

**SYCAMORE CITY COUNCIL**  
**AGENDA**  
February 19, 2007

**City Council Committee Meetings**  
No Meetings Are Scheduled

.....

**Regular City Council Meeting**  
7:00 P.M.

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **INVOCATION**
3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
5. **AUDIENCE TO VISITORS**
6. **CONSENT AGENDA**
  - A. Approval of the Minutes for the Regular City Council Meeting of February 5, 2007.
  - B. Payment of the Bills for February 19, 2007.
  - C. Plan Commission Minutes for the Meeting of January 8, 2007.
7. **PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS, COMMUNICATIONS, AND BILLS.**
  - A. Report by State Rep. Bob Pritchard on issues before the General Assembly in the Spring Session.
8. **REPORTS OF OFFICERS**
9. **REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**
10. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**A. Public Hearing on the Proposed Annexation of 82.76 Acres for Public Park Purposes.**

The Sycamore Park District owns two parcels that will be used for public park purposes but have not been annexed to the City of Sycamore. Both are contiguous with the community park and are located west of Airport Road and south of IL Route 64. The annexation of these parcels will bring soon-to-be-developed areas of the community park within the corporate limits in accordance with the Park and City comprehensive plans. Further information on this annexation petition is presented under Ordinance No. 2006.64, below.

**B. Public Hearing on the Proposed Annexation of 0.92 Acres for a Public Water Supply.**

The annexation of the two Park District parcels noted above will make the City’s new well site (Well #9) contiguous to the corporate limits. The City has petitioned for the annexation of this 0.92 acre parcel where Well #9 is presently in operation. Further information on this annexation petition is presented under Ordinance No. 2006.65, below.

**11. ORDINANCES**

**A. Ordinance No. 2006.61—An Ordinance Concerning the Recommendation of the Plan Commission With Regard to a Proposed Amendment to Section 6.8.4, “Prohibited Signs,” of the Unified Development Ordinance of the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.**

On January 15, 2007 the City Council’s Ordinance Committee considered a proposed amendment to Section 6.8.4 of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) regarding electronic signs. Specifically, the committee—and the Council in general—expressed concern that the parameters for illuminated electronic signs, as defined in Section 6.8.4 of the UDO, are not sufficiently restrictive to prevent some aesthetic and safety issues. In recent months, a number of scrolling electronic signs have been installed in commercial districts. Though legal under the current UDO sign regulations, their very colorful and eye-catching electronic features have exceeded the expectations of many observers and have raised anxiety that certain commercial areas—especially the central business district—might gradually drift toward an uncharacteristic and crass “Coney Island” look as more electronic signs are installed.

The provisions of the UDO may be amended by the City Council from time to time, but only after a public hearing has been held and a recommendation has been made by the Plan Commission. At the regular meeting of the Plan Commission on February 12, the Commission held a public hearing on the following revisions to Section 6.8.4 (the proposed revisions are italicized):

**6.8.4. Prohibited Signs.** The following signs shall not be permitted in any zoning district:

*A. Flashing signs and illuminated electronic message boards.*

**Explanation:**

- 1. In the downtown business district defined in Section 6.7.2,E of this code, electronic message boards are prohibited.*
- 2. In C-1 Neighborhood Business Districts, electronic message boards are prohibited.*
- 3. In C-2 Business Districts [other than the downtown business district referenced in (1), above] and C-3 Highway Business Districts, electronic message boards may*

*show the time, temperature, business hours, and business or public service messages. Such messages may scroll, but may not re-cycle in less than two (2) second intervals. In addition, the background for such print shall not feature simulated fireworks, explosions, flags flying, or other distracting electronic displays. Electronic message boards at or near intersections shall not use red or green colored lettering in order to avoid confusion with traffic control devices.*

