

## COUNCIL WORKSHOP ITEM

**ITEM:** Stormwater and Flood Plain Oversight Committee  
File #00-04 Code Amendment: Section 26-77 "Fees"  
**DATE:** January 22, 2001  
**PREPARED BY:** Robert Jungwirth, Village Engineer  
**PURPOSE:** Adopt staff requested revision to stormwater and floodplain ordinance

### DISCUSSION:

In conjunction with the recent revisions to portions of the Building Code, the Director of Code Services has asked the Stormwater Permitting Staff to review the fees for stormwater management permits. The fee schedule has not been revised since its initial adoption in 1992.

As suspected, some of the fees are too low to support the cost of engineering review and field inspections. The problem is most severe with residential development – permits for substantial room additions or new garages can cost as little as \$50.00.

A survey was made of several comparable communities' permit fees. On the whole, we are among the lowest and charge far less than what builders are accustomed to paying elsewhere.

We also found that some fees were calculated on irrelevant data. For example, the cost of a wetland submittal review is not directly proportional to the size of the wetland. A truer administrative procedure is to charge a flat fee plus the direct cost of consultant charges.

Review and inspection fees for non-residential development will continue to be assessed based upon a percentage of the cost of stormwater facilities. This system has worked well because it keeps pace with inflation.

The charge for a variance or appeal hearing has also not changed. We have, however, added a reinspection fee (of \$50.00). This revision should reduce the number of repeated inspections that presently are unfunded by the permittee.

The Stormwater and Flood Plain Oversight Committee discussed all of these changes at their November 16, 2000 meeting and have recommended the adoption of the new schedule. The minutes of that meeting are attached.

### RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt amendment.

# VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE COUNCIL ACTION SUMMARY

**INITIATED BY:** Robert T. Jungwirth, Village Engineer      **DATE:** January 22, 2001

**RECOMMENDATION FROM:** Stormwater and Flood Plain Oversight Committee  
(Board or Department)

**FILE REF:** File #00-04 Code Amendment: Section 26-77 "Fees"

## STEPS NEEDED TO IMPLEMENT ACTION

Adopt Revision to Municipal Code

### NATURE OF ACTION:

- Ordinance  
 Resolution  
 Motion  
 Other

### SUMMARY OF ITEM:

At the November 16, 2000 Stormwater and Flood Plain Oversight Meeting, it was recommended to the Village Council that the above described revision be adopted.

Further discussion regarding this file can be found in the attached November 16, 2000 Stormwater and Flood Plain Oversight Committee Meeting Minutes.

### RECORD OF ACTION TAKEN:

---

---

---

---

**Village of Downers Grove**

**Stormwater and Flood Plain Oversight Committee Meeting**  
*Minutes*

**Downers Grove Public Works Facility**  
**5101 Walnut Avenue**

**November 16, 2000**

Mr. Donald Eckmann, Chairman, called the November 16, 2000 meeting of the Downers Grove Stormwater and Flood Plain Oversight Committee to order at 7:10 p.m.

**Present:** Mr. William Bollenberg, Mr. William Ponstein, Mr. Donald Eckmann

Mr. Perry Erhart arrived at 7:30 p.m.

**Absent:** Ms. Julia Beckman

**Staff:** Mr. Robert Jungwirth, Village Engineer, Ms. Chrys Rymas, Stormwater Management Engineer, Ms. Hope Hathaway, Recording Secretary

Chairman Eckmann stated the first order of business was the roll call. After this was the acceptance of the Minutes from the September 28, 2000 meeting. He asked the Committee if there were any changes or corrections to the minutes.

The Committee briefly discussed the acceptance of the minutes.

Mr. Bollenberg requested that his name be changed to Bollenberg instead of Bollenberger as noted on page two.

***Committee Member Bollenberg moved to accept the September 28, 2000 minutes.***

***Committee Member Ponstein seconded the motion.***

***Motion carried 3:0.***

Chairman Eckmann stated that the Committee would continue the review of File #00-02; Code Amendment, Section 26-78 "Duration and Revision to Permits".

