

**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING**

**CHAMPAIGN COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

**1776 E. Washington Street**

**Urbana, IL 61801**

**DATE: June 16, 2011**

**PLACE: Lyle Shields Meeting Room  
1776 East Washington Street**

**TIME: 7:00 p.m.**

**Urbana, IL 61802**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Catherine Capel, Thomas Courson, Roger Miller, Melvin Schroeder, Eric Thorsland, Paul Palmgren, Brad Passalacqua

**MEMBERS ABSENT :** None

**STAFF PRESENT :** Connie Berry, John Hall

**OTHERS PRESENT :** Neal Toler, Alan Singleton, Phillip Jones, Sara Jones, Ben Shadwick, Carl Brown, Lois Jones, William J. Jones, Jody Eversole, Jerry Christian, Larry Hall, Julia Hall, Donald Shunk, Jud Nogle, Chuck Sollers, D. Scott Reichard, Mark Fisher, Jean Fisher, Joshua Fisher, Damon Hood

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m.

**2. Roll Call and Declaration of Quorum**

The roll was called and a quorum declared present.

**3. Correspondence**

None

**4. Approval of Minutes**

None

**5. Continued Public Hearing**

None

**6. New Public Hearings**

6/16/11

1 **Case 687-AM-11** Petitioner: **Dr. Phillip Jones and Sarabeth Jones** Request to amend the  
2 **Zoning Map to change the zoning designation from CR Conservation-Recreation to AG-1**  
3 **Agriculture.** Location: **An approximately 12.69 acre tract of land that is located in the North**  
4 **Half of the South Half of the Northeast Quarter of Section 27 of Crittenden Township and**  
5 **located on the west side of Illinois Route 130 (CR 1600E) and 1,328 feet south of the**  
6 **intersection of Illinois Route 130 and CR 200N and County Highway 16 and commonly known**  
7 **as the property at 175N CR 1600E, Villa Grove.**

8  
9 **Case 688-S-11** Petitioner: **Dr. Phillip Jones and Sarabeth Jones** Request to authorize the  
10 **construction and use of a “Heliport-Restricted Landing Area” as a Special Use on land that is**  
11 **proposed to be rezoned to the AG-1 Agriculture from the current CR Conservation-Recreation**  
12 **Zoning District in related zoning case 687-AM-11; and with a waiver of Special Use standard**  
13 **condition required by Section 6.1 that requires a runway safety area to be located entirely on**  
14 **the lot.** Location: **An approximately 12.69 acre tract of land that is located in the North Half of**  
15 **the South Half of the Northeast Quarter of Section 27 of Crittenden Township and located on**  
16 **the west side of Illinois Route 130 (CR 1600E) and 1,328 feet south of the intersection of Illinois**  
17 **Route 130 and CR 200N and County Highway 16 and commonly known as the property at**  
18 **175N CR 1600E, Villa Grove.**

19  
20 Mr. Thorsland called Cases 687-AM-11 and 688-S-11 concurrently.

21  
22 Mr. Thorsland informed the audience that Case 688-S-11 is an Administrative Case and as such the  
23 County allows anyone the opportunity to cross examine any witness. He said that at the proper time  
24 he will ask for a show of hands for those who would like to cross examine and each person will be  
25 called upon. He requested that anyone called to cross examine go to the cross examination  
26 microphone to ask any questions. He said that those who desire to cross examine are not required to  
27 sign the witness register but are requested to clearly state their name before asking any questions. He  
28 noted that no new testimony is to be given during the cross examination. He said that attorneys who  
29 have complied with Article 6.5 of the ZBA By-Laws are exempt from cross examination.

30  
31 Mr. Thorsland called Mr. Alan Singleton to present his opening comments.

