

1  
2  
3  
4 **MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING**

---

6 **Champaign County Environment**                      **DATE:**            **October 16, 2006**  
7 **& Land Use Committee**                                      **TIME:**            **7:00 p.m.**  
8 **Champaign County Brookens**                              **PLACE:**           **Lyle Shields Meeting Room**  
9 **Administrative Center**    **Brookens Administrative Center**  
10 **Urbana, IL 61802**    **1776 E. Washington Street**  
11    **Urbana, IL 61802**

---

12  
13  
14  
15 **MEMBERS PRESENT:**      Jan Anderson, Tony Fabri, Nancy Greenwalt (VC), Kevin Hunt, Ralph  
16    Langenheim (C), Brendan McGinty, Steve Moser, Jon Schroeder

17  
18 **OTHER COUNTY**  
19 **BOARD MEMBERS**  
20 **PRESENT:**

Barbara Wysocki (Champaign County Board Chair)

21  
22  
23 **MEMBERS ABSENT:**      Chris Doenitz

24  
25 **STAFF PRESENT:**      John Hall, Jamie Hitt, Leroy Holliday, Christina Papavasiliou (Senior  
26    Assistant State's Attorney), Brent Rose (RPC Economic Development  
27    Specialist), Susan Monte

28  
29 **OTHERS PRESENT:**      Mark Thompson, Gerald Schweighart, Jim Norman, Dorothy Norman, Eric  
30    Thorsland, Mark Dixon, Teri Legner, Hal Barnhart, Barbara Wright, Sandra  
31    Beak

---

32  
33  
34  
35 **1.      Call to Order, Roll Call**

36  
37 The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m. The roll was called and quorum declared present.

38  
39 **2.      Approval of Agenda**

40  
41 **Mr. Schroeder moved, seconded by Mr. McGinty to approve the agenda as submitted.**

42  
43 Mr. Langenheim informed the Committee that if there are no objections he will rearrange the agenda and  
44 place Item #5, County Board Chair's Report after Item #14, Other Business. No objections were heard.

45  
46 **The motion carried by voice vote.**

47  
48 **3.      Minutes of Previous Meeting (September 13, 2006)**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

**Mr. Moser moved, seconded by Mr. McGinty to approve the September 13, 2006, minutes as submitted. The motion carried by voice vote.**

**4. Public Participation**

None

**5. County Board Chair’s Report**

**A. Closed session pursuant to 5 ILCS 120/2 (c) 1 to consider the employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of an employee.**

The Committee entered closed session at 7:50 p.m. and adjourned from closed session at 7:57 p.m.

**6. CDAP Loan Request for Solar Tan (Mark and Kelly Hodson)**

**Ms. Greenwalt moved, seconded by Mr. Moser to recommend approval of the CDAP Loan Request for Solar Tan (Mark and Kelly Hodson). The motion carried by voice vote.**

**7. Enterprise Zone Boundary Amendment – Clearview Subdivision**

Mr. Gerald Schweighart, Mayor of the City of Champaign declined to speak at this time.

Mr. Mark Dixon, Director of Real Estate for the Atkins Group, stated that the Atkins Group proposes to develop more than 500 acres north of Interstate 57 and West of Mattis Avenue. The development will be a mixed use development. He said that the Atkins Group has requested an amendment to the boundaries of the Enterprise Zone to include 236.37 of these 500 acres. It is anticipated that this portion of the property will develop as an employment center with professional offices, hotel/conference center, restaurants and other eligible commercial uses that would benefit from Enterprise Zone incentives. He said that it is the goal of the Atkins Group to have Champaign County pursue the same level of excellence with its medical groups as Rochester has with its affiliation with the Mayo Clinic. He said that the Christie Clinic project will involve 25 acres and the Carle project will also involve 25 acres. He said that due to the volume of phone calls from medical groups it is anticipated that more medical groups will locate in this area in Champaign County. He said that without the Enterprise Zone the Atkins Group cannot attract major corporations to the County. He requested that the Committee review the attached spreadsheet titled “*Champaign County-projected revenue impact.*”

Ms. Anderson regretted that this information was not available to previous month and asked Mr. Dixon who decided that it would be a good to have a medical complex.

Mr. Dixon stated that he has been working on this project for approximately 18 months. He said that it has been an ongoing project with the City of Champaign and the medical clinics. He said that if everything goes as planned it will be a tremendous medical development.