- B. Signs which are wholly dependent upon a building for support or mounted on the roof, which project more than six (6) inches above the highest point of a building or roof to which they are attached, unless permitted otherwise, herein.
- C. Signs which constitute a hazard to public health or safety.
- D. Signs displaying obscene, indecent or immoral matter.
- E. Signs mounted on trailers or motor vehicles, provided that signs containing the name, address or business identification of the owner or user and displayed on a motor vehicle in use and portable signs defined herein are exempt from this Section.
- F. Attention-getting devices including, but not limited to, inflatable, moving, rotating or undulating signs, or light beams except as otherwise permitted with a special events permit.
- G. Signs which, by reason of size, location, content, color, or manner of illumination, obstruct the vision of motorists or interfere with the visibility or effectiveness of any traffic sign or control device on public streets.
- H. Signs which make use of words such as "Stop," "Look," "One-Way," "Danger," "Yield," or any similar word, phrase, symbol or light so as to interfere with or confuse pedestrian or vehicular traffic.
- I. Signs displayed within or extended over public right-of-way, except those erected or authorized by a government authority.
- J. Signs which obstruct ingress or egress from any fire escape, door, window, or other exit or entrance.
- K. Advertising, business, or identification signs on light poles of establishments.
- L. Signs painted directly on trees, rocks and fences and other structures or objects, except walls.
- M. Festoon lighting.

In the public hearing, no persons were present to object to the proposed changes. The Commission concurred with the Council's concerns and recommended the aforementioned revisions by a vote of 9-0. City Council approval of the Plan Commission recommendation is requested.

**B. Ordinance No. 2006.62--An Ordinance Concerning the Recommendation of the Plan Commission With Regard to the Petition of John Hall Homes to Amend the Original Annexation Agreement between the City of Sycamore and Freda R. Herst to Include a New Preliminary plat, Zoning Revisions and Certain Zoning Variances. First and Second Reading.**

The preliminary plan and plat presented by John Hall Homes is a refinement of a plan that was presented to the Plan Commission on August 14, 2006, the City Council on October 16, 2006, and the Plan Commission on January 8 and February 12 of 2007. The proposed plan would amend the “shell” plan presented with the September 2005 annexation. In addition, the Council’s attention is drawn to the proposal to re-zone the neighborhood commercial (“R-1”) and surrounding multiple family (“R-3”) zoning to “C-4” Mixed Use-Commercial.

**Background**

The 97.21-acre Freda R. Herst farm was annexed and zoned on September 19, 2005. The farm is located at the northeast corner of Plank Road and Lindgren Road. In the fall of 2005, Freda Herst was not interested in developing her property, but in the context of discussions with City officials concerning the dedication of a realigned Lindgren Road, the impact of such a public improvement on future development of her property naturally arose. Ms. Herst and her counsel, Robert Krupp, petitioned to annex their property to the City of Sycamore and to provide for the realignment of Lindgren Road, with certain additional conditions spelled out in an annexation agreement. Among the additional considerations was an understanding that any future development would be reviewed under the City’s planned unit development regulations as a special use, with all required public hearings pertaining to preliminary plats, final plats, rezonings, etc. This important provision prompted the workshop sessions in August 2006 and January 2007 with John Hall Homes.

**The Proposed Preliminary Plan from John Hall Homes**

The attached preliminary plan and plat present the following key features:

- a) The realignment of Lindgren Road (see review comments below).
- b) Land Uses. To better represent the Comp Plan’s expectations for a mix of commercial and low-intensity commercial uses near the intersection of Lindgren Road and Plank Road, the “C-4” Mixed Use Commercial Business District was suggested by the City staff. This is a change from the August concept plan to conform to the UDO’s stricter guidelines for mixed use developments under the C-4 provisions. All of the proposed “C-1” and “R-3” zoning would be combined in the planned development format as a special use, “C-4” Mixed Use Commercial Business District. Such a zoning designation anticipates planned unit developments designed to accommodate compatible residential and commercial uses on larger tracts of land and to maximize opportunities for orderly economic development. Typical mixed use designs include a core of community facilities (e.g. not-for-profit agency offices, day care centers, etc.) small retail establishments (e.g. corner market, dry cleaner) and commercial office uses (e.g. dentists, attorneys, etc.) adjacent to, or surrounded by, a variety of housing types

including single family attached homes such as townhouses or zero lot line (“courtyard”) single family houses as depicted on the concept plan. In such zoning districts, public or open space to promote public gathering is encouraged, in contrast with utilitarian open space such as stormwater detention ponds or undevelopable areas such as floodplains or wetlands.