32  
33 Mr. Alan Singleton, attorney for the Petitioners, stated that he is working with Phillip and Sarabeth  
34 Jones to establish the requested restricted landing area on their acreage which is located a couple of  
35 miles north of the southern Champaign County line. He said that the land is very much in an  
36 agricultural setting although it is currently zone CR Conservation-Recreation. He said that the land  
37 has been in row crop for as long as the aerial photographs can indicate and evidence will show that  
38 the request is a good and appropriate use of the land. He said that Dr. Jones owns additional

6/16/11

1 farmland, provides crop tours for other farmers, utilizes his helicopter to pollinate crops which is  
2 very much in tune with the agricultural setting, and also occasionally assists the law enforcement  
3 when air support is required. He said that overall he believes that the request is a good and proper  
4 use for the land and Dr. Jones and his wife Sarabeth are present to answer any questions that the  
5 Board or the public may have regarding their request. He noted that he has not filed documentation  
6 which would prevent the public from asking questions.

7  
8 Mr. Hall stated that the requests are for a map amendment and a special use permit. He said that the  
9 special use request is for a Heliport/RLA and the property is currently zoned CR which does not  
10 allow a Heliport/RLA therefore the subject property is requested to be rezoned to AG-1, Agriculture.

11 He said that it is not often that a request is submitted for rezoning from one rural district to another  
12 rural district. He said that things that are commonly reviewed during a map amendment are: street  
13 access, traffic conditions, drainage conditions, availability of water and sewer and area, height and  
14 placement regulations. He said that there is little or no difference regarding these considerations  
15 between the two rural districts but there is a significant difference in the purpose and intent of the  
16 districts. He said that the purpose and intent of the CR District is to protect the public health by  
17 restricting development in areas subject to frequent or periodic floods and to conserve the natural and  
18 scenic areas generally along the major stream networks of the County. He said that the AG-1 District  
19 is intended to protect the areas of the County where soil and topographic conditions are best adapted  
20 to the pursuit of agricultural uses and to prevent the admixture of urban and rural uses which would  
21 contribute to the premature termination of agricultural pursuits. He said that if the allowed uses in  
22 the two districts were compared there is a striking difference because there are a lot of recreational  
23 type uses authorized in the CR District by special use permit and there are some uses authorized in  
24 the AG-1 District that are not allowed in the CR District because of the purpose and intent. He said  
25 that recently the County Board added wind farm as a use in the AG-1 District but it is not allowed  
26 even within one mile of the CR District. He said that the County Board allows gas turbine peaker  
27 plants in the AG-1 District with a special use permit although it is not allowed in the CR District. He  
28 said that contractor facility is allowed in the AG-1 District with a special use permit but it too is not  
29 allowed in the CR District. He said that there are a lot of agriculture related business such as farm  
30 chemical and fertilizer sales and farm implement dealers by special use permit that are not authorized  
31 in the CR District even though CR is as much an agricultural district in terms of individual farmers  
32 carrying out their agricultural activities. He said that CR is more of a residential district than AG-1.  
33 He said that the last use that is sort of conspicuous by not being allowed in CR is the RLA. He said  
34 that the wind farms were not authorized in the CR District because it was decided that the blade  
35 swept area creates concerns about wildlife plus it just disturbs the residential character of the CR  
36 District. He said that gas turbine peaker plants are not allowed in the CR District because it didn't  
37 seem to be a use that had to go in the CR District. He said that the CR District is one of the smallest  
38 districts. He said that contractor facilities are not wanted in the CR District because it is primarily a

6/16/11

1 residential district and there is no use to take that land with a contractor's facility and the same goes  
2 for farm chemical and fertilizer sales as well as farm implement dealers. He said that in regards to  
3 RLA's his best guess as to why they are not allowed in the CR District is because of the inherent  
4 problems of needing an approach zone at the end of each runway in a district where there are a lot of  
5 big trees.