**SWM File #00-02 Code Amendment, Section 26-78 "Duration and Revision to Permits".**

Chairman Eckmann stated that the Committee members would continue with the reconsideration of this item from the last meeting and asked Mr. Jungwirth for his comments.

Mr. Jungwirth answered that there was a concern in regard to the life span of a subdivision approval, which is two years following the plat being recorded. To avoid conflicts between a

subdivision permit and all other permits, an additional paragraph is provided. The recommended revision, Item 1, states *except as provided herein*, permits would be valid one year following the date of permit issuance. Item 2, states *permits issued in conjunction with the approval of a final plat of subdivision will be valid for a term of two years following date of plat recordation*. It is hoped that this will avoid any problems or questions. This should handle one of the issues that were observed with the one-year term for all permits. Of key importance is that permits can be extended and for subdivisions an extension is given on a one-year basis, so extensions would not be granted in two-year increments (2, 4, 6, 8 years). The permit would be extended one additional year if the public improvements were not completed at the end of the two years time limit. Sometimes, three or six month's extension is given, but we do not anticipate any big issues although, without this change, there was an issue.

The second part dealt with special management areas. The issues regarding the change in the current requirements will arise occasionally. The subdivision permit will be effective for two years, which will protect the developer from changes in the wetland rules that may cause a hardship.

Mr. Jungwirth asked the Committee Members if there were any questions or comments.

Chairman Eckmann asked if whether or not 99% of the subdivision work done in the village could be done reasonably within two years. He has no problem with this change, but there is a possibility that if they have to go for a renewal that a developer may be confronted with another ordinance and would have to make the changes. He had a problem with this ordinance change.

Mr. Ponstein stated that no matter what is done, it remains that the detention or special mangement areas are all set with the entire subdivision, but he believed that most of the items left to do would be sidewalks and felt that two years would not be a hardship.

Mr. Jungwirth stated that if the change were made it would encourage the developer to complete that part of the project. By ordinance, all those improvements must be done at the beginning of the two-year period but sometime this would not be practical. In that case, a developer would be advised that a renewal would be necessary.

Chairman Eckmann questioned how would the developer be aware of a change at the end of two years.

Mr. Jungwirth stated that the change would come from a higher authority, such as county, state, or FEMA. Stormwater Management would be notified first of any changes, and there is a 90 day review period for comments. If a change were noted that could potentially alter a development under construction, the developer would be encouraged to complete that portion so he would not be subjected to any changes.

Chairman Eckmann suggested that verbiage be changed after the word "ordinance" to 'provided notification by the Village of Downers Grove of any changes 90 days prior.'

Mr. Ponstein commented that if the developer had the stormwater management completed and the last things to do were upstream and the storage requirements changed, there might be no more space available.

Mr. Jungwirth answered that there were some changes, however, generally it seems that the County was in receipt of those changes and asked us to do the same, they have given allowance for the projects under construction or those that had permits issued.

Mr. Ponstein stated that this does not do that.

Chairman Eckmann agreed.

Mr. Jungwirth stated that his concern was that this was the County's language for this particular item. If some language is added that may weaken or modify it or makes it less restrictive than the county, they may not allow the adoption of the language. In general, we may be more restrictive but not less restrictive.

Chairman Eckmann suggested to the Board that this be viewed as right and the county may view it in another manner.

Mr. Bollenberg stated that looking at this academically, legally and esoterically it is offensive that a developer could be 23 months and 29 days into a project and the rules would change and make you change your project.

Ms. Rymas stated that the language is confusing. A three-year project cannot be changed two years hence and expect the project to begin again.

Mr. Bollenberg agreed there would be too many insurmountable changes allowed. This does not allow for a request of variance. The practical matter is that there is no place in Downers Grove that would take longer than two years to develop. There is no unincorporated outward property available, only unincorporated inward property available within our township.