1  
2 Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. Dixon what type of medical industry the Atkins Group anticipates with this  
3 development.  
4  
5 Mr. Dixon said that companies like Pfizer, Medtronix and Beyer would be great and he stated that the  
6 Christie Clinic project will take them from a 7 acre block in downtown Champaign and relocate them to a 25  
7 acre site with 168,000 square feet which will allow for more employees, services and parking. He said that  
8 the newspaper headlines have mainly focused on the surgi-center but it is really only a small portion of the  
9 larger project. He said that many cardiac groups and clinical practice groups have contacted them indicating  
10 that the area is underserved.  
11  
12 Mr. Schroeder stated that he believes that the project will go a lot further if the University of Illinois would  
13 become involved so that the facility could be a teaching facility. He said that Champaign County is located  
14 in a great location because it is only 150 miles from downtown Chicago, 140 miles from downtown  
15 Indianapolis and 3 hours from St. Louis.  
16  
17 Ms. Greenwalt stated that she appreciates the effort to attract industry but she is uncomfortable in abating  
18 the tax dollars in this area.  
19  
20 Mr. Fabri asked Mr. Dixon how many jobs would be created for the community.  
21  
22 Mr. Dixon stated that it is difficult from the Atkins Group prospective to anticipate the number of non-  
23 construction jobs that would be created in the community. He said that they have consulted with Carle and  
24 Christie Clinic and they have projected the number of new employees that would be added to the  
25 community. He said that they are working with all of the consultants of the anticipated businesses that will  
26 be added to the complex to project the number of new positions which will be added to the community.  
27  
28 Mr. Fabri stated that he is not opposed to tax breaks if it can be demonstrated that the development will be a  
29 benefit to the community.  
30  
31 Ms. Teri Legner, Assistant to the City Manager for the City of Champaign, stated that she can answer any  
32 questions regarding the City of Champaign's position on the Enterprise Zone Expansion. She said that she  
33 mentioned last month that the City of Champaign approved the Enterprise Zone Expansion for this particular  
34 development on September 5, 2006. She said that the City of Champaign is currently working with its  
35 financial advisors to put together the detail with the Atkins Group in looking at comparable developments  
36 for the area. She requested that the County indicate its support for the requested Enterprise Zone Boundary  
37 Expansion.  
38  
39 Mr. Hal Barnhart, who resides at 469 CR 1500N, Champaign declined to speak at this time.  
40  
41 Ms. Anderson asked Ms. Legner if medical facilities, such as a hospital, who receive tax abatements would  
42 provide charity services to the community.  
43

1 Ms. Legner stated that perhaps Mr. Dixon could answer Ms. Anderson's question. She said that the City of  
2 Champaign understands that a portion of the development will be served by Christie Clinic and the  
3 Committee is aware of its services. She said that Carle is also a major part of the development and from a  
4 taxing status a portion of the Carle development will be taxable.

5  
6 Mr. Eric Thorsland, who resides at 480E CR 2500N, Mahomet stated that this is will move business out of  
7 down town. He said that members of the community who are less fortunate or the elderly may not be able to  
8 get to the new facility because it may not be accessible by bus. He said that it appears that the expansion of  
9 the enterprise zone will reward people to move their businesses out of town. He requested that the  
10 Enterprise Zone be used for a more appropriate use.

11  
12 Mr. Dixon stated that there will not be any development at Clearview Development if the Enterprise Zone  
13 Expansion is not approved. He said that it is a great opportunity to redevelop the downtown area with the  
14 relocation of Christie Clinic and that redevelopment will impact the County. He said that the Enterprise  
15 Zone is a key component to this project and it is one of the few tools that are available for business  
16 attraction.

17  
18 Mr. Hal Barnhart stated that he has been in the audience during several other Enterprise Zone Expansion  
19 requests and this is the first time that there has been this much discussion. He said that the Enterprise Zone  
20 Ordinance (No.255) was adopted in 1985, therefore it may be time for a Comprehensive Review of this  
21 Ordinance as well as the County's Economic Development Policy. He stated that perhaps an impact  
22 analysis should be prepared for the historical and current enterprise zone projects to indicate the benefits and  
23 costs to the County for this proposal. He asked what other tax abatements have already been approved in  
24 the enterprise zone amendments. He said that the total abatement for Christie appears to be \$2,703,000 in  
25 abatements which is 10% of the projected cost of the total project. He said that it is his understanding that  
26 this amendment will cover 236 acres in opposed to the 25 acres serviced by Christie. He asked what the  
27 abatement totals will be for the remaining acreage with unknown projects. He said that he is an anti-sprawl  
28 proponent and it appears that if the County is going to condone this type of sprawl it is one thing but  
29 subsidizing it is another. He said that he agrees with the following statement indicated on Page 13 of the  
30 packet: Approval of this extension for the Christie Clinic facility sets an unfortunate precedent for the use  
31 of local tax incentives to facilitate relocation of existing businesses in the county; an unproductive drain on  
32 county tax revenues.