6  
7 Mr. Hall distributed a new Supplemental Memorandum dated June 16, 2011, to the Board for  
8 review. He said that the memorandum makes it very clear that just because land is zoned CR does  
9 not mean that there is any difference between it and AG-1. He said that most of the challenge on the  
10 map amendment is to evaluate the number of effects on Goal 8, Natural Resources of the Land  
11 Resource Management Plan. He said that there are a few key policies which discuss specific areas  
12 such as the CR District and he has yet to begin that analysis. He said that the other part of the map  
13 amendment application required the petitioner to indicate what error in the present Ordinance is to be  
14 corrected by the proposed amendment. He said that everyone who seeks a map amendment is  
15 required to answer this question even though the zoning map was drawn in 1973 and it is now 2011  
16 and obviously things have changed since then. He said that in this instance virtually nothing has  
17 changed because the land cover is essentially the same as it was in 1973. He said that the petitioner  
18 indicated that they were correcting the error that this site was included in the CR District when it was  
19 not appropriate. Mr. Hall stated that there were a lot of justifications that were related to agriculture  
20 although he is not going to address those because in his mind CR is as much agriculture as AG-1.  
21 He said that one of the comments was that most of the subject property is above the Base Flood  
22 Elevation and that is absolutely correct therefore there is the suspicion as to why this land was  
23 included in CR.

24  
25 Mr. Hall stated that in regards to the special use permit the Preliminary Memorandum dated June 10,  
26 2011, showed the proposed site plan for the RLA making it clear that the safety area encroaches into  
27 the right-of-way of Route 130. He said that he is not sure if there was any miscommunication in the  
28 earlier meetings with the petitioner and that encroachment is not intended to occur. He said that it  
29 would be fair to ask if the safety area were not in the right-of-way but right at the right-of-way would  
30 it be enough to not approve the requested waiver. He said that the petitioner may be waiting to see if  
31 the Board has any particular feelings one way or another but the main issue with the current location  
32 of the safety area, as shown by the survey plat and legal descriptions, is that if it does not need to be  
33 changed then it would save a lot of time on everyone's part. He said that the Preliminary  
34 Memorandum dated June 10, 2011, for Case 688-S-11 included a crude sketch of the runway clear  
35 zones and the runway approach zones. He said that this case has made him aware of, in his opinion,  
36 an oversight in the Ordinance in that the Ordinance does not allow RLA's in the CR District but  
37 neither does it require RLA's to be setback any minimum distance from the CR District. He said that  
38 if someone had AG-1 zoning on their property and the CR District was next to it and there were trees

6/16/11

1 growing right up the border then that property owner could propose an RLA up to within 10 feet of  
2 their property line and still have a problem with the clear zone in the CR District. He said that the  
3 Ordinance doesn't point that out but it does require him, as the Zoning Administrator, to make sure  
4 that the vegetation below the runway clear zone is maintained so that it won't encroach in to the  
5 approach zone. He said that the Ordinance does not say that this doesn't apply to existing vegetation  
6 in the CR District but that is what his interpretation would be therefore with this RLA he is inclined  
7 to believe that the subject property should not be in the CR District but by rezoning 2,080 lineal feet  
8 of the CR District the runway will be closer to what little vegetation still exists in the CR District on  
9 the other side of the east branch of the Embarras River. He said that the amount of wooded area  
10 underneath the runway clear zone, which is the area that he is authorized to make sure that the  
11 vegetation does not encroach, is only a couple of acres but it is the only couple of acres in the CR  
12 District with vegetation at that location. He said that he would not want the Board to think that just  
13 because there is vegetation that it especially serves as a habitat or is especially important but the  
14 Board should be aware that it is the only permanent vegetation in the CR District at that point. He  
15 reminded the Board that the CR District is intended to conserve the natural and scenic areas along  
16 the major stream networks. He said that there are approximately 2 linear miles of CR District to the  
17 north of County Highway 16 therefore it is not like there is a large amount of CR District north of the  
18 subject property but there are some extensive wooded areas. He said that Champaign County did  
19 something very unique in 1973 when it adopted the CR District in that it recognized that river valleys  
20 are corridors for wildlife and nutrients and water and are highways for the natural system and the  
21 more that they become chopped up and reduced in size the less sustainable they become in the long  
22 term. He said that he has no way to analyze something like this but he wanted to bring this  
23 information to the Board's attention.

