



Meeting Agenda

Location:

Village Hall -
10631 Main Street
Roscoe, IL 61073

Zoning Board of Appeals

Wednesday, April 09, 2025
5:30 PM

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. **Approval of the Minutes** for the meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals from **February 12, 2025.**
2. **Approval of the Minutes** for the meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals from **March 12, 2025.**

NEW BUSINESS

3. ZBA 2025-007: **Design Review** for Approval of a **120 SF Dumpster Enclosure** at Dollar General located at **4733 Bluestem Road** (PIN: 04-29-428-009).
[Property Owner: Hoogland 2006 Family Real Estate, Dollar General]
4. ZBA 2025-008: Discussion on **future amendment** to **Article XIII - Planned Unit Development** of Chapter 155 (Zoning Regulations) of the Village's Code of Ordinances

OLD BUSINESS

PUBLIC COMMENT (Limited to 3 minutes per speaker)

ADJOURNMENT



Meeting Minutes

Location:

Village Hall -
10631 Main Street
Roscoe, IL 61073

Zoning Board of Appeals

Wednesday, February 12, 2025
5:30 PM

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 5:30pm by Chair Durstock.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT

Chairman Jay Durstock
Member Laura Baluch
Member Dayne Mead
Member George Wagaman

ABSENT

Member Brad Hogland
Member Melissa Smith
Member Ryan Swanson
Village Clerk Stephanie Johnston

STAFF

Josef Kurlinkus - Village Administrator
Evan Hoier - Zoning Administrator (Vandewalle & Associates)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. **Approval of the Minutes** for the meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals from **December 11, 2024.**

Motion: A motion was made to approve the Minutes of the **December 11, 2024** ZBA Meeting.

No changes, additions, or corrections.

Motion made by Member Baluch, Seconded by Member Mead.

Voting Yea: Chairman Durstock, Member Baluch, Member Mead, Member Wagaman

Minutes approved 4-0-0.

2. **Approval of the Minutes** for the meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals from **January 8, 2025.**

Motion: A motion was made to approve the Minutes of the **January 8, 2025 ZBA Meeting**.

No changes, additions, or corrections.

Motion made by Member Wagaman, Seconded by Member Baluch.

Voting Yea: Chairman Durstock, Member Baluch, Member Mead, Member Wagaman.

Minutes approved 4-0-0.

NEW BUSINESS

3. ZBA 2025-003: **Discussion and Recommendation for Approval** of a **Replat** for the properties located at **10307 and 10375 Clearwing Lane** (PIN 08-05-104-016 & 08-06-231-002).

[Applicant: Joshua Petry]

Jeff Linkeheld, applicant's engineer with Arc Design Resources, Inc. presented on behalf of the applicant Josh Petry.

Mr. Linkenheld summarized his understanding of the history of "Lot A" of the Clearwing Subdivision was originally intended as a community center for the planned condo association, but never materialized. Currently, there are 12 different entities owning individual or multiple buildings within the development. Mr. Petry, who owns the property, is interested in developing a planned unit development to put in 24 units within the open lot. These units would be townhome-style, similar to those proposed in Hawks Point subdivision. The proposal includes 4 family buildings and 1 three-family building, with a private driveway and supplemental parking. The project also involves sewer and water extensions and replatting of Lot A as a PUD.

The Village's Zoning Consultant Evan Hoier presented the staff report on the proposal explaining his understanding of the lot, as being intended for open space, and explaining the need to justify waiving the park and open space dedication requirements for the proposed development. Mr. Hoier outlined three potential justifications: the village's need for affordable housing, the insufficient parcel size for meaningful recreation, and the surrounding development pattern with existing open space. Member Wagaman questioned whether the applicant should provide these justifications, but Evan clarifies that the Zoning Board of Appeals should make this determination.

The discussion revolved around the use of a vacant lot in a subdivision that was initially planned as a community center. Mr. Petry expressed their intention to repurpose the lot for multifamily use, which would provide a slightly different character than the surrounding lots but with less density. Administrator Kurlinkus clarified that the lot was never intended to be a public park and was not dedicated to the village, and that the subdivision was originally planned as condos. He also explained that under the current code, new subdivisions must provide parkland or a financial contribution for park development.

Mr. Hoier stated that Village Staff recommends approval of the plan, with the condition that revised plat documents must be filed with Winnebago County before any improvements are made, and the need for affordable housing. He noted that the final decision on the plan will be made by the Village Board of Trustees.

Mr. Linkenheld clarified that the property, which includes open lots and possibly detention areas, is currently not easily accessible for residents. The redevelopment plan includes the construction of rental units, possibly in the form of townhomes or stacked units, and clarified that the redevelopment plan does not involve low-income or section 8 housing, but rather market-rate housing. He emphasized the property's current status as private property was emphasized, with his understanding that it is not a public park or property owned by a condominium association.