33  
34 Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. Barnhart if he had ever visited the Clearview Farm.

35  
36 Mr. Barnhart stated no.

37  
38 Mr. Gerald Schweighart stated that Christie Clinic is currently landlocked therefore any expansion will be  
39 non-existent. He said that he has reviewed plans and discussed this issue with the Atkins Group and he is  
40 very excited about the redevelopment of the Christie property. He said that he is not concerned about a void  
41 left by the relocation of Christie Clinic and if he thought there would be a void he would not support the  
42 project. He said that if the County does not approve the Enterprise Zone Expansion it will miss out on an  
43 exciting opportunity to have a medical center in this community that is above and beyond what is available

1 in the area.

2  
3 **Mr. Moser moved, seconded by Mr. Schroeder to approve the Enterprise Zone Boundary Amendment**  
4 **– Clearview Development. The motion carried.**

5  
6 **8. Report on Enforcement Activities**

7  
8 Ms. Christina Papavasiliou, Senior Assistant State’s Attorney distributed a report dated October 16, 2006,  
9 regarding Outstanding Zoning Enforcement Cases.

10  
11 Mr. Moser asked Ms. Papavasiliou if Fat Daddy’s has been sold to a new owner.

12  
13 Ms. Papavasiliou stated that it has been rumored but there has been no notification of such.

14  
15 **9. Request for proposal for the demolition and cleanup of 1101 E. Perkins Road, Urbana.**

16  
17 **Mr. Moser moved, seconded by Mr. Schroeder to approve the request proposal for the demolition and**  
18 **cleanup of 1101 East Perkins Road, Urbana.**

19  
20 Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. Hall if the County has had a lien on this property for two years.

21  
22 Mr. Hall stated no. He said that the County does have a lien on the Mefford property.

23  
24 Mr. Fabri asked Mr. Hall if the County has done this in the past.

25  
26 Mr. Hall stated that during the lifetime of the Nuisance Ordinance the County has only become directly  
27 involved in the cleanup of two properties. He said that one property was located on Johnson Lane in the  
28 Urbana extra-territorial jurisdiction and the County was granted a \$32,000 in fines, in 2001. He said that  
29 \$13,000 was spent for clean-up of the property and the remaining \$19,000 was placed in the General  
30 Corporate Fund. He said that the County spent \$7300 on the Mefford property located on Campbell Drive,  
31 near Champaign in 2003. He said that staff has received regular complaints about 1101 East Perkins Road,  
32 Urbana and the only way that it appears that this is the only way that it will be cleaned up in a timely  
33 manner.

34  
35 **The motion carried by voice vote.**

36  
37 **10. Request for Proposal for the demolition and cleanup of 3304 Pine Circle, Urbana.**

38  
39 **Mr. Schroeder moved, seconded by Mr. McGinty to approve the request for proposal for the**  
40 **demolition and cleanup of 3304 Pine Circle, Urbana.**

41  
42 Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. Hall if the County has a lien on the property.

1 Mr. Hall stated that the Internal Revenue Service has a lien on the property not the County.

2  
3 Mr. Schroeder asked why enforcement of these properties takes so long. He asked if the County Board  
4 could direct the Planning and Zoning Department to do something different procedurally to speed up the  
5 process.

6  
7 Mr. Hall stated that this issue came up in 2004 and at that time it wasn't clear whether the County Board  
8 desired to spend money to clean up these properties. He said that due to the change of Zoning  
9 Administrators the issue fell through the cracks.

10  
11 Ms. Hitt stated that many times the owner of the property cannot be located. She said that the owner of  
12 3304 Pine Circle, Urbana was an employee at the University of Illinois but has since relocated. She said that  
13 staff has done everything that they can do to locate the owner with no success.

14  
15 Mr. Langenheim asked if the property taxes were being paid.

