject to the conditions outlined in the staff report.

Motioned by: B. Bucaro Seconded by: G. Koziol

Roll Call

Ayes: B. Bucaro, C. Deveaux, J. Kapadoukakis, G. Koziol, J. Miaso, M. Sarwas, M. Werden

Nays: None

The motion carried.



(#22-11) Southwind Self Storage

The following exhibits were presented:

Exhibit A – Picture of Sign

Exhibit B - Mail Affidavit

Exhibit C - Notification of Publication

The petitioners, **Dean Kelley**, 612 5th Street, St. Charles and **Jeffrey Budgell**, Architects' Studio, 257 N West Avenue, Elmhurst came forward and were sworn in by M. Werden. J. Budgell stated that the site plan for the project shows that customers would enter off of Benchmark into the site. There is a ring road that goes around the site that provides fire access as well as access to exterior units that are at grade level around the building. There is loading and unloading in-doors for the building. This is a 2story building. We are asking for site plan approval and approval for variations to increase the floor area ratio to 0.84 and to reduce the required perimeter landscaping to allow the exterior access doors to be at grade. This would be a climate-controlled self-storage building which is a very benign use. A busy day might have 8 to 10 customer trips to this facility. There would be very low traffic and this would be well maintained. Regular business hours would be 7 or 8 in the morning to 6 or 7 in the evening. Interior access is not allowed after hours except in an emergency. There would be one employee on site while the facility is open. This use is perfect for this site with the residential across the street. The majority of the landscaping will be around the perimeter of the site. This site would be highly landscaped with a lot of evergreen landscaping that keeps its foliage in the winter. M. Werden I was impressed that you included so many evergreens in your landscape plan. J. Budgell we did group evergreens along Route 25 to buffer the residential area. M. Werden I think this is ideal since you will not have a lot of noise or traffic that would irritate nearby neighbors. J. Budgell that is correct. I would also like to add that there are many light industrial and commercial uses that could build a one-story building here, but they would have more employees and trucks coming and going. In our case, we have a second-story, which requires the increase in the floor-area-ratio, but this will be a benign use. You will rarely see people at this site. This is the perfect use for this type of site in our opinion. **M. Werden** will IDOT be widening that intersection or roadway? K. Stone IDOT does not have plans to widen the roadway, but they are looking at possibly resurfacing in the future. C. Deveaux the corner of Benchmark and Route 25 going north is in terrible condition. The corner will need some attention. B. Bucaro the circular interior drive is one-way looking at the dimensions of the lot having 2-way traffic would be too tight. J. Budgell that is one of the reasons we did a one-way, but again the traffic load here will be very low and we cannot imagine a situation where you would have more than 2 or 3 cars there, but we do accommodate that with the one-way. K. Stone we also required the petitioner to add islands at the corners of the building to provide a protected area for the vehicles that are loading and unloading so that they are not obstructing the access ring road. G. Koziol this appears to be a well-thought out plan. I like the looks of the building and the landscaping is attractive. This is going to be a very quiet neighbor in the area. It is a good use.

M. Werden opened the public hearing portion of the meeting.



Kerry Flood, 1066 Moraine, South Elgin came forward and stated, I live across the street from this development. I was very surprised at how much traffic is on Route 25 specifically in this area. I am concerned that this will bring more traffic. I am hoping that this building can be hidden by trees and the lighting will not be outward facing. **J. Budgell** we have submitted a photometric plan that meets the Village's requirements for lighting and all of the lighting will be directed down and the landscaping will be evergreens which stays green all year round to block the building. You can see that in the rendering. **K. Stone** the landscaping along the west property line exceeds what our zoning ordinance requires. The petitioner was very accommodating with the landscaping. **M. Werden** have you received any comments from the public about this project? **K. Stone** no, we have not.