- c) Commercial and residential condominiums. In the proposed C-4 zoning area, two-story and three-story buildings will house commercial units on the ground floor with the option of residential or commercial condominiums on the second floor, depending upon market interest. The mixed commercial/residential buildings would have roof profiles to blend with the nearby residential buildings.
- d) Courtyard homes. These units are part of the C-4 zoning area and are adjacent to the commercial uses. As an alternative to townhouse construction, courtyard or “zero lot line” homes are built on smaller lots and feature a courtyard on one side of each unit. This approach departs from the repetition in design and the close living quarters that typify even the most expensive townhouses in our community.
- e) The 4.5-acre townhouse area is left unplatted to await market interest. A future revision of the preliminary plan and plat would be required if and when there is sufficient market demand to warrant such housing, as depicted in the original concept plan of August 2006.
- f) Park space. Park District director David Peek sees the two dedicated parks in Sycamore Creek II, immediately east of the Herst farm, as adequate to the needs of residents in this area. One of the B&B parks, the three-acre Columbia Park, would be directly east of the Herst farm on Des Moines Street. A larger regional park in Sycamore Creek II—the 13.86 acre Washington Park—is just to the north and east of the smaller park. Sycamore Creek II can begin development in 2010. A photocopy of the adjacent portion of the Sycamore Creek development plan is attached to illustrate the proximity of the parks.
- g) Bike Paths. The Commission and City staff have been insistent upon bike path linkages since the 2000 Comp Plan process. In this instance, the regional pathway that is to be built on the south side of Lindgren Road would be linked at Schumaker Way (the main Lindgren Road entrance) to bring a dedicated pathway to the single-family zoning area.

### **Variations**

1. Minimum Yard Setbacks. The neo-traditional look proposed by John Hall Homes introduces a number of features such as alleys and “old-town” frontage looks that conflict with the City’s conventional zoning setback requirements. The differences between the current code provisions and the developer’s proposals are highlighted in the following tables:

<b>Townhouses (“R-3”)</b>		
	UDO Requirement	Proposed
Front Yard	25’	25’
Corner Side Yard	25’	25’
Side Yard	7’	7’
Rear Yard	30’*	30’
<b>Zero Lot Line Houses (“R-3”)</b>		
	UDO Requirement	Proposed
Front Yard	25’	10’
Corner Side Yard	25’	10’
Side Yard	7’	0’/7’
Rear Yard	30’*	22’
<b>Single Family Detached (“R-1”)</b>		
Front Yard	25’	25’
Corner Side Yard	25’	20’**
Side Yard	10’	7’
Rear Yard	25’	25’

\*20 feet if garage is attached to rear of unit for alley access. Detached garages may be 3 feet from any side or rear lot line.

\*\*If the house has a side-loaded garage, the setback has to be 22 feet so a vehicle parked in the driveway does not encroach upon the sidewalk right-of-way.

2. Minimum Residential Lot Size. The zero lot line or courtyard houses would be unique in Sycamore. They are an alternative to rows of attached housing that have a repetitive look. Zero lot line houses align one building wall on a common lot line and set the opposite building wall off the adjacent lot line by at least the required seven feet in order to create a small courtyard between units. The walls built on the lot lines would have to be designed without windows for fire protection purposes. A depiction of these quaint houses is attached. If this approach is acceptable, a variance from the minimum lot size of 9,000 square feet would be required.

3. Second Floor Residential Condominiums. To permit the introduction of second floor condominiums in a “C-4” zoning district, a variation from the provisions of Table 5.3.1 of the UDO would have to be granted to allow such uses by right. Presently, second floor residential uses above ground floor commercial uses are only allowed in the “C-2” Central Business District.

4. Building Height. To permit a third floor residential loft in the “C-4” zoning area, the developer requests a variance from the building height limit of 35 feet to permit a height of 45 height. This would also accommodate the unique cupolas and roof lines illustrated in the developer’s three-dimensional renderings.

5. C-4 Uses. The developer proposes additional commercial uses that might qualify as “neighborhood” commercial uses in the “C-4” zoning area. From the staff perspective, the commercial uses in the table that follows approximate permitted uses identified in “C-1” or “C-4” districts. The developer asks that the Commission also consider the commercial uses identified in an attachment to this agenda item.