Member Baluch stated that she had concerns over the lack of parkland, and requested additional information on the original history of the parcel. She requested that any decision be laid over so that staff could review historical minutes related to the development of the parcel and provide those to the ZBA so that they could make a better informed decision as to the original intent of the parcel.

Motion: A motion was made to lay over the two agenda items related to the properties located at 10307 and 10375 Clearwing Lane.

Motion made by Chairman Durstock, Seconded by Member Wagaman.

Voting Yea: Chairman Durstock, Member Baluch, Member Mead, Member Wagaman

Motion Approved 4-0-0

4. ZBA 2025-004: **Public Hearing and Recommendation for Approval of a Planned Unit Development (PUD)** for the properties located at **10307 and 10375 Clearwing Lane** (PIN 08-05-104-016 & 08-06-231-002).

[Applicant: Joshua Petry]

Motion: A motion was made to lay over the two agenda items related to the properties located at 10307 and 10375 Clearwing Lane.

Motion made by Chairman Durstock, Seconded by Member Wagaman.

Voting Yea: Chairman Durstock, Member Baluch, Member Mead, Member Wagaman

Motion Approved 4-0-0.

N.B. Motion, discussion, and approval of this item was made as part of the previous agenda item.

5. ZBA 2025-005: **Discussion and Recommendation for Approval of Final Plat 6 of Hawks Pointe Subdivision.** (PIN 08-06-101-009)

[Applicant: White Oak Trust (Joshua Petry)]

Jeff Linkeheld, applicant's engineer with Arc Design Resources, Inc. presented on behalf of the applicant Josh Petry.

Mr. Linkeheld discussed some of the background of the Plat 6 of Hawkes Pointe Subdivision and that the final site design was approved as part of a settlement agreement with Mr. Petry.

Mr Hoier discussed the plat being submitted and stated that the project also includes a park lot dedicated to the village, sidewalks, and a site screen fence, and that layout and landscaping plan meet the terms of the settlement agreement. The project is currently in the final engineering review stage before being presented to the Village Board for final approval.

Motion: A motion was made to recommend approval of the Final Plat 6 of Hawks Pointe Subdivision.

Motion made by Member Baluch, Seconded by Member Mead.

Voting Yea: Chairman Durstock, Member Baluch, Member Mead, Member Wagaman

Motion Approved: 4-0-0

OLD BUSINESS

The members of the Board discussed the status of Plat 5 of Hawkes Pointe, and were informed by Mr. Linkenheld that it is currently being built out. He also mentioned that they are looking into the possibility of selling individual units in the development as condominiums or townhomes, rather than apartments, and that more information about this request will be forthcoming in future meetings.

PUBLIC COMMENT (Limited to 3 minutes per speaker)

Mike Sima spoke under public comment. He expressed concerns about the precedent set by approving a subdivision without public space and suggested the possibility of donating a lot for green space.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: A motion was made to adjourn the meeting.

Motion made by Member Baluch, Seconded by Member Wagaman.

Voting Yea: Chairman Durstock, Member Baluch, Member Mead, Member Wagaman.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:39 PM.



Meeting Minutes

Location:

Village Hall -
10631 Main Street
Roscoe, IL 61073

Zoning Board of Appeals

Wednesday, March 12, 2025
5:30 PM

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 5:30pm by Chair Durstock.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT

Chairman Jay Durstock
Member Laura Baluch
Member Brad Hogland
Member Dayne Mead
Member Melissa Smith
Member Ryan Swanson
Member George Wagaman

ABSENT

Village Clerk Stephanie Johnston

STAFF

Josef Kurlinkus - Village Administrator
Evan Hoier - Zoning Administrator (Vandewalle & Associates)
Thomas Green - Village Attorney (Barrick, Switzer, Long, Balsley, & Van Evera)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. **Approval of the Minutes** for the meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals from **February 12, 2025**.

Motion: A motion was made to lay over approval of the Minutes of the February 12, 2025 ZBA Meeting.

Motion made by Member Baluch, Seconded by Member Swanson.

Voting Yea: Chairman Durstock, Member Baluch, Member Hogland, Member Mead, Member Smith, Member Swanson, Member Wagaman

Motion approved 6-0-0.

NEW BUSINESS

2. ZBA 2025-006: **Public Hearing** for a **Map Amendment from the UT: Urban Transition District to the R1: Single Family Residential District** for a property commonly known as **92XX Sheringham Drive** (PIN: 08-11-100-013).
[Applicant: KG2JGS investments, LLC & Robert S. & Lynne M. Twigg]

Chairman Durstock opened the Public Hearing for a Map Amendment from the **UT - Urban Transition District** to the **R1- Single Family Residential District**.