Mr. Jungwirth stated that he could confer with our village attorney whether he would consider speaking with the States Attorney at the County to discuss the ramifications of this particular passing of the code.

Mr. Bollenberg stated that this passage could be an effective tool for projects being completed in a timely manner as written.

Mr. Jungwirth stated that the Council recommendation would question whether or not there is a problem in this regard. A statement should be made stating that not everything that is done in public is not necessarily agreed upon. No problems have been noted where the rules have changed and it has been expensive to the developer or he has had to construct a larger basin. Mr. Ponstein asked what the benefits were if the fees changed.

Mr. Jungwirth stated that the fees were to be paid at the time of permit issuance.

Mr. Ponstein asked if an extension were given, would the developer be subject to making up the difference in a fee change. In other words, if the project was not complete, if adhering to the ordinance in place at the time, and there were higher fees, would they apply?

Mr. Jungwirth answered that he did not know. The ordinance as it appears today and what we were discussing regarding the fee amounts, we require renewal permits, but do not require payment of any additional fees. Stormwater is introducing the payment of re-inspection fees, which coincides with building permits, i.e., if the project is not complete at the time of the inspection, then a fee will be assessed for a follow-up inspection, but not on permit renewal fees. It was unclear how changing the fees would put all the active permits into a state of limbo where increases would be due upon renewal.

Mr. Ponstein commented that there were two points of contradiction in the ordinance. It states that it is two years from the plat recordation, yet in 'Justification', it states 'at the time of final plat approval be valid for a coincident term of two years.' Which does the ordinance really say? It is stated two different times.

Mr. Jungwirth stated that the two expressions were used synonymously and should not have been as there would be some lapse of time between the final plat approval, which is a Council action and the developer taking the plat to Wheaton for recordation. Therefore, the ordinance states the date the plat is recorded not the date of Council approval. To say two years after the time of final plat approval was his mistake.

Mr. Bollenberg stated that the record would show that it is the revision not the justification being discussed.

Mr. Jungwirth clarified it is as stated in italics under 'Recommended Revision', which is the language to be inserted in the newly revised ordinance.

Mr. Ponstein stated that this should agree with the ordinance as far as the time limit.

Mr. Jungwirth confirmed the expiration date permitted as stated in Chapter 20 allows two years from the date the plat is recorded.

Chairman Eckmann questioned the language of the ordinance with regard to the date of permit issuance and the date of plat recordation.

Mr. Jungwirth commented that unless it is a subdivision plat, the permit is issued by the Village of Downers Grove cashier. The fees are paid by the applicant, receives their copy of permit, then the one-year time frame begins. When a subdivision stormwater permit is issued the time begins when the plat is recorded. The act of issuing a permit is different, one is when the monies are paid and one is when the plat is recorded in Wheaton.

Chairman Eckmann stated that there were several alternatives to this ordinance; one being to strike out the area regarding the permitted activity part of this ordinance, or leave as stated, or add a provision that would say 'provided the developer is notified six months prior to expiration'.



More time was used in processing the return of bonds, which were so low, that the owners ignored it.

Chairman Eckmann asked how do you define the term disturbed area.

Mr. Jungwirth answered that it is a change in character and/or grade. A disturbed area is a grass area that is paved, which is changed from pervious to impervious, or if there is a grading change.

Chairman Eckmann asked if there was a garage and a driveway, with no grading around it, is that a footprint.

Mr. Jungwirth answered that a footprint is the area where activity is taking place.

Mr. Ponstein stated that if you use change in character, why would a permit not be necessary to tear out an old driveway and put a new one in.

Ms. Rymas stated that that is considered maintenance. No permit is required if the driveway remains exactly the same size and there are no grade changes.

Mr. Jungwirth added that a shopping center couldn't be removed to make another shopping center. The rules state that that would not be considered maintenance, but would be considered a redevelopment. The recommendation for Subsection 1 of the ordinance is in the way it was reconstructed, the various sections were reviewed with recommended changes to be categorized.