M. Werden closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

G. Koziol made a motion to pass along **a positive recommendation** to the Village Board to approve case **(#22-12) Southwind Self Storage** Site Plan Review and Variations to increase the floor area ratio and to reduce the perimeter landscaping requirement subject to the and findings of fact outlined in the staff report.

Motioned by: G. Koziol Seconded by: B. Bucaro

Roll Call

Ayes: B. Bucaro, C. Deveaux, J. Kapadoukakis, G. Koziol, J. Miaso, M. Sarwas, M. Werden

Nays: None

The motion carried.



(#22-15) Political Signs

The following exhibits were presented: Exhibit A – Notification of Publication

Kurt Asprooth, Ancel Glink, 140 S Dearborn St, Suite 600, Chicago, Il came forward and was sworn in by K. Asprooth stated that there is a provision in the State code that preempts all municipalities home rule and non-home rule from regulating political signage on residential property. The Village cannot prevent anyone from putting up a political sign in their front yard in any way. The only power that any municipality in the State of Illinois has is to enforce reasonable size restrictions. We looked at the current Village Zoning Ordinance and there are some carve outs for political signs, but there are still some impermissible restrictions on political signs including a limitation on the number of signs and a limitation on the time period for how long those signs can be up. We did look at the legislative history when this law was passed in 2011 to clarify exactly what the legislature was intending with this law. They made it very clear that any number of signs is permissible and that we cannot prevent anyone from having 25 political signs in the front yard. Although not directly expressed, we think the goal was that there might be 20 races on the ballot or 10 referendum questions on the ballot and the State Legislature wanted a residential property owner to be able to have a sign for each race if they chose to do so. The legislature also limits the ability for the Village to say how long those signs can be up. A lot of people will leave political signs up for a long time after an election and signs become outdated. We know that is a concern. The Village cannot say when a political sign has to be taken down after a certain period of time after an election. In the past, that was a pretty common provision in most zoning codes across the State. We cannot enforce a time restriction any longer. We did look at the code and wrote a draft Text Amendment to enforce the one restriction that we can regulate and that is the size of political signs for residential property. This is does not apply to commercial or industrial properties. This draft size restriction will be a limit of 16 square feet for an individual sign. We have also included a height limitation of 6 feet to ensure that someone does not put a billboard in their yard. We also make it very clear that these signs must be on private property and not placed in the right-of-way. This is a situation where our hands are tied in many ways. We do not have a lot of discretion. We want to make sure that the zoning ordinance is clear not only for staff and for enforcement purposes, but also for residents to know what they can and cannot do when election season comes along. The intent of the legislature is to ensure that a resident can have as many political signs as they want. G. Koziol on residential property, after an election, we cannot enforce the removal of political signs and they could stay there forever? K. Stone correct. G. Koziol do we have the right to enforce the removal of signs on non-residential property? K. Stone yes, this only pertains to residential properties. **B. Bucaro** is the size of 16 square feet a normal size and is that the size that other villages allow as the one item that can be regulated? K. Asprooth we did a broad survey of what other communities allow for political signs. Some communities limit the size to 6 square feet, which is the standard yard sign size. Some communities allow very large signs. Hoffman Estates allows up to 32 square feet for a single political sign. At 16 square feet we are in the middle of what size other communities allow.



- M. Werden opened the public hearing portion of the meeting. No one from the public came forward.
- M. Werden closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.
- **J. Miaso** made a motion to pass along **a positive recommendation** to the Village Board to approve case **(#22-15) Political Signs** text amendment.

Motioned by: J. Miaso Seconded by: M. Sarwas

Roll Call

Ayes: B. Bucaro, C. Deveaux, J. Kapadoukakis, G. Koziol, J. Miaso, M. Sarwas, M. Werden

Nays: None

The motion carried.



Old Business/ New Business

K. Stone I do not believe that we will have a January meeting.

M. Werden asked if there was a motion to adjourn.

Motioned by: G. Koziol Seconded by: M. Sarwas

Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 pm.