The applicants, representing Robert S. and Lynne M. Twigg, presented to the Board through Attorney Kaycee Chadwick. Attorney Chadwick stated that the Twiggs seek to develop a single-family home on a property they are contract purchasers for. The property, located off a public road on Sheringham Drive, and adjacent to the **Remington Creek Subdivision** is currently zoned AG-Agriculture under Winnebago County's Zoning Ordinance, and is contiguous with the village. The twigs seek to have this property annexed into the Village and zoned as Village of Roscoe R1-Residential so they can build their home, to continue the current agricultural use of the property. Attorney Chadwick stated that the Twiggs currently and have no plans for further development, and acknowledging that any further development would require them to bring forward new applications to the Village Board.

The Village's Zoning Consultant Evan Hoier presented the staff report on the proposal and recommended approval of the annexation and map amendment to zone the property as R1 – Residential Single Family, consistent with the planning and best use for the property.

Testimony Presented:

George Schaffner, a resident of Remington Creek, expressed concerns about the potential development of a new lot in their subdivision. He highlighted the importance of maintaining the community's unity and the need for proper notice of such developments. George also emphasized the potential impact of increased construction traffic on the neighborhood and the risk to the property values of the 38 families residing there. He suggested that the development should not be tied to Remington Creek and proposed finding an alternative access for the Twig family's new property.

Sherwin Mccarren, a resident of Remington Creek, says he has been a property owner at Remington Creek since he built his home in 2001. He stated that their subdivision is the nicest in the county, and their homes are valuable to the Village, and that their roads have problems with the culverts. He further stated that the property is owned by an LLC, that is controlled by one of their neighbors, and that the neighbor tried detaching the property from the Rockford School District so it would be more valuable

Chris Diedrich, a resident of Remington Creek, says he has no objection to the annexation. He stated that the property's to the north are considered RE zoning and the southern lots are R1, and that he would like to have this subdivision zoned RE because RE zoning would be better for the property. He also stated that part of the property is part of a FEMA flood zone. He stated that there should be a plat layout for the property, and the city engineer would need to do a layout. Larger zoning restriction on the property would make sense.

Michael Pulson. Says that he is close to the property at the south end of the property. He stated that there is a lot of rain water going to the property.

Mr. Hoier responded, and explained the zoning process and that those are reviewed when the permit is coming forward.

Kara Mulligan. Says she lives on Tembridge Court. She stated that the verbiage in the application is the problem and would like to have assurances that the property will not be developed. She stated that the neighboring residents do not want a mass development that crams homes onto the property, and that they do not like the agricultural use will go away. Says that they do not want the entire property rezoned to R1, and wanted to know if the property is subject to the Remington Creek Homeowners Association bylaws. She further stated that their neighborhood does not allow sheds, and she is ok with 1 house, but not with 100 houses on the subject property.

Attorney Green explained that these are future issues, that are speculative, and not currently before the ZBA.

Additional written testimony from Shaun McCarren and George and Cheryle Schaffner was submitted into the record.

Rebuttal by the Applicants.

Attorney Chadwick addressed points raised by the public. She stated the term *initial* single-family homes. There will only be one single family home. Says that her clients are only going to build a single-family home, and that they are not going to build further homes in the future.

Karl Gasbarspa – current owner of the property. Stated that he is a resident of Remington Creek. Says that the reason subdivision parcels show up on the exhibit map is that he did a feasibility study several years ago when purchasing the property, and these would have been the proposed lot lines if he was going to develop the property. He stated that due to the topography of the parcel, he scrapped the plan for the subdivision.

Board Discussion.

The board discussed only the annexation and zoning are before them, and that this property fits into the zoning of the surrounding properties.

MOTION: A motion was made to recommend annexation of the property into the Village of Roscoe, with R1-Single Family Residential Zoning, and to allow continued agriculture use.

Motion made by Chairman Durstock.

Voting Yea: Chairman Durstock, Member Baluch, Member Hogland, Member Mead, Member Smith, Member Swanson, Member Wagaman

OLD BUSINESS

3. ZBA 2025-003: **Discussion and Recommendation for Approval of a Replat** for the properties located at **10307 and 10375 Clearwing Lane** (PIN 08-05-104-016 & 08-06-231-002).