Type of Commercial Use	Permitted	Special Use
Veterinary Clinic		S
Financial service/counseling office	P	
Insurance agency office	P	
Bakery shop	P	
Delicatessen	P	
Package liquor store		S
Butcher shop	P	
Accountant office	P	
Attorney office	P	
ATM kiosk	P	
Barber shop	P	
Beauty parlor/hair salon	P	
Business office	P	
Dental clinic	P	
Medical clinic	P	
Commercial mailing service	P	
Day spa	P	
Physician's office	P	
Engineering service office	P	
Dry cleaner	P	
Locksmith office	P	
Licensed massage therapy	P	
Management services	P	
Optician's office	P	
Printing (xerographic) services	P	
Shoe repair shop	P	
Tailor shop	P	
Tanning salon	P	
Tax preparation services	P	
Health club		S
Recreation equipment showroom	P	
Art gallery	P	
Book store	P	
Camera/photographic sales & supplies	P	
Clothing store	P	
Gift shop	P	
Stationery/greeting card store	P	
Office Supply Store (2,500 sf or less)	P	
Bicycle shop/rentals	P	
Bed & Breakfast Inn	P	

6. The “40%” rule. In the descriptive language concerning “C-4” Mixed Use developments in Section 6.5.2 of the UDO, there is an expectation that the commercial uses “shall not be greater in area than forty (40) percent of the planned mixed use development.” With

respect to the overall site plan, the designated neighborhood commercial area comprises 15% of the overall site (14.62 of the overall 97.21 acres). However, within the “C-4” zoning designation that includes the neighborhood commercial uses as well as the courtyard homes, townhouses, and about one-half of the open space, the commercial uses comprise about 58% of the land area. The developer requests a variance from the 40% rule, because the mix of building types and avenues proposed in the neighborhood commercial area requires slightly more land area to establish than “boxes” of a more conventional design.

**Phasing and Zoning**

In terms of the pace of any residential permits, the applicable regulatory framework is Ordinance 2003.65 (Ordinance 2005.60 was not approved until November of 2005). According to Ordinance 2003.65, building permits for residential construction may be issued annually as follows:

Number of Dwelling Units on the Preliminary Plan	Dwelling Units Permitted Per Year as a Percentage of the Total Lots on The Preliminary Plan	Time Limit Before New Building Permits Are Issued Following Annexation
0 to 50 dwelling units	No Limit	No Time Limit
51 to 100 dwelling units	No More than 35 per Year	One Year
101 to 200 dwelling units	25% or 40, whichever is lower	Two Years
201 to 300 dwelling units	20% or 50, whichever is lower	Three Years
301 to 400 dwelling units	18% or 60, whichever is lower	Four Years
401 to 500 dwelling units	15% or 70, whichever is lower	Five Years
Over 500 dwelling units	10% or 75, whichever is lower	Six Years

Ordinance 2003.65 permits the phasing or sequential development of tracts which have less than 100 acres in total area. In this instance, the developer hopes to develop commercial uses simultaneously with the various types of residential units, but the market for the commercial uses may not evolve at the same pace as the demand for the residential units. Accordingly, the developer proposes two phases. The C-4 zoning area constitutes one phase, and the R-1 zoning constitutes another phase. The permitting of the first single family home in the R-1 zoning could occur two years after the date of Council approval.

**Review Comments**

The City staff have shared the following review comments with the developer since receiving the attached preliminary plan and plat:

- Access to the C-4 properties from Lindgren Road should be limited to full access at the National Street intersection, and a right-in only roughly between Plank Road and National Street, on both sides. The right-in options should be reviewed with the County Engineer, with respect to stacking issues and other safety considerations near the intersection with Plank Road.
- The portion of Lindgren Road which will be vacated once the realigned Lindgren Road is constructed can be shown as being incorporated into Lots 305, 306 and 307 with the same C-4 zoning since the approved annexation agreement provided that all of this vacated road would go to the Herst property.

