



Post Office Box 299  
Peru, Illinois 61354

**August 7, 2025**

Mayor Ken Kolowski,  
Peru City Clerk, and  
Aldermen of the City of Peru

RE: Petition of James J. Brady III  
Consolidation Plat for Lot 8 & 9 of The Pointe Subdivision, Peru, Illinois  
(PINs 17-08-421-008 & 17-08-421-009)

Gentlemen:

Pursuant to legal notice published in the News Tribune in the manner provided by law, the Planning/Zoning Commission of the City of Peru convened for a public hearing on Wednesday, August 6, 2025, at 5:00 p.m. in the City Municipal Building, 1901 Fourth Street, Peru, IL, to consider the Petition of James J. Brady III ("Petitioner") concerning real estate commonly known as 1 Pointe Boulevard and 2 Pointe Boulevard, also known as Lot 9 and Lot 8 in The Pointe Subdivision, respectively, in the City of Peru, Illinois (PINs: 17-08-421-009 & 17-08-421-008) ("Subject Parcels").

Petitioner is the owner of the vacant Subject Parcels, and also the owner of the adjacent Lots 10 and 11 of the Pointe Subdivision, and desires to consolidate the Subject Parcels to a single parcel and requests the following relief under the City of Peru Subdivision and Site Development Regulations Ordinance, to wit:

- (a) Approval of the Consolidation Plat for Lot 8 & 9 of the Pointe Subdivision, Peru, Illinois, as prepared by Michael S. Richetta of Chamlin & Associates and dated July 14, 2025; and
- (b) For such other and further relief deemed necessary or appropriate.

The Subject Parcels are zoned R-2 Single Family, Detached Dwelling District.

Planning/Zoning Commission Members Miller, Lucas, Jones, Grabowski, Brady, and Becker were present at the hearing. Member Kalsto was absent.

Tom Brady appeared on behalf of the Petitioner and was duly sworn. Mr. Brady testified that Petitioner owns the two Subject Parcels next to his current residence and has a desire to combine them into a single parcel. Petitioner believes the buildable area upon the Subject Parcels is more suitable for one residence and, whether Petitioner decides to build a spec home or sell the Subject Parcels in the future, it is his desire to see only one residence built there.

City Director of Engineering and Zoning, Eric Carls, stated he had no comments or objections to the petition.

City Corporation Counsel, Scott Schweickert, stated that he had consulted with Mr. Brady regarding this matter and advised him that the City, as the zoning authority, required a Consolidation Plat and Petitioner had one prepared that incorporated existing drainage and utility easements, but eliminated interior building setbacks between the Subject Parcels.

Attorney Schweickert said that typically covenants and restrictions applicable to the property are outside the purview of the City, but the City did have involvement with the covenants and restrictions with respect to the Pointe Subdivision as part of a development agreement. Schweickert noted The Pointe Subdivision covenants and restrictions do contain a provision that provides: “10. No Lot shall be further subdivided in any manner or form, provided, however, two (2) contiguous Lots may be combined for development purposes but, after combined, shall not thereafter be subdivided.” Schweickert noted the original intent behind that provision was that Petitioner was interested in purchasing two contiguous lots at the time, which he subsequently did and constructed a beautiful residence. There is also another beautiful home constructed adjacent to the Subject Parcels on the opposite side. Schweickert noted the Subject Parcels are located at the “point” of “The Pointe”. It would be the City’s desire to see another high-quality home built on the Subject Parcels, consistent with the area, given the high visibility location.

Noting that Covenants and Restrictions can be modified, and consistent with Petitioner’s desire, Attorney Schweickert recommended that language be added to the Plat that the combined property shall not be resubdivided except in accordance with the applicable Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions for the Pointe Subdivision and with the consent and approval of the City of Peru in full compliance with applicable ordinances.

There were no public comments or objections.

The Planning/Zoning Commission found the requested relief will not alter the essential character of the locality; will not be detrimental or injurious to other properties in the area; will not impair an adequate supply of light or air to adjacent properties, or increase the danger of fire, or endanger the public safety, or diminish or impair property values and will not increase street congestion and, therefore, favorably recommended to the City Council that it grant the relief as prayed for in the Petition.

Member Grabowski moved, and Member Jones seconded, to favorably recommend that the City Council approve the Petition as prayed for. The motion passed unanimously: 5 aye, 0 nay, Member Brady abstaining, and Member Kalsto absent.

Respectfully submitted,

---

CARY MILLER, Chairman of the  
Planning/Zoning Commission