The fee of \$10 for less than 500 square feet is antiquated. The Recommended Revision is changed from \$10.00 to \$50.00.

Mr. Jungwirth asked Ms. Rymas to distribute the 'Complete Waiver Communities' listing, which showed the fees of several surveyed communities. Ms. Rymas contacted other complete waiver communities for comparison of fees.

Ms. Rymas stated that some of the larger communities, i.e., Bloomingdale, are still in full development stages. As indicated on the listing, there are several approaches to fees.

Mr. Jungwirth stated some communities have a minimum, some incorporate the size of the development, which does not hinder the review time. It is felt that the disturbed area is key rather than the size of the lot.

Ms. Rymas commented that some communities did not charge review fees.

Mr. Jungwirth stated that some communities have a site development permit, which is similar to a stormwater permit, but is not on the official county form, therefore, some information may not be related to the public. There is question as to where and when to charge the fees, but not two communities are alike.

Ms. Rymas explained each permit requires two inspections for smaller disturbed areas and the larger size projects require a third inspection, the lawn inspection.

Mr. Ponstein asked what the inspections were for.

Ms. Rymas stated that one inspection is to check whether the grading is finished so a final occupancy inspection can be scheduled; and the second inspection is to check that the grass landscaping has been established, so that bonds could be returned.

Mr. Jungwirth stated that there have been recent changes in the building codes regarding occupancy when there are incomplete improvements.

Mr. Jungwirth continued with Subsections 3 and 4, stating the original \$90.00 fee per unit be changed to \$250.00 for new residential construction. Review and inspection time is essentially the same for homes within areas with or without detention. The cost of \$35.00 including detention, was usually reasonable. He pointed out several cost factors, such as employee, benefits, staff vehicles, office space, review plans, meeting with people, telephone service that need to be built into the fees. The focus is not on the cost as it might be as if an outside consultant was hired to provide this service.

Mr. Ponstein asked if the same amount of time is spent on a pre-approved site plan as is done on a single family lot.

Ms. Rymas answered no, subdivisions are quicker. Site plans for single family lots may need to be reviewed more than once due to revisions.

Mr. Jungwirth felt that a two- tiered fee schedule for single lots and subdivisions where the grading is pre-approved was reasonable.

Mr. Bollenberg stated that this fee is a very good price for residential names and just a good value for the subdivisions.

Ms. Rymas commented that there may be changes in site plans in a subdivision during the construction phase.

Mr. Jungwirth referred to Subsection 5, (a) adding that the \$90.00 per acre was never utilized. He requested a check of Subsection 8 be changed to Subsection 5 with no text changes. No changes were suggested, for commercial, institutional, and industrial properties.

He directed the members to Subsection 7, subdivisions. He believed the emphasis on the fee charges is on GAR's, small size and single family homes. In Subsection 8, the table indicates the estimated probable cost to construct the stormwater facility in relation to the review and inspection fee. It does not cost twice as much to review the plans for a 5-acre subdivision versus a 10-acre subdivision. Mr. Jungwirth continued with an explanation of fees on the diagram stating that the chart is working for the department.

Chairman Eckmann asked how is the probable cost for stormwater facility ascertained.

Mr. Jungwirth answered that the design engineer for the developer calculates the probable cost. It has not been a problem or challenged in determining the review inspection fee nor has there been any challenge of the fee.

Subsection 9 and 10, the fees for flood plain and wetlands in the first couple of years if the ordinance were not clear. The numbers were not well matched. The fees were determined by consultants reviewing our plans. This fee amount for the review was forwarded to the Village of Downers Grove which then was passed on to the developer. The recommended revision states that the applicant shall reimburse the Village for the cost of all fees related to outside consultants along with Special Management Area fee of \$100.00 per submittal.

Chairman Eckmann thought that a consultant's fee should have a maximum value. This would maintain a check and balance system. He had concern with the fee being transferred to the developer.