- The alley at the rear of the courtyard homes should be a private alley.
- The green buffer area along Plank Road should be shown as also adjoining the C-4 Lots 300-305.
- The location of the proposed bikepath should be shown.
- Ten feet (10') of additional right-of-way should be shown along the north side of Lindgren Road adjoining Lot 300 for construction of a right turn lane. Also, an additional ten feet (10') of right-of-way should be shown at the radius at Plank Road.
- Setback lines for the C-4 lots should be shown on the plat.
- Street standards for residential collector streets and commercial streets shall conform to the requirements contained in the City's Unified Development Ordinance.
- Since the project is larger than 40 acres, the storm water storage shall be designed using an approved hydrograph method rather than the rational method.

### **Recommendation**

At the regular Plan Commission meeting of February 12, the Commission voted 7-2 (Henderson, Evans opposing) to support the proposed preliminary plan and plat and rezoning, plus the variation requests with the addition of the following commercial uses: day care, a convenience store (limited to 4800 s.f.); a specialty grocery (limited to 4800 s.f.); an electronic store (limited to 2400 s.f.); a floor covering store (limited to 2400 s.f.); a hardware store (limited to 4800 s.f.); a pet store, restaurants (with a special use requirement for outdoor dining); and drug stores by special use only. Because the developer's plan constitutes an amendment to the original plan accompanying the annexation agreement of September 2005, a two-thirds vote of the City Council is necessary to approve it.

The City staff request a favorable recommendation for the attached plan and plat, including the proposed variations, subject to the changes outlined above.

### **C. Ordinance No. 2006.63--An Ordinance Concerning the Recommendation of the Plan Commission With Regard to the Petition of Milan Krpan to Rezone Property Adjoining a Portion of Gateway Drive and a Portion of Dosen Drive in Sycamore from "M-1" Light Manufacturing District to "C-3" Highway Business District in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.**

At the Sycamore Plan Commission meeting of February 12, the Commission reviewed a concept plan for the zoning of 27.25 acres in the Thanks America subdivision, under development by Mr. Milan Krpan and his family. With the opening of the Oakland Drive Extension to Peace Road via Dosen Drive and Wirsing Parkway, there is renewed commercial and industrial interest in the largely unplatted acres that remain in the Thanks America subdivision. A more comprehensive plan for this subarea's development would be justified by this fact alone. Several other factors contribute to the need for a more orderly plan, namely

- the development interest to the north, represented by the Three Sula commercial subdivision (52 acres and 24 lots annexed in August 2004);
- the recent purchase of the 25-acre Thorald Anderson parcel at the southwest corner of Peace and Bethany Roads by Mr. Krpan;

- the continuing commercial office development in the Prairie Professional Park under development by Dr. Dennis Collins and additional commercial office development along Gateway Drive, east of the Hauser-Ross facility.

Based on suggestions from the Plan Commission on January 8 and subsequent conversation with the City staff, the attached concept plan and zoning exhibit were prepared for the Commission’s formal review on February 12. The concept plan poses a number of zoning considerations:

- Commercial Zoning. Lots 1-4 of the Thanks America Professional Subdivision (surrounding the intersection of Dosen and Gateway Drives) and Lots 1-3 of the Thanks America Commercial Subdivision (on the north side of Oakland Drive), are presently zoned “C-3” Highway Business District. The businesses developing in the Kishwaukee Health Services subdivision are primarily commercial office uses and it is logical that this type of use would continue eastward on Gateway Drive, on both sides, based on the proximity of the new hospital. A rezoning of the lots along the Gateway Drive corridor to “C-3” would be appropriate in this light.
- Industrial Zoning. The City’s need for industrial-zoned lots of varying sizes is addressed by retaining the “M-1” zoning of Lots 8-15 and Lot 29. The larger unsubdivided area to the east of these smaller, industrial-zoned parcels gives the developer and the City flexibility in attracting one or more larger industrial users to this industrial park.
- Unincorporated Land. After further conversation between DeKalb and Sycamore officials, the land east of the Com Ed right-of-way would fall to DeKalb upon annexation; the former Thorald Anderson property that lies north and west of the Com Ed right-of-way would fall to Sycamore upon annexation. The entire un-annexed area falls under the revenue-sharing provisions of the Sycamore-DeKalb boundary agreement of 1995.
- The proposed roadway that runs along the west side of the Anderson property and the east side of the Voluntary Action Center would pass through a significantly sloped terrain and would require careful engineering, but would align with a logical entrance to the Ideal property behind the houses on Bethany Road, if re-development of the northwest corner of Peace and Bethany Roads were to occur.