24  
25 Mr. Hall stated that the Supplemental Memorandum dated June 16, 2011, for Case 687-AM-11 only  
26 focuses on the rezoning and it reviews the underlying factors that the CR District was based upon.  
27 He said that when the Zoning Map was drawn in 1973 no one sat down to write a careful report  
28 about how they would locate the CR District. He said that the authors pretty much just drove around  
29 the County to speak to farmers and ended up with the CR District. He said that in 1973 there was no  
30 modern Soil Survey nor was there a flood insurance rate study with floodplain maps and the only  
31 topographic information available for the entire County used a contour interval (difference in ground  
32 elevation) of five feet. He said that in Champaign County a five foot interval change could account  
33 for a large area. He said that he will walk through the memorandum with the Board to show that  
34 there is a lot of evidence for why the rezoning is reasonable just considering the natural  
35 characteristics of the land. He said that Attachment A, Draft 1973 Land Cover for Subject Property  
36 and Vicinity, has very poor contrasts but if a lot of time is spent for review it can be determined that  
37 it looks very much like the 2008 aerial photograph which is the basis of all of the other maps in the  
38 Attachments. He said that the amount of vegetation along the east branch of the Embarras River in

6/16/11

1 this area has not changed much since 1973. He said that Attachment B, Stream Related Soils for  
2 Subject Property and Vicinity, indicates the locations of stream related soils, bottom land soils,  
3 stream terrace soils and indicates how far the woodland soils are spread in this area. He said that at  
4 one time there was a large woodland but since long before 1973 there has not been much and there  
5 hasn't been any less in the intervening time. He said that Attachment C, Topography for Subject  
6 Property and Vicinity, is based on the LIDAR topographic data from the GIS Consortium which is  
7 very good topographic data using two foot contour intervals. He said that all of the maps may not  
8 appear as such but they are all at the same scale which is 1 inch equals 800 feet. He said that it is  
9 very hard to pick out a major river valley on Attachment C but on the south side of the east branch of  
10 the Embarras River there are some steep slopes that are not present on the north side and that is a  
11 difference that is also reflected in the soils because there is a big difference between the north side  
12 and the south side. He said that the area of vegetation west of the proposed RLA is in an area where  
13 the slope is not so steep but much more gradual. He said that Attachment D Draft Composite Sketch  
14 Map of CR District Suitability for Subject Property and Vicinity with Existing CR District, indicates  
15 the areas which are below the Base Flood Elevation. He said that the Base Flood Elevation for the  
16 property is 654.5 and the map indicates the base flood falling in almost the same location as Wayne  
17 Ward's data which is an actual survey data from the property therefore it is accurate. He said that the  
18 purpose of having the LIDAR data is because it shows the larger landscape and how the contours  
19 vary and the extent of area below the Base Flood Elevation. He said that one thing that Attachment  
20 D demonstrates is that on the east side of the river there is not a large area which is below the Base  
21 Flood Elevation and most of the subject property is above the base flood. He said that Attachment E  
22 Draft Composite Sketch Map of CR District Suitability for Subject Property and Vicinity with  
23 Existing CR District, combines on one map the 1973 vegetation, the soils information, base flood  
24 information, areas below the Base Flood Elevation and placed them on the same map with the CR  
25 District, red outline, and it can be noted that there is a lot of activity along the east branch and close  
26 to it but otherwise there is not much going on upon the landscape and a lot of it is zoned CR. He  
27 said that Attachment F Draft Sketch Map of Areas Most Suitable for CR District for Subject  
28 Property and Vicinity, indicates the area that is most suitable for the CR District. He said that this  
29 analysis has only been completed for this zoning case and there are judgments when maps such as  
30 this are created. He said that if the County Board were to draw a new and improved CR District they  
31 might determine that just having woodland soils below the Base Flood Elevation might be all that is  
32 needed to include something in the CR District. He said that his recommendation to the Board is  
33 that the subject property does not merit being located in the CR District in and of the natural  
34 characteristics of the property. He said that one thing that the County Board might do if they were to  
35 redraw the CR District is explicitly include a buffer area around those land areas that do have  
36 vegetation and are below the base flood and do have riparian soils. He said that if you read almost  
37 any reference they talk about including a buffer of at least 100 feet therefore he could see that half of  
38 the subject property might be suitable for the CR District but it is unknown if the County Board