[Applicant: Joshua Petry]

Jeff Linkenheld, engineer for the applicant, presented a replat proposal for properties at 10307 and 10375 Clearwing, and provided the recap of the issue, and why this was laid over last month. He discussed the archival documents found by Village Staff, and that the property has remained as a lot reserved as a community center for the last 21 years, as private property, with no creation of a homeowner's association and no establishment of a community center on the property. He noted that Josh Petry, who was expected to attend, was unable to make it due to travel issues from Wisconsin. The proposal is to develop Lot A into a planned unit development with 23 single-family or townhome-style buildings. The ZBA further discussed some of the concerns related to the potential loss of open space, but Mr. Linkenheld clarified that the original intention was for a community center, not necessarily open space or parkland.

Motion: A motion was made to recommend approval of the amendment to the Plat of Clearwing to allow for development into the multifamily residential.

Motion made by Member Hogland, Seconded by Member Baluch.

Voting Yea: Chairman Durstock, Member Hogland, Member Mead, Member Smith, Member Wagaman

Voting Nay: Member Baluch

Abstaining: Member Swanson

Motion approved: 5-1-1

4. ZBA 2025-004: **Public Hearing and Recommendation for Approval of a Planned Unit Development (PUD)** for the properties located at **10307 and 10375 Clearwing Lane** (PIN 08-05-104-016 & 08-06-231-002).

[Applicant: Joshua Petry]

Jeff Linkenheld, engineer for the applicant, presented the plan for the PUD. The plan involves multiple buildings on the same lot, which requires a PUD. Two variances from the landscaping code were also discussed, one for the transition area and the other for parking lot perimeter landscaping. The members of the ZBA discussed that this development is compatible with the surrounding properties.

A motion was made to recommend the approval of the PUD to the Village Board for Approval.

Motion made by Member Baluch, Seconded by Member Smith.

Voting Yea: Chairman Durstock, Member Hogland, Member Mead, Member Smith, Member Wagaman

Voting Nay: Member Baluch

Abstaining: Member Swanson

Motion Approved: 5-1-1

PUBLIC COMMENT (Limited to 3 minutes per speaker)

none.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting.

Motion made by Member Baluch. Voting Yea: Chairman Durstock, Member Baluch, Member Hogland, Member Mead, Member Smith, Member Swanson, Member Wagaman

The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 PM.

Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting of April 9th, 2025

Application No. ZBA 2025-007

Applicant: Nick Chapman

Location: 4733 Bluestem Road

Requested Action: Design Review for Waste Enclosure

Existing Use: Retail

Proposed Use: Retail

Existing Zoning: CPD (Commercial – Planned)

Adjacent Zoning:

North: CPD (contiguous)

East: CPD (contiguous)

South: CPD (contiguous)

West: CPD (contiguous)

Description: The applicant is requesting Design Review approval to extend the enclosure for a waste receptacle at 4733 Bluestem Road. The property is currently occupied by a Dollar General convenience store.

At present, one dumpster is stored outside of the existing waste enclosure on the west side of the building. The existing enclosure contains additional waste bins and receptacles. The proposed project seeks to expand the fenced enclosure to accommodate the dumpster currently stored outside the designated area.

The proposed fencing will match the material and height of the existing enclosure.

	District Standard	Proposed
Development Setback Standards		
Front Setback	30 feet	110+ feet
Side Setback	15 feet	41 feet
Rear Setback	30 feet	29 feet (existing structure)

Parking: The proposed fence expansion will remove one parking space from the property.

- Current Parking Supply: 40 spaces
- Required Parking (retail establishment): 1 space per 250 square feet of gross floor area
- Building Size: Approximately 8,403 square feet (per GIS measurements)
- Minimum Parking Requirement: 34 spaces
- Current Surplus: 6 spaces

Even after the removal of one parking space, the property will still exceed the required number of spaces under Village zoning regulations.

The zoning code defines a retail establishment as:

"An establishment engaged primarily in selling merchandise for personal or household consumption and rendering service incidental to the sales of goods."

Staff believes that the loss of one parking space will not impact the store's operations or create parking issues for the public.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends **approval** of the requested Design Review request to expand the waste disposal enclosure at 4733 Bluestem Road.

Design Review Application – Dollar General

Date of Submission: March 27, 2025

PART I. GENERAL INFORMATION

A. Project Information

1. Project/Owner Name: Dollar General / John Chapman
2. Project Location: 4733 Bluestem Road, Roscoe, Illinois
3. Brief Project Description: Construction of a 12 ft. by 10 ft. dumpster enclosure with 7 ft. tall fencing on the northwest side of the property to comply with Village of Roscoe Code.
4. Project Property Legal Description: Commercial retail store
5. Project Property Size in Acres and Square Feet: 1 acre (approx. 43,560 sq. ft.)