The Commission voted 9-0 to approve the plan and rezoning request. City Council approval of the Plan Commission recommendation is requested.

**D. Ordinance No. 2006.64--An Ordinance Concerning the Recommendation of the Plan Commission With Regard to the Petition of the Sycamore Park District for the Annexation of Two Parcels Comprising a Total of 82.76 Acres Located West of Airport Road and South of IL. Route 64, Involving the Rezoning of Said Parcels to “R-1” One Family Residence District with a Special Use Permit for Public Park Purposes in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.**

This item and Ordinance 2006.65, below, are essentially “clean-up” items. The Park District owns 77.76 acres south of the present soccer fields and sports facilities and west of Airport Road that has not been annexed. Additionally, as part of the Parkside Estates subdivision approval in August 2001, a five-acre City parcel once targeted as a wastewater

treatment site was transferred to the Park District but was not annexed. These two parcels would be annexed and zoned “R-1,” One Family Residence District, with a special use for public park purposes.

The Plan Commission reviewed the proposed annexation of February 12 and determined that it was consistent with the City’s Comprehensive Plan. The Commission then voted 9-0 to recommend Council approval of the proposed annexation.

City Council approval of the Plan Commission recommendation is requested.

**E. Ordinance No. 2006.65--An Ordinance Concerning the Recommendation of the Plan Commission With Regard to the Petition of the City of Sycamore for the Annexation of the Well #9 Site at 475 South Airport Road, Involving the Rezoning of Said Parcel to “R-1” One Family Residence District with a Special Use Permit for a Public Water Supply in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.**

The larger parcel referenced in Ordinance 2006.64, above, surrounds the 0.92-acre well site recently developed by the City of Sycamore as Well #9 on Airport Road. With the annexation of the larger parcel, the Well site can be annexed. The proposed zoning is “R-1,” One Family Residence District with a special use permit for a public water supply.

The Plan Commission reviewed this proposed annexation on February 12 and determined it was consistent with the City’s Comprehensive Plan. By a vote of 9-0 the Commission recommended the Council’s approval. City Council approval of the Plan Commission recommendation is requested.

**12. RESOLUTIONS--None**

**13. CONSIDERATIONS**

**A. Consideration of a Preliminary Capital Plan for Fiscal Years 2008, 2009, and 2010.**

The proposed three-year capital budget is appended in a spreadsheet for the Council’s review and comment. The Council and the general public will see a very ambitious proposal totaling \$22,826,300 but involving no increase in the City’s portion of the aggregate property tax. Excluding monies set aside for the replacement of operational equipment and vehicles, approximately \$21,088,000 or 92% is dedicated toward the repair or enhancement of City infrastructure. The key projects are as follows:

**FY08 Highlights (May 1, 2007 through April 30, 2008—Total of \$11,063,800):**

- Construction of Fire Station #2: \$2.5 million.
- Reconstruction of the 100 block of S. California Street: \$850,000.
- Street Maintenance: \$300,000 (the remaining 2003 bond proceeds will add \$100,000 to the \$100,000 contributed by the General Fund and \$100,000 contributed by the Capital Fund).
- Engineering plans for Water Tower #2: \$150,000.
- Engineering for Phase I of the treatment plant expansion: \$329,000.

- Installation of new de-watering facilities and a new bar screen at the Treatment Plant as part of Phase I: \$5.829 million.
- Sidewalk replacement on South Main Street (in addition to the Building department's annual sidewalk replacement program): \$100,000.
- Further demolition at the Harvester Square complex: \$150,000.
- Funding of the engineering and grading for the Peace Road bikepath from Bethany Road to IL. Rt. 64: \$275,000.
- Vehicle and equipment replacement including a used bucket truck, two police squad replacements, a large dump truck, digital video equipment for the Police squads, and air pack replacements: \$289,800.
- A new ambulance to replace the 1996 unit: \$110,000.