6/16/11

1 desires such a buffer. He said that the County Board used a much larger buffer originally just out of  
2 convenience and a nice easy way to describe the legal descriptions for the major blocks of land. He  
3 said that he believes that the petitioner has made a good point about the rezoning but when you move  
4 the boundary of the CR District from Illinois Route 130, 2,000 feet to the west, whatever happens  
5 outside the CR District is now 2,000 feet closer to the real core of the CR District.  
6

7 Mr. Hall stated that Attachment G, Best Prime Farmland Soils for Subject Property and Vicinity,  
8 indicates how much best prime farmland is within the vicinity. He said that AG-1 is to the east of  
9 the subject property and all of that land is virtually all best prime farmland. He said that Attachment  
10 G is consistent with the Natural Resource Report from the Champaign County Soil and Water  
11 Conservation District. He said that the eastern third of the subject property is best prime farmland  
12 but when the calculations are completed as per the LESA system describes to determine best prime  
13 farmland it is determined that overall the subject property is not best prime farmland. He said that  
14 there are many areas in the AG-1 District which are not considered best prime farmland.  
15

16 Mr. Hall stated that he has no new information regarding the proposed RLA for the Board at this  
17 time.  
18

19 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Hall.  
20

21 Ms. Capel asked Mr. Hall if the vegetation within the safety zone is a concern.  
22

23 Mr. Hall stated that he can slightly see the vegetation from the road and he does not have the right to  
24 go back to it therefore he is not sure if the vegetation is a concern. He said that the beginning of the  
25 vegetation is 700 feet from the proposed end of the RLA and if the ground elevation is constant  
26 something would have to be higher than 46 feet to intrude into the runway clear zone at that point.  
27 He said that once you go down to the river the ground elevations are lower, based on the LIDAR data  
28 they are no more than 8 feet lower but that could be off by one foot. He said that the trees that one  
29 would expect to see in the CR District in the County could easily surpass 50 feet in height and some  
30 of them surpass 75 feet, although those would be unique trees, but at the furthest extreme of the  
31 runway clear zone, if ground elevation were constant, something would have to be higher than 66  
32 feet to intrude into the clear zone. He said that at the extreme end of the clear zone the ground  
33 elevation goes back up therefore even if the Board requires the trees to be trimmed it may not make  
34 much difference but it is something that the Board needs to address in its findings on both of the  
35 cases. He said that during the map amendment this issue cannot be ignored because the purpose of  
36 the map amendment is for the special use permit. He said that public safety is at issue in both cases  
37 and in both cases the broader achievement of the County's Land Use Policies needs to be considered.  
38 He said that even though during the special use permit the Board has the same findings that are dealt

6/16/11

1 with in every special use permit the Board must also address everything that is in the map  
2 amendment and vice versa.

3  
4 Ms. Capel asked Mr. Hall if the State considers the height of the vegetation during permitting.

5  
6 Mr. Hall stated that would be a good question for the State. He said that a previous RLA was before  
7 the Board and vegetation was an issue therefore he is concerned as to what he is supposed to do if the  
8 RLA is approved because currently he does not plan to do anything about the vegetation.

9  
10 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any additional questions for Mr. Hall and there were  
11 none.

12  
13 Mr. Thorsland called Phillip Jones to testify.

14  
15 Dr. Phillip Jones, who resides at 175 N County Road 1600E, Villa Grove, IL stated that he  
16 appreciates everyone's attendance at tonight's meeting. He said that the trees were measured and the  
17 highest tree point is 50 feet above the ground at that elevation therefore roughly 42 feet if it has been  
18 determined that the elevation is eight feet below the runway. He said that there is a lot of room for  
19 the existing trees to continue to grow but to his best guess the trees are fully mature and are probably  
20 at their maximum height. He said that the trees will not be damaged, touched or violated in any way  
21 during use of the proposed RLA.