B. Owner Information

Name: John Chapman

Address: 4733 Bluestem Road, Roscoe, IL

Phone Number [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

PART III. SITE DATA TABLE (Proposed)

Lot Size: 1 acre

Lot Coverage: 120 sq. ft. (~0.28%)

Height of Tallest Structure: 7 feet (fence height)

Total Parking Spaces: No change

Structure Location: Northwest side of the lot

B. Owner Information

1. Signature: [REDACTED]

2. Name: John Chapman

3. Address: 4733 Bluestem Road, Roscoe, IL

4. Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Fax: N/A

Email: nickchapmansemail@gmail.com

C. Agent Information (if applicable)

1. Signature: _____

2. Name:

3. Address:

4. Phone Number:

Fax:

Email:

PART III. SITE DATA TABLE

Existing:

Lot Size: 1 acre

Proposed:

Lot Size: 1 acre

Lot Coverage: 120 sq. ft. (~0.28%)

Height of Tallest Structure: 7 feet (fence height)

Structure Location: Northwest side of the lot

Total Parking Spaces: No change

Other fields: [To be confirmed or completed by Village Staff or detailed plans]

PART IV. JUSTIFICATION OF THE PROPOSED DESIGN REVIEW

1. The proposed dumpster enclosure supports compliance with Village ordinances and improves property aesthetics and organization. It aligns with Roscoe's goal of maintaining clean and safe commercial areas.
2. The enclosure is located in a service area, away from residences, ensuring no visual or auditory impact to neighboring dwellings.
3. The 7-foot fence design will block visibility, reduce odor dispersal, and contribute to the cleanliness and appearance of the area.
4. The location and structure will not obstruct access, visibility, or enjoyment of neighboring properties. It is a minor addition for sanitation purposes.

5. The enclosure is compatible with the commercial use of the property. It complements existing development and mitigates potential issues with trash visibility, smell, and access.

6. Any potential nuisances such as odor or debris are contained within the enclosure, which meets local sanitation standards.

7. No additional special uses are required. The structure is consistent with the property's commercial use and zoning.



Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting of April 9th, 2025**Application No. ZBA 2025-008****Applicant:** N/A**Location:** N/A**Requested Action:** Discussion of Future Amendment to PUD Ordinance**Existing Use:** N/A**Proposed Use:** N/A**Existing Zoning:** N/A**Adjacent Zoning:** N/A

Background: This discussion item focuses on a potential amendment to Article XIII of the Zoning Regulations within the Village's Code of Ordinances. This article governs the Village's ability to grant flexibilities, variances, and special requirements for Planned Unit Developments (PUDs). These approvals allow developers and property owners to negotiate with the Village when proposing projects that do not strictly align with existing zoning or subdivision regulations.

Currently, the Village uses a one-step process to approve these types of projects at the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) and at the Village Board level. This one approval includes everything within a potential development from street layout, zoning standards, subdivision requirements, site plans, landscaping plans, building elevations, and utility plans. Requiring all of these materials upfront for a single approval can present significant financial and logistical challenges for both applicants and the Village during review.

With the need to have drawings commissioned for all of these materials before even knowing if the zoning or layout is palatable to the Village, several developers have asked about why the Village uses this one-step process as opposed to other communities using a two- or multi-step process. Often, other communities will use a two-step process: approval of a General Development Plan (GDP) and Precise Implementation Plan (PIP). The Village had this kind of format previously but was changed to a one-step format along with the new zoning ordinance in 2021.

The GDP serves as the initial approval by the ZBA and Village Board, establishing the general layout, density, and conceptual site plan of a project. With this initial acceptance of the nature of the development, the applicant can wait on commissioning more detailed drawings like utility, landscaping, architectural, and engineering plans. This also allows staff to hold off on reviewing

these more detailed drawings before the zoning or conceptual layout of the site is approved and agreed upon.

The PIP acts as the final approval for the project to move forward. As stated above, the more detailed drawings and materials necessary for PUD approval are reviewed and finalized at this stage. Though the general zoning and conceptual site plan has been approved and agreed upon, the Village retains ability in this step to negotiate for further improvements like architectural and landscaping elements.

The redline document provided in the packet for discussion details amendments to the Village's PUD section of the code. These amendments would effectively separate the existing approval requirements into the GDP and PIP processes. Under this format, the ZBA and Village Board would primarily review the GDP for general compliance and site layout, while more detailed design elements would be considered in the PIP stage. Below are some points of discussion for the ZBA to consider:

1. Are there any elements within both the GDP and PIP that should be added?
2. Are there any elements within both the GDP and PIP that should be removed?
3. Are there any elements within both the GDP and PIP that should be moved to a different part of the process?
4. Are there any process notes that should be added? (e.g. time limits, what can be negotiated, etc.)
5. Should there be a statutory standard that allows smaller projects to go through a one-step approval, if the applicant so chooses?