**FY09 Highlights (May 1, 2008 through April 30, 2009—Total of \$11,186,200):**

- Construction of Water Tower #2 and related mains: \$3,000,000.
- Construction of Phase II improvements at treatment plant: \$6,032,000.
- Sidewalk installation on Commercial Street: \$150,000.
- Street maintenance (in addition to General Fund and Capital Fund contributions): \$150,000.
- Reconstruction of S. Main Street from State to Elm: \$600,000.
- Re-surfacing of State Street from Main to Locust: \$275,000.
- Reconstruction of Locust Street from Exchange Street to Sycamore Street: \$275,000.
- Construction plans for remodeling at the Public Safety building: \$60,000.
- Vehicle and equipment replacement including two Police squads, two used SUVs in the Engineering department, more air packs, laptops for the Police squads, etc.: \$295,200.
- Purchase of a new street sweeper: \$150,000.

**FY10 Highlights (May 1, 2009 through April 30, 2010—Total of \$576,300):**

The FY2010 capital spending is very dependent on the progress of large capital projects in fiscal years FY08 and FY09. For example, it is very likely that some millions of dollars in treatment plant improvements will fall within that capital year, in light of the many-tiered process of review at other levels of government. So, the relatively small allocation noted on the attached spreadsheet is almost certainly going to change in another 12 to 24 months.

At this writing, we are only certain that we plan to continue our annual replacement of selected front-line vehicles and equipment for our operating departments in order to achieve some trade-in value and to maintain our safety program's priority for safe and well-maintained vehicles and equipment. The estimated cost for such replacements at this writing is \$261,300.

\*\*\*\*\*

The City Manager requests Council direction so that final numbers can be put in the FY08 budget in the next few weeks.

**B. Consideration of an Administration Request for Direction Regarding Possible Tourism Grants in FY08.**

Both the Sycamore Historical Society and Museum and the Midwest Museum of Natural History have requested the City Council's consideration of grant support in FY08. Both agencies have requested support from the Hotel/Motel Tax Fund (Fund 9) which derives its revenue from a tax of 5% of the rent charged for the use of hotel and motel rooms within the City of Sycamore. Aside from the atypical visit from a local resident, couple, or family, these are not tax revenues paid by local residents or businesses but are generated by visitors who might attend one or both museums during their visit to Sycamore.

The Council is aware that the City's Hotel/Motel Tax Fund presently supports tourism in various ways. First, the fund has allocated \$45,000 a year to the Discover Group in recent years to support the group's tourism activities by helping to fund the downtown coordinator's position (\$15,000 per year), financing a variety of local and state-wide tourism guides, and fostering community events. Second, the fund reimburses the General Fund for community development and attraction efforts of the City's administration (\$45,000). Third, in recent years the fund has also allocated \$20,000 to \$25,000 per year for downtown façade improvements along the State Street corridor. Finally, in the present fiscal year the fund has also financed the lobbying efforts of The Daley Group (\$80,000). The projected FY07 year-end revenues are \$207,800, with projected year-end FY07 expenditures of \$195,000.

The Sycamore Historical Museum and the Midwest Museum have each requested an FY08 grant of \$10,000. From a financial standpoint, the Hotel/Motel Tax Fund is now generating sufficient annual revenues to finance the disbursements noted above as well as an additional \$20,000 without tapping any of the fund's reserves (please see the attached fund spreadsheet for FY08).

Aside from financial considerations, the principal policy question is: why should the City finance the cultural endeavors of these two private, not-for-profit groups? To help answer that question, each group has been asked for information about its operations, including some estimation of the appeal of their collections to visitors. Copies of their responses are appended to this agenda. Summaries of their separate and unique cases for City support follow.

**Sycamore Historical Society and Museum**

The Sycamore Historical Society and Museum was established in 1999. Its mission is to "collect, preserve, study, interpret and exhibit significant materials relating to Sycamore and the surrounding area, and to provide related educational services for the purpose of increasing and enriching public knowledge of Sycamore for its members, supporters, visitors, students and researchers." The Museum was located in the former Sycamore Municipal Hospital at 211 W. Elm Street from 2000 until 2006, when it was relocated to the lower level of the Sycamore Center. The Museum is actively searching for a new permanent home.