22  
23 Mr. Singleton asked if he could bring up some important points.

24  
25 Mr. Thorsland stated that Mr. Singleton will have the opportunity to present additional testimony if  
26 necessary. He informed Mr. Singleton that he could cross examine Dr. Jones if he so desired.

27  
28 Dr. Jones stated that he will answer any questions that the Board or the public may have regarding  
29 the request but his intentions with RLA are for personal use. He said that he does not have the  
30 opportunity to fly more than twice per month currently therefore there is not going to be a huge  
31 amount of air traffic on the RLA. He said that currently the subject property for the RLA is in hay  
32 and will be baled within the next couple of weeks. He said that the proposed RLA has not been used  
33 since the Illinois Department of Transportation landed on the runway last May and they informed  
34 him that once the zoning issues were corrected he would have no problem in obtaining a permit from  
35 their office.

36  
37 Mr. Palmgren asked Dr. Jones if he plans to keep the runway in hay.

38

6/16/11

1 Dr. Jones stated that currently the runway is planted in bluegrass and fescue which will be utilized  
2 for his cattle and horses. He said that the grass for the runway will be kept at approximately at six to  
3 eight inches which is good for erosion control and wildlife. He said that he and his wife have created  
4 a beautiful wildlife habitat with the property.

5  
6 Mr. Palmgren asked Dr. Jones if he will be changing anything from its current state.

7  
8 Dr. Jones stated no. He said that the property will stay exactly as it is today and no tillage of the  
9 ground will occur. He said that the only difference will be that the hay will be baled. He noted that  
10 there is no water or mud standing on the subject property.

11  
12 Mr. Passalaqua asked Dr. Jones if he needs the entire space for the size of his aircraft.

13  
14 Dr. Jones stated no. He said that the actual runway is approximately 1,600 feet with safety zones at  
15 each end which extends the runway to approximately 2,600 feet. He said that the airplane, fully  
16 loaded, would only require 700 to 900 feet therefore he would only require approximately 500 feet to  
17 take off. He said that there is plenty of safety margin built into the runway.

18  
19 Mr. Passlaqua asked Dr. Jones if Illinois Route 130 poses an issue with the runway.

20  
21 Dr. Jones stated no. He said that IDOT requires a setback of 250 feet from the center line of Illinois  
22 Route 130. He said that he provided an additional cushion and set the runway back further than  
23 IDOT's requirements and IDOT was pleased. He said that after discussion with Mr. Hall regarding  
24 the proposed RLA he suggested that an additional cushion be provided, which was no problem given  
25 the ample room that was available, therefore addition setback was indicated.

26  
27 Mr. Passlaqua asked Dr. Jones if the 42 foot trees were out of the picture with the additional setback  
28 provided.

29  
30 Dr. Jones stated yes, unless the mature trees grow from 42 feet to 66 feet.

31  
32 Ms. Capel asked Dr. Jones if he would be the only pilot utilizing the airstrip.

33  
34 Dr. Jones stated that currently the airstrip is not used but he would like to allow his father, who is a  
35 licensed pilot, to utilize the airstrip. He said that the RLA is a private airstrip and he believes that it  
36 is not technically legal for people to land and take off without permission. He said that he cannot  
37 have more than six plans come into the strip without a written letter to the FAA therefore there are  
38 many regulations set up by the State and the Federal government.