Staff Recommendation: Because this is a discussion item and there is no approval required, no staff recommendation is given.

ROSCOE PUD AMENDMENT

Section 15-723 *Procedures*

The following steps are provided to ensure the orderly review of every planned development application in a timely and equitable manner:

(1) *Pre-filing review and transmittal of application.*

a. *Conference.*

1. A prospective applicant, prior to submitting a formal application for a planned development, shall meet for a pre-filing conference with the zoning administrator and the development review team, assembled at the discretion of the zoning administrator. If in the opinion of the zoning administrator the village does not have the requisite expertise on staff to complete the review of any application for a planned unit development, the zoning administrator shall notify the applicant before acquiring the services of consultants and/or attorneys as may be necessary for the proper review and preparation of the report and/or opinion. The developer shall, within five calendar days, either formally withdraw its application or provide written acknowledgement that the developer is responsible for all fees incurred by the village for the review.
2. The purpose of the conferences is to help the applicant understand the comprehensive plan, zoning regulations, site development allowances, standards by which the application will be evaluated, and the application requirements.
3. After reviewing the planned development process, the applicant may request a waiver of any application requirement which in the applicant's judgment should not apply to the proposed planned development. Such request shall be made in writing prior to the submission of the formal application documents.
4. All requests for waiver shall be reviewed by the zoning administrator. A final determination regarding the waiver shall be given to the prospective applicant following the decision. Denied requests may be appealed to the village board.
5. The applicant, prior to submitting a formal application for a planned development, shall, at the discretion of the zoning administrator, be required to schedule a meeting to discuss the proposed planned development and its impact on adjoining properties and area residents. The applicant shall send a written notice of the meeting via mail to all taxpayers of record and residents for all property within 300 feet of the proposed planned development. Such notice shall be mailed by the village not less than 15 days prior to the date of the meeting. A written summary of comments made at the meeting shall be maintained and submitted by the applicant with the application.

b. *Filing of application.* Following the completion of the pre-filing conferences, the applicant shall file an application for a planned development in accordance with this section. The

zoning administrator shall deliver copies of the application to other appropriate village departments for review and comment.

c. *Deficiencies.* The zoning administrator shall determine whether the application is complete. If the zoning administrator determines that the application is not complete, he shall notify the applicant in writing of any deficiencies and shall take no further steps to process the application until the deficiencies are remedied.

d. *Application review.* The zoning administrator shall work with the development review team and the applicant to review and revise the application.

e. *Report on compliance.* A copy of the complete application and a written report incorporating the comments of village staff and other agencies regarding the compliance of the proposed planned development with the requirements and standards of this section shall be delivered to the zoning board of appeals prior to the public hearing.

f. *Determination not binding.* Neither the zoning administrator's determination that an application is complete nor any comment made by the zoning administrator or village staff at a pre-filing conference or as part of the review process shall be intended or construed as a formal or informal recommendation for the approval of a planned development for the proposed planned development, or component part thereof, nor shall be intended or construed as a binding decision of the village, the zoning board of appeals, or any staff member.

(2) ~~Zoning board of appeals review~~ General Development Plan (GDP).

a. Upon receiving the report from the zoning administrator, the zoning board of appeals shall hold at least one public hearing on the proposed ~~planned development~~ General Development Plan. Notice of the public hearing shall be provided and the public hearing shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of this section, state law and rules of procedure adopted by the zoning board of appeals. The applicant shall provide the Zoning Administrator with a draft GDP plan submittal packet for a determination of completeness prior to placing the proposed GDP on the Zoning Board of Appeals agenda for GDP review. This submittal packet shall contain all of the following items, prior to its acceptance by the Zoning Administrator and placement of the item on a Zoning Board of Appeals agenda for GDP review:

1. A location map of the subject property and its vicinity in the Village of Roscoe, appropriately showing property lines and buildings and structures on the parcel;

2. A map of the subject property showing all lands for which the Planned Development is proposed, and all other lands within 300 feet of the boundaries of the subject property, together with the names and addresses of the owners of all lands on said map as the same appear on the current records of the Register of Deeds of Winnebago County (as provided by the Village of Roscoe). Said map shall clearly indicate the current zoning of the subject property and its environs, and the jurisdiction(s) which maintains that control. Said map and all its parts and attachments shall be submitted in a form which is clearly reproducible with a photocopier, and shall be at a scale which is not less than one inch equals 800

feet. All lot dimensions of the subject property, a graphic scale, and a North arrow shall be provided;