Mr. Jungwirth stated that unless we have a certified resident staff member who has all the required degrees: background in soil science, biology, botany, and geology to do wetland delineation's per the Army Corps Engineers Manual, the County requires we use a consultant.

Ms. Rymas asked Chairman Eckmann if the expense should then be paid by the Village.

Mr. Erhart answered that it would be well advised to have a ceiling on the fees.

Mr. Ponstein commented that the developer would be liable for the consultant's charges as well as the developers initial fees.

Chairman Eckmann stated that the principle is wrong, requiring the developer to pay fees based on the village's selection.

Mr. Ponstein suggested that estimated costs could be obtained before proceeding.

Ms. Rymas questioned how this would be obtained.

Mr. Jungwirth stated that a number of consultants could estimate hours for each review. If a consultant appears to be out of range of other consultants, the village would not retain them.

The Committee Members discussed several ways of hiring consultants.

Mr. Jungwirth stated that Planning Resources, the consultant providing services for the village, have reasonable fees as compared to other consultants in the field.

Mr. Ponstein suggested that the village work with two different consultants.

Mr. Erhart stated that there is a lack of checks and balances. The ideal situation may be to put consultants out to bid, but is not reasonable.

Mr. Jungwirth asked if that is a consideration.

Mr. Erhart commented that perhaps there is a way to get a contractual agreement, which would not control the number of hours on any given project.

Ms. Rymas stated that, that was researched.

Mr. Erhart asked if there was a common denominator to use for the agreement.

Ms. Rymas stated that there are different types of wetland. There are too many variables to consider.

Discussion transpired on the types and conditions of wetlands. The review of wetlands is far more complicated than saying two acres will take twice as long to review as one acre as it could be the opposite depending upon the combination of factors from that particular wetland.

Mr. Jungwirth commented that the delineation method would yield the same answer regardless of the consultants. Five qualified consultants would provide numbers that are very close in terms of the quality of that wetland. Their pricing would differ due to various reasons.

Chairman Eckmann stated that there should be a controlling factor established in terms of these fees.

Mr. Bollenberg said he felt the reverse in that he had more faith in the village staff. He trusts the consultant to do a good job for the citizens and developers of Downers Grove knowing that the costs will be passed on to the client/citizens.

Mr. Jungwirth stated that he has never refused to reveal records to a developer indicating the origin of charges to be reimbursed.

Mr. Jungwirth commented that he is willing to entertain any suggestion as to how manage this part of the problem.

Chairman Eckmann proposed that we investigate lump sum contracts.

Mr. Jungwirth stated that the consultants would be forced to provide a lump sum fee for an unknown review and certain tests can be eliminated because they are not applicable. However, if they are not paid on their billed time, they could ask for \$2,000.00 for work that may have been a \$1,000.00 on an hourly basis, but because consultants are given certain parameters, they would charge more than would be an actual billing as a precautionary method.

Ms. Rymas stated that it would be calculated to the consultant's advantage.

Mr. Erhart asked what criteria lies in the scope of their bid.

Mr. Jungwirth stated that the scope of services is driven by the ordinance. They are required to go into the field, delineate the wetland as required by the Corps of Engineers, which will include an inventory of plant species.

Mr. Erhart asks what the consultant would be required to do.

Mr. Jungwirth stated that a consultant must be informed of the location to estimate how much is required in order to satisfy the requirements of the ordinance. It is impossible to look at a piece of paper and estimate a dollar amount for the review. The estimate would probably be high in the event it is discovered that the review actually would take more time than originally estimated.

Ms. Rymas stated that the number of reviews required couldn't be pre-determined.

Mr. Ponstein referred to an incident wherein additional time was charged to the consultant as well as to the developer.

Mr. Jungwirth stated that this was a specific circumstance where the village failed to provide our consultant with all the information.

Chairman Eckmann suggested that developers use a list to contract consultants for review services.

