

Staff Responses to Council Questions

June 14, 2016

5. Consent Agenda

C-D. Resolutions: Authorize Amendment to the Contracts with Engineering Resource Associates and Robinson Engineering, Ltd.

Need further explanation as to why these contracts expect so much more activity.

The Village has seen a 3% increase in permit activities over last year. Much of this increase has come in the form of new single family homes, larger residential additions and new commercial buildings which require more detailed engineering reviews. To meet the Village's goal to complete all permit reviews in 10 business days, the need to utilize outside consultants has grown and the Village is sending out reviews to the two consultants more frequently than in years past.

Further, the stormwater engineering reviews have become more complex, requiring the consulting engineers to spend more time reviewing each building permit application. The construction of most new single family houses now require the installation of Post Construction Best Management Practices (PCBMP's) such as rain gardens or dry wells. It takes the consulting engineers additional time to review engineering plans with these improvements.

A few years ago, the Community Development department generated \$800,000 in revenue. Should we project another year exceeding revenue projections or are we going to experience increased review costs to dampen those expectations?

The vast majority of costs associated with these two contracts are recouped through permit fees paid for by the applicant. The increase in review costs will not significantly impact net revenue.

Robinson has been doing the work for Nelson Meadows developer. Will they in any way shape or form be involved in reviewing plans on behalf of the Village? Will this totally be ERA?

The Village does not permit consultant firms to review their own work. This is the reason the Village has two contracts for stormwater review services.

In this case specifically, the permit was originally submitted in 2014 and the Village had a contract with Burns & McDonnell and ERA for stormwater review services. The permit application for Nelson Meadow was reviewed by Burns & McDonnell through the end of their contract in December 2015. By December 2015, Burns & McDonnell had completed all reviews and had signed off (approved) on the proposed engineering. Since January 1, 2016 the Village staff has reviewed all subsequent submittals.

6. Active Agenda

D. Resolution: Approve the Preliminary Plat of Subdivision for 5527-5531 Fairmount Avenue with Exceptions

Is the attached the correct table for side yard setbacks? If not please provide the correct table.

Article 2 | Residential Districts • Sec. 2.030 | Lot and Building Regulations

Regulations	R-1	R-2	R-3	R-4	R-5	R-5A	R-6
Apartment/condo	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,000
Other buildings/uses	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
L2 Minimum Lot Width (feet)							
Detached house	100	85	75	50	50	50	50
Attached house [1]	-	-	-	-	80	80	80
Two-unit house	-	-	-	-	80	80	80
Apartment/condo	-	-	-	-	-	-	80
Other buildings/uses	100	85	75	50	80	80	80
L3 Minimum Street Frontage [1]	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Minimum Building Setbacks							
S1 Street (feet)	40	35	30	25	25	25	25
S2 Side (interior) (% lot width/feet, whichever is greater)	[2]	10/7	10/6	10/5	10/5	10/5	10/5[3]
S3 Rear (feet)	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
Maximum Floor Area Ratio							
Residential	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.50
Nonresidential	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.80	0.80	1.50
C Maximum Building Coverage (% of lot, principal + accessory)	32	32	32	32	32	32	40

It appears that the side yard setback in the R-3 district is 10% or 6 feet whichever is greater. Therefore a 65 foot lot would require a 6.5 foot setback and a 72 foot lot would require a 7.2 foot setback.

That is correct.

Can the council require a 7.5 foot side yard setback as a condition of approving non-conforming lot(s) with width less than 75 feet as part of the subdivision approval process?

The change of setbacks could be placed as a condition of approval of the preliminary plat of subdivision and as a requirement on the final plat of subdivision.

Non-Agenda Questions

Stormwater First Congregational

I was asked about a review or look at "a culvert" between Village Hall and Carpenter. Could you shed some light on what this question might entail and what results, if any, are available?

The Village has requested proposals for work related to inspecting the 11' diameter pipe between Village Hall and Carpenter Street. This pipe carries St. Joseph's Creek through the downtown. The purpose of the inspection is to determine the condition of the pipe and if any repairs are needed to maintain it in good working condition.

Apparently, First Congregational is going ahead with parking lot and other improvements. Is the Village providing any assistance, or is any available, for this project? Can, or should, the Village take advantage of their plans to do any stormwater remediation that would be beneficial to stormwater management for the Village?

First Congregational Church is proceeding with parking lot improvements that will improve drainage around the building. Village staff has provided some technical assistance with this project, however, is not contributing financially to the project. The Village no longer has a grant program for stormwater management improvements made by not for profit entities. The grant program was eliminated when the Stormwater Utility was changed to not charge fees to property tax exempt parcels. The Village has agreed to temporarily designate several parking spaces on Curtiss Street in front of the church for 15 minute time limits during the summer camp/pre-school pick-up hours while the parking lot is under construction.

ATTACHMENTS

There are no online rEmarks.