6/16/11

1  
2 Mr. Miller asked Dr. Jones if his residence is adjacent to the runway.  
3  
4 Dr. Jones stated yes. He said that his home is approximately 200 feet east of the finger of the  
5 runway.  
6  
7 Mr. Miller asked Dr. Jones how long he has owned the subject property.  
8  
9 Dr. Jones stated that he and his wife have owned the property where his home and the wooded area  
10 are located since 2004. He said that in 2009 he purchased the additional 15 acres to the south which  
11 is the subject property for the RLA.  
12  
13 Mr. Thorsland asked if the Board had any additional questions for Dr. Jones and there were none.  
14  
15 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Dr. Jones and there were none.  
16  
17 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone desired to cross examine Dr. Jones.  
18  
19 Mr. Mark Fisher requested the opportunity to cross examine Dr. Jones.  
20  
21 Mr. Thorsland called Mark Fisher to the cross examination microphone.  
22  
23 Mr. Thorsland reminded the audience that questions during cross examination are limited only to  
24 zoning and any testimony that Dr. Jones has given thus far.  
25  
26 Mr. Mark Fisher, who resides at 195 CR 1600E, Villa Grove, IL, stated that he is Dr. Jones' neighbor  
27 to the north. He said that he is confused because it was his understanding that the request was to  
28 authorize the construction and use of a Heliport/RLA although Dr. Jones has testified that he desires  
29 to land his plane on the RLA.  
30  
31 Dr. Jones stated that it is actually a Helipad/Restricted Landing Area with a runway.  
32  
33 Mr. Fisher asked Dr. Jones if the request is actually to authorize the use for helicopters and airplanes.  
34  
35 Dr. Jones stated yes.  
36  
37 Mr. Fisher stated that he cannot speak for the other neighbors but he has occurrences of airplanes  
38 flying dangerously close to their home.

6/16/11

1  
2 Mr. Thorsland interrupted Mr. Fisher and reminded that he can only address the testimony that Dr.  
3 Jones has given thus far.  
4  
5 Mr. Fisher stated that he is concerned about public safety and Dr. Jones mentioned public safety.  
6  
7 Mr. Thorsland stated that public safety is a requirement of the RLA.  
8  
9 Mr. Fisher asked Dr. Jones if he had every flown his plane within 200 feet of his home.  
10  
11 Dr. Jones stated that it is possible but he doubts it because 200 feet is pretty close.  
12  
13 Mr. Thorsland informed Mr. Fisher that Dr. Jones did not testify to such therefore he will not allow  
14 any further discussion regarding such. He requested that Mr. Fisher limit his questions to only what  
15 Dr. Jones has testified about for the two cases and not his flying habits.  
16  
17 Mr. Fisher stated that Dr. Jones had stated he owns and farms 130 acres. He asked Dr. Jones if most  
18 of his farmland is located in Champaign County.  
19  
20 Dr. Jones stated no.  
21  
22 Mr. Fisher asked Dr. Jones if his additional farmland is zoned for agriculture.  
23  
24 Dr. Jones stated that his additional farmland is located in Douglas County which has no zoning.  
25  
26 Mr. Fisher asked Dr. Jones why he desires to place the RLA in Champaign County when he could  
27 locate it in an area where he would not have to rezone. He asked Dr. Jones why he desires to chip  
28 away at a conservation area to create a Heliport/RLA.  
29  
30 Dr. Jones stated that the majority of his farmland in Douglas County does not have adequate length  
31 for an RLA and it is a 20 minute drive from his residence.  
32  
33 Mr. Fisher asked Dr. Jones what the length of his farmland is in Douglas County because it has to be  
34 over 100 acres.  
35  
36 Dr. Jones stated that the farmland in Douglas County is over 100 acres but there is a road through the  
37 center of the farmland as well as a river.  
38

6/16/11

1 Mr. Fisher asked Dr. Jones if he has attempted to locate his Heliport/RLA on the farmland in  
2 Douglas County.

3  
4 Mr. Thorsland stated that the Board is not here to discuss property that Dr. Jones owns in Douglas  
5 County.

6  
7 Mr. Fisher asked that if Dr. Jones' sole purpose is to preserve natural areas and improve agriculture  
8 how will a helicopter and airplane assist in that purpose.

9  
10 Mr. Miller requested that Mr. Fisher present all of his concerns during his opportunity to testify.

11  
12 Mr. Thorsland agreed with Mr. Miller and requested that Mr. Fisher voice his concerns during his  
13 testimony and not during cross examination of Mr. Jones.

14  
15 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone desired to cross examine Mr. Jones.

16  
17 Mr. Thorsland called Mr. Larry Hall to the cross examination microphone.