In 2005, the Society hired an executive director, Michelle Donahoe, who is a professional with a masters degree in public history from Loyola University. Ms. Donahoe works part-time. The Society has volunteers who give tours, maintain the collection, lead fund-raising activities and promote the museum.

The Society requests \$10,000 to continue to support a modest stipend for its executive director.

**Midwest Museum of Natural History**

The Midwest Museum of Natural History was chartered in 2002 and opened at 425 West State Street on February 7, 2005. The Museum’s home is the former Community Center. The Museum board commissioned a museum plan in the spring of 2002 under the direction of Rich Faron of Museum Explorer which came to \$20,000. The plans for the renovation and conversion of the center were completed by Durrant Architects late in 2002 at a cost of \$49,860 and the renovation work was completed in 2003-2004 for a cost of \$1,220,000 by TASC Contracting of Dixon, Illinois. The City of Sycamore contributed the following toward the building’s renovation in that period:

Source	Amount
Sales Tax Distributive Fund	\$300,000
Hotel/Motel Tax Fund	\$50,000
Hotel/Motel Tax Fund (roof, soffit, gutters, etc.)	\$153,747
Total	\$503,747

The mission of the Museum is to “encourage an appreciation of the world’s diverse natural environment and human culture through exhibits and interactive learning experiences for children and adults. Such experiences will guide visitors in understanding the importance of preservation as it relates to the natural world.”

The Museum has one full-time executive director, Chris Brodnicki, and six part-time paid staff. As with the Sycamore Historical Society and Museum, the MMNH has a board of directors and a corps of volunteers who give tours, maintain the collection, lead fund-raising activities and promote the museum. The museum has also benefited from local corporate sponsorships.

The Museum has prepared attendance figures for 2005 and 2006 which are attached. From its opening in February 2005 to December 2006, the Museum served 19,561 visitors. In 2006 the Museum began a marketing survey to ascertain the hometowns of its visitors, as well as their purpose in visiting Sycamore. A blank form is attached, along with some of the quarterly reports from the director to the museum board.

The background also includes the names of special and ongoing workshops, lecture series, and events which have attracted visitors to Sycamore, and entertained local residents. The local and regional media coverage of these many events has been abundant and has enhanced Sycamore’s reputation as a weekend destination in particular.

The Museum requests \$10,000 for capital purposes to help retire the balance of a local loan that was secured in 2004 to complete the renovation project at 425 West State Street.

**Recommendation**

This is not an action item, but direction is needed as the FY08 budget preparation moves toward completion in draft form. The numerical budgets are complete but the narratives are not. A plug number has been included in the Hotel/Motel Fund allocation under line item 09-8343 (“Developmental Services”).

What do we do? At the staff level, we have investigated what other communities do to support their museums. Certainly, Sycamore is not alone in its interest in museums. By way of reference, the Illinois Association of Museums estimates that over 400 Illinois communities account for more than 850 museums. This does not include the variety of county museums and museums run by state associations and scientific agencies in the state. Many museums are in historic buildings converted for the special purpose of exhibiting something about a person, a family, an institution, or a community. These Illinois museums are tourist attractions and a source of community pride, and they have positive ripple effects on local businesses. They owe their enduring appeal to some intellectual curiosity. They typically offer educational programs for young and old alike. Most are small (less than 4,000 square feet) and more than half have modest operating budgets of less than \$50,000 per year.

More Illinois museums are run by not-for-profit entities than not. Whether public or private, these not-for-profits rely on community support for their success. Financially speaking, this takes the form of annual museum memberships, donations, and some tax support. Most receive some form of tax support, which is most often property tax support. As the foregoing report has made clear, no local property or sales taxes are proposed as a source of operating funds for either Sycamore museum. Hotel/Motel taxes are proposed but their source is the visitors who come to our City.

The City Manager recommends the Council’s support for these home-grown and popular museums because they have established themselves as centers for learning.

**C. Consideration of an Administration Request for a Closed Session to Discuss Personnel Matters.**

- 14. OTHER NEW BUSINESS**
- 15. APPOINTMENTS**
- 16. ADJOURNMENT**