Mr. Jungwirth stated that this is a permitting program where the specialists work is checked in relation to all the construction. The consultant must review certain elements of development permits and that cost is passed on to the permitting program.

Mr. Jungwirth asked Ms. Rymas if this process was consistent with what other neighboring villages were doing, such as Oak Brook, Naperville, Wood Dale, etc. In some villages the county is used and collecting a fee. County ordinance demands rigorous analysis due to the wetlands. There is not enough activity to hire a full time staff person instead of a consultant.

Mr. Erhart asked if it was routine to get an estimate to complete a review.

Ms. Rymas stated that an estimate is requested for large projects.

Mr. Jungwirth added that he was involved in the review of a proposed development, which includes a 1.9 acres delineated wetland. A consultant reported the necessary steps required for investigating and analyzing the wetland so that the village could determine whether or not a permit would have any adverse impacts and advise us if a permit should be issued.

Chairman Eckmann asked the Committee Members for a straw poll to determine whether this item should be reviewed at the next meeting.

Mr. Erhart asked if transferring the consultant's fee to the developer was similar to the procedure in other village departments that use consultants.

Ms. Rymas answered yes.

Mr. Jungwirth commented that it is his understanding that other villages use consultants and pass the fees on.

Mr. Ponstein stated that wetlands are reviewed to meet county ordinance.





ORDINANCE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PERMIT FEES

BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the Village of Downers Grove, in DuPage County, Illinois, as follows: (Additions are indicated by shading; deletions by ~~strikeout~~.)

SECTION 1. That Section 26-77 of the Downers Grove Municipal Code is hereby amended as

follows:

**26-77. Fees.**

~~\_\_\_\_\_ A Basic Stormwater Management Permit Fee, as set forth below, shall be paid to the Village for all non exempt developments. In addition, fees shall be paid to the Village for the submittals indicated below. For each submittal, applicants shall pay the Basic Stormwater Management Permit Fee plus the applicable additional fees required for the submittals as described below. Provided, any appeal fee shall be refunded if an appeal is successfully taken pursuant to Section 26-110.~~

~~(1) Basic Stormwater Management Permit Fee, to be paid upon application for all submittals, except appeals (Article 11) and Variances (Article 12): \$35.00.~~

~~(2) Accessory structures, or additions, to existing principle structures: \$15.00 plus the basic stormwater management permit fee.~~

~~(3) New residential construction which is not located within an area served by an approved site runoff storage facility: the basic stormwater management permit fee plus the greater of the following:~~

~~(a) \$90.00 per unit, or~~

~~(b) a fee determined pursuant to Section 26-77.8, based upon the estimated probable cost to construct the stormwater facilities, which estimate shall be approved by the Administrator. \_\_\_\_\_)~~

~~New residential construction which is located within an area served by an approved site runoff storage facility: \$15.00 plus the basic stormwater management permit fee.~~

~~(5) Non residential or mixed commercial, industrial or institutional construction which is not located within an area served by an approved site runoff storage facility: the basic stormwater management permit fee plus the greater of the following:~~

~~(a) \$90.00 per acre, or~~

~~(b) a fee determined pursuant to Section 26-77.8, based upon the estimated probable cost to construct the stormwater facilities, which estimate shall be approved by the Administrator.~~

~~(6) Minor developments in excess of 500 sq. ft., such as driveways and patios, for which no building permit is required, but which, pursuant to Section 26-50, are required to comply with the site runoff storage requirements of Section 26-53: the basic stormwater management permit fee.~~

~~(7) Subdivision/Planned Development processed pursuant to the Village of Downers Grove Zoning Ordinance or Chapter 20 (Subdivisions) of the Downers Grove Municipal Code: the basic stormwater management permit fee plus the greater of the following:~~

~~(a) \$90.00 per acre, or~~

~~(b) a fee determined pursuant to Section 26-77.8, based upon the estimated probable cost to construct the stormwater facilities, which estimate shall be approved by the Administrator.~~