3. A general written description of the proposed Planned Development, including:

i. General project themes and images;

ii. The general mix of dwelling unit types and/or land uses;

iii. Approximate residential densities and nonresidential intensities as described by dwelling units per acre, floor area ratio, and impervious surface ratio.

iv. The general treatment of natural features;

v. The general relationship to nearby properties and public streets;

vi. The general relationship to any applicable comprehensive or area plans.

vii. A statement of rationale as to why Planned Development zoning is proposed. This shall identify barriers that the applicant perceives in the form of requirements of standard zoning districts and opportunities for the highest and best use of the property the applicant suggests are available through the proposed PD zoning;

viii. A complete list of ordinance standards which will not be met by the proposed Planned Development and the location(s) in which they apply and a complete list of standards which will be more than met by the proposed Planned Development and the location(s) in which they apply shall be identified.

ix. A written description of potentially requested exemption from the requirements of the underlying zoning district, in the following order:

1. Land use exemptions;

2. Density and intensity exemptions;

3. Bulk exemptions;

4. Landscaping exemptions;

5. Parking and loading requirements exemptions;

6. Engineering exemptions.

x. A general development plan drawing at a minimum scale of one inch equals 100 feet of the proposed project showing at least the following information in sufficient detail to make an evaluation criteria for approval:

1. A conceptual plan drawing of the general land use layout and the general location of major public streets and/or private drives;

2. Location of recreational and open space areas and facilities and specifically describing those that are to be reserved or dedicated for public acquisition and use;

3. Statistical data on minimum lot sizes in the development, the approximate areas of large development lots and pads, density/intensity of various parts of the development, floor area ratio, impervious surface area ratio and landscape surface area ratio of various land uses, expected staging, and any other plans required by the Plan Commission or Common Council; and

4. Notations relating the written information provided in the previous standards to specific areas on the GDP drawing.

b. Notice of the required public hearing shall be published not more than 30 nor less than 15 days before the scheduled hearing in a newspaper published in the village or if there is none, then in a newspaper of general circulation in the village and shall contain the following information:

1. The application case number;
2. The date and time of the public hearing;
3. The location of the public hearing; and
4. The general location of the property and its common street address, if applicable, and a short description of the proposed planned development and purpose of the public hearing.

c. Notice of the required public hearing shall also be provided by posting a sign or signs on the property no less than 15 days prior to the public hearing. Failure to post such signs and/or the removal or knocking down (by the village or others) of the sign after posting but before the public hearing shall not invalidate, impair, or otherwise impact any planned development subsequently granted following such public hearing.

d. Notice of the required public hearing shall also be provided by the village by U.S. mail to the taxpayers of record and owners of record of the property which is the subject of the application (if different than the applicant), and the taxpayers of record of all property within 300 feet of the subject property. Such notice shall contain the information as is required in this section and shall be mailed by the village not more than 30 nor less than 15 days prior to the date of the public hearing. The notice shall also include the name of the applicant for the planned development.

e. The zoning board of appeals shall review the application, the standards and requirements established by this section, the report of the zoning administrator, and any and all evidence and testimony received by the zoning board of appeals at the public hearing. Following the close of the public hearing and at a regular meeting, the zoning board of appeals shall present its findings addressing each of the standards set forth in this section and transmit such findings, together with a recommendation of approval, approval with conditions, or denial to the village board.

(3) ~~Review and action by the village board.~~Precise Implementation Plan (PIP).

a. After the effective date of the rezoning to PD/GDP, the applicant may file an application for a proposed precise implementation plan (PIP) with the Zoning Board of Appeals. This submittal packet shall contain all of the following items, prior to its acceptance by the

Zoning Administrator and placement of the item on a Zoning Board of Appeals agenda for PD review.