16  
17 Ms. Hitt stated that during certain years the property taxes have been paid. She said that she mails the  
18 violation notification to the address indicated on the tax records but it is unknown who is responsible for  
19 pickup of the mail for that address. She said that the average time for resolution of these types of cases is  
20 three to five years.

21  
22 Mr. Schroeder asked Ms. Hitt if the County has any procedure that is out of the ordinary in comparison to  
23 the City of Champaign or the City of Urbana.

24  
25 Ms. Hitt stated no. She said that the court system allows the owner time to resolve the violation. She said  
26 that normally the owner indicates that they will resolve the situation and the court grants continuance after  
27 continuance and after three years the problem is still apparent.

28  
29 Ms. Sandra Beak, who resides at 304 E. Sherwin Drive, Urbana, stated that they live near 3304 Pine Circle.  
30 She said that when they purchased their home the house was not finished and unoccupied. She said that in  
31 22 years there has been no maintenance or additional work completed on the property. She said that the  
32 house is very deteriorated and is in hazardous condition. She said that graffiti has been painted on the  
33 house, wild animals living in the house, viewed three abandoned vehicles in the driveway, trees and bushes  
34 block the doors. She said that there are three young children that now reside on the cul-de-sac where the  
35 house at 3304 Pine Circle is located and the neighbors fear for their safety. She urged the Committee to do  
36 whatever they can to ensure the demolition of this house.

37  
38 **The motion carried by voice vote.**

- 39  
40 **11. Zoning Case 558-AT-06 Petitioner: Zoning Administrator**  
41 **Request: 1. Amend paragraph 4.2.1C to allow "mortuary or funeral home" in the AG-2**  
42 **District as a second principal use on a lot on which there is a cemetery when the**  
43 **lot is under common management.**

10/16/06

AS APPROVED NOVEMBER 13, 2006

ELUC

- 1 2. *Amend Section 5.2 to change “mortuary” to be “mortuary or*
- 2 *funeral home”.*
- 3 3. *Amend Section 5.2 to add “mortuary or funeral home” as a Special Use Permit in*
- 4 *the AG-2 District with footnote specifying that a mortuary or funeral home is only*
- 5 *allowed in the AG-2 district as a second principal use on the same lot as a*
- 6 *cemetery and the lot must be under common management.*
- 7 4. *Add standard conditions for “mortuary or funeral home” as a Special Use Permit*
- 8 *in the AG-2 District.*
- 9

10 **Mr. Moser moved, seconded by Mr. Fabri to recommend approval of Case 558-AT-06. The motion**

11 **carried unanimously by voice vote.**

12

13 **12. Comprehensive Zoning Review**

14

15 Mr. Hall reminded the Committee that this item was deferred until the November 13, 2006, ELUC meeting.

16 He noted that he is available to answer any questions that anyone may have regarding CZR.

17

18 **13. Monthly Report (June, July, August and September, 2006)**

19

20 **Mr. Moser moved, seconded by Mr. Fabri to accept and place the Monthly Reports for June, July,**

21 **August and September, 2006, on file. The motion carried by voice vote.**

22

23 **14. Other Business**

24

25 Mr. Moser asked Mr. Hall if the zoning case for the Hindu Temple will come before ELUC.

26

27 Mr. Hall stated that the zoning case for the Hindu Temple is a request for a special use permit and will only

28 go before the Zoning Board of Appeals. He said that no protests are allowed and since it is a religious use

29 the Assistant State’s Attorney will be present at each meeting to ensure that the state’s laws regarding

30 religious freedom are adhered to and that is a standard procedure that would be followed with any such case.

31

32 Mr. Moser asked Mr. Hall if the property has been purchased or do they only have the option to purchase

33 pending upon the outcome of the case.

34

35 Mr. Hall stated that at this point they only have the option to purchase the property. He said that the

36 signature of the current landowner is on the Special Use Permit Application.

37

38 **Ms. Greenwalt moved, seconded by Mr. Fabri to enter into executive session pursuant to 5 ILCS 120/2**

39 **(c) 1 to consider the employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of an employee.**

40 **She further moved that the following individual remain present: Recording Secretary. The motion**

41 **carried by voice vote.**

42

43 The Committee entered closed session at 7:50 p.m.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

The Committee adjourned closed session at 7:57 p.m.

**15. Determination of Items to be placed on the County Board Consent Agenda**

None

**16. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 7:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary to the Environment and Land Use Committee

eluc\minutes\minutes.frm