~~(8) Plan review and inspection fee schedule for stormwater facilities:~~

~~Estimated probable cost~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ to construct~~

~~the stormwater facility~~

Review and Inspection fee

\$ 2,499 or less	6% of estimated cost
\$ 2,500 to \$ 9,999	5% of estimated cost, but not less than \$150
\$ 10,000 to \$ 24,999	4.5% of estimated cost, but not less than \$500
\$ 25,000 to \$ 49,999	4% of estimated cost, but not less than \$1,125
\$ 50,000 to \$ 99,999	3.75% of estimated cost, but not less than \$2,000
\$100,000 to \$199,999	3.5% of estimated cost, but not less than \$3,750
\$200,000 or more	3.25% of estimated cost, but not less than \$7,000

(9) Flood plain submittal:

(a) Up to 20 acres of flood plain within the development: \$500.00 plus basic stormwater management permit fee.

(b) More than 20 acres of flood plain within the development: \$500.00 plus \$35.00 per acre over 20 acres, plus basic stormwater management permit fee.

(10) Wetlands submittal:

(a) Up to 20 acres of wetlands within the development: \$500.00 plus basic stormwater management permit fee.

(b) More than 20 acres of wetlands within the development: \$500.00 plus \$35.00 per acre over 20 acres, plus basic stormwater management permit fee.

(11) Variations: \$350.00

(12) Appeals: \$350.00

Pursuant to the general requirements of this Article, all applicants for a Stormwater Management Permit shall pay review and inspection fees per the following schedule:

1. Accessory structures, additions to principal structures and new impervious surfaces such as a driveway or patio:

(a) disturbed area less than 500 square feet: \$50.00

(b) disturbed area 500 to 5,000 square feet: \$125.00

(c) disturbed area over 5,000 square feet: \$250.00

2. New single-family residential construction:

(a) that substantially conforms with a previously approved site plan: \$200.00

(b) not in conformance with a previously approved site plan: \$250.00

3. New construction other than single-family residential: a fee determined pursuant to Section 26-77.5, based upon the estimated probable cost to construct the stormwater facilities, which estimate shall be approved by the Administrator.

4. Subdivisions or Planned Developments processed pursuant to Village of Downers Grove Municipal Code: a fee determined pursuant to Section 26-77.5, based upon the estimated probable cost to construct the stormwater facilities, which estimate shall be approved by the Administrator.

5. Plan review and inspection fee schedule for stormwater facilities:

Estimated probable cost  
to construct

the stormwater facility: Review and inspection fee

\$ 2,499 or less	6% of estimated cost
\$ 2,500 to \$ 9,999	5% of estimated cost, but not less than \$150
\$ 10,000 to \$ 24,999	4.5% of estimated cost, but not less than \$500
\$ 25,000 to \$ 49,999	4% of estimated cost, but not less than \$1,125
\$ 50,000 to \$ 99,999	3.75% of estimated cost, but not less than \$2,000
\$100,000 to \$199,999	3.5% of estimated cost, but not less than \$3,750
\$200,000 or more	3.25% of estimated cost, but not less than \$7,000

6. For all developments requiring Special Management Area (Floodplains, Wetlands and Riparian environment) submittals, a fee of \$100.00 shall be paid per submittal. In addition, prior to the issuance of any permit, the applicant shall reimburse the Village for the cost of all fees related to outside consultants retained by the Village for the purpose of plan review or project analysis.

7. Variances: \$350.00

8. Appeals: \$350.00. If an appeal is successfully taken pursuant to Section 26-110, the appeal fee shall be refunded.

9. Inspections that must be repeated will not be provided until the applicant has paid a reinspection fee of \$50.00.

SECTION 2. That all ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict with the provisions of this ordinance are hereby repealed.

SECTION 3. That this ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage and publication in the manner provided by law.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

Passed:

Published:

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_

Village Clerk

[SW-fees]