1. A location map of the subject property and its vicinity.
2. A general written description of the proposed PIP, including:
 - a. Specific project themes and images;
 - b. The specific mix of dwelling unit types and/or land uses;
 - c. Specific residential densities and nonresidential intensities as described by dwelling units per acre, floor area ratio, and impervious surface area ratio;
 - d. The specific treatment of natural features;
 - e. The specific relationship to nearby properties and public streets;
 - f. A statement of rationale as to why PD zoning is proposed. This shall identify barriers that the applicant perceives in the form of requirements of standard zoning districts and opportunities for community betterment the applicant suggests are available through the proposed PD zoning;
 - g. A complete list of zoning standards which will not be met by the proposed PIP and the location(s) in which they apply and a complete list of zoning standards that will be more than met by the proposed PIP and the location(s) in which they apply shall be identified. Essentially, the purpose of this listing shall be to provide the Zoning Board of Appeals with information necessary to determine the relative merits of the project in regard to private benefit versus public benefit
3. Any more specific relevant information to the approval of the PIP, including:
 - a. The names and addresses of the owner of the subject property, the applicant, and all persons having an ownership or beneficial interest in the subject property and proposed planned development.
 - b. A statement from the owner of the subject property, if not the applicant, approving of the filing of the application by the particular applicant.
 - c. A survey of, and legal description and street address for the subject property.
 - d. A statement indicating compliance of the proposed planned development with the comprehensive plan and evidence of the proposed project's compliance in specific detail with each of the standards for review for planned developments.
 - e. A scaled site plan showing the existing contiguous land uses, natural topographic features, zoning districts, public thoroughfares, transportation, and utilities.
 - f. A scaled site plan of the proposed planned development showing lot area, the required yards and setbacks, contour lines, common space, and the location, floor area ratio, lot area coverage and heights of buildings and structures, number of parking spaces and loading areas.
 - g. Schematic drawings illustrating the design and character of the building elevations, building materials, types of construction, and floor plans of all proposed buildings and structures. The drawings shall also include a schedule showing the number, type, and floor area of all uses or combinations of uses, and the floor area of the entire development.

- h. A professional traffic study acceptable to the village showing the proposed traffic circulation pattern within and in the vicinity of the area of the planned development, including the location and description of public improvements to be installed, and any streets and access easements, if determined necessary by the zoning administrator.
 - i. A schedule of development showing the approximate date for beginning and completion of each stage of construction of the planned development.
 - j. A professional economic analysis acceptable to the village, if determined necessary by the zoning administrator, including the following:
 - i. The financial capability of the applicant to complete the proposed planned development;
 - ii. Evidence of the project's economic viability; and
 - iii. An analysis summarizing the economic impact the proposed planned development will have upon the village.
 - k. Copies of all environmental impact studies as required by law.
 - l. An analysis setting forth the anticipated demand on all village services, if deemed necessary by Village staff.
 - m. A plan showing off-site utility improvements required to service the planned development, and a report showing the cost allocations and funding sources for those improvements, if deemed necessary by Village staff.
 - n. A site drainage plan for the commercial planned development.
4. A Precise Implementation Plan drawing of the proposed project showing at least the following information in sufficient detail to make an evaluation against criteria for approval:
- a. A PIP site plan conforming to any and all the requirements of Section 15-775, *Design Review*. If the proposed Planned Development is a group development, a proposed tentative plat shall be provided in addition to the required site plan;
 - b. Location of recreational/open space areas and facilities, specifically describing those that are to be reserved or dedicated for public acquisition and use;
 - c. Statistical data on minimum lot sizes in the development, the precise areas of all development lots and pads, density/intensity of various parts of the development, floor area ratio, impervious surface area ratio and landscape surface area ratio of various land uses, expected staging, and any other plans required by the Zoning Board of Appeals, and;
 - d. Notations relating the written information provided above to specific areas on the PIP drawing.
5. A landscaping plan for the subject property, specifying the location, species, and installed size of all trees and shrubs. This plan shall also include a chart which provides a cumulative total for each species, type, and required location (foundation, parking lot, transition area) of all trees and shrubs.

6. A series of building elevations for the entire exterior of all buildings in the Planned Development, including detailed notes as to the materials and colors proposed.
7. A general signage plan for the project, including all project identification signs, concepts for public fixtures and signs (such as street light fixtures and/or light poles or street sign faces and/or poles), and group development signage themes which are proposed to vary from City standards or common practices.
8. A general outline of the intended organizational structure for a property owners association, if any; deed restrictions and provisions for private provision of common services, if any;
9. A written description which demonstrates the full consistency of the proposed PIP with the approved GDP.
10. Any variations between the requirements of the applicable PD/GDP zoning district and the proposed PIP development; and,
11. The Precise Implementation Plan (PIP) submission may include site plan and design information, allowing the Zoning Board of Appeals to combine Design Review and review of the PIP.
12. The Precise Implementation Plan (PIP) may include final plat drawings and information, allowing the Zoning Board of Appeals to combine Final Plat review and review of the PIP.
13. The Zoning Board of Appeals or Village Board may specify other plans, documents or schedules that must be submitted prior to consideration or approval of the PIP, as such may be relevant to review.
14. The process for review and approval of the PD shall be identical to that for Special Use Permits in Section 15-780. The approval of a PD/PIP shall formally establish the PD overlay zoning district and any such land uses and site plans included in the approved PIPs.
- ~~1.~~15. The Village may require the applicant to provide surety, with the approval of Village staff, to ensure the development of public and private improvements.