18  
19 Mr. Larry Hall, who resides at 177 CR 1600E, Villa Grove, IL, stated that his residence is  
20 immediately adjacent to the proposed runway. He asked Dr. Jones if he had changed the runway  
21 from its original state when he was using it to land his airplane. He said that it appears that the  
22 runway is further back from Illinois Route 130 than it actually is. He said that the runway has been  
23 rolled and the ground smoothed out but the location of the runway appears to be a lot closer to his  
24 property than it is to Illinois Route 130.

25  
26 Dr. Jones stated that the safety zone was planted in the hay, grass mix for simplicity and for  
27 conservation but it is over 250 feet back from the centerline of the road.

28  
29 Mr. Larry Hall asked Dr. Jones why he felt the need to smooth the 250 foot setback.

30  
31 Dr. Jones stated that he rolled the 250 foot setback so that it is smooth when he mows it. He said  
32 that if he did not roll the area it would shake a person to pieces when it is mowed. Dr. Jones stated  
33 that he also rolls his yard so that it is smooth when he mows it.

34  
35 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone desired to cross examine Dr. Jones.

36  
37 Mr. Thorsland called Ms. Jean Fisher to the cross examination microphone.

38

6/16/11

1 Ms. Jean Fisher, who resides at 195 CR 1600E, Villa Grove, IL, stated that she resides north of the  
2 subject property. She said that the current zoning does not allow the landing of helicopters or  
3 airplanes. She asked Dr. Jones if he has already landed his helicopter or plane on his property.

4  
5 Dr. Jones stated that he does not believe that zoning indicates that a helicopter cannot be landed on  
6 property but it does indicate that a helipad is prohibited in the CR District.

7  
8 Ms. Fisher asked Dr. Jones if he has landed his airplane on his property.

9  
10 Dr. Jones stated that it is legal for him to land his helicopter on his property as long as he does not do  
11 it more than 25 times in one location.

12  
13 Ms. Fisher asked Dr. Jones if it is okay with Champaign County if he lands his helicopter on his  
14 property no more than 25 times.

15  
16 Dr. Jones stated that the zoning rules that he was given indicates that no helipad is to be located  
17 within the CR District and he does not have a helipad at this time.

18  
19 Ms. Fisher again asked Dr. Jones if he has landed airplanes on his property.

20  
21 Dr. Jones stated that the State landed their airplane on the property in May 2010.

22  
23 Ms. Fisher asked Dr. Jones if any other airplanes have landed on the property after May 2010.

24  
25 Dr. Jones stated that it is possible although he cannot remember.

26  
27 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone desired to cross examine Dr. Jones and there was no  
28 one.

29  
30 Mr. Thorsland asked Mr. Singleton if he desired to cross examine Dr. Jones and he indicated no.

31  
32 Mr. Thorsland called Ms. Julia Wright Hall to testify.

33  
34 Ms. Julia Wright Hall, who resides at 177 N CR 1600E, Villa Grove, IL, stated that she and her  
35 husband, Larry Hall, have lived at their current residence since June 2004. She said that their  
36 property is east of the Jones' home and pond area and just to the north of the proposed Restricted  
37 Landing Area. She said that she is present tonight to express their desire that the property  
38 surrounding their home, specifically the property mentioned in Case 687-AM-11, is not changed

6/16/11

1 from CR Conservation-Recreation to AG-1 Agriculture. She said that they also oppose the  
2 construction of a Heliport/RLA special use permit, specifically requested in Case 688-AM-11.

3  
4 Ms. Wright Hall expressed that she and her husband have no quarrel with Phillip or Sarabeth Jones  
5 and they enjoy the occasional landing of their helicopter on the property. She said that they are  
6 primarily concerned about their future property value and the landscape protection of their area and  
7 neighborhood.

8  
9 Ms. Wright Hall stated that she and her husband have worked very hard to improve the beauty and  
10 property value of their home. She said that she and her husband are not loud and have been very  
11 good neighbors and they do appreciate that Dr. Jones has done a wonderful job in improving his  
12 property. She said that part of their complaint, which she understands is not part of this hearing, is  
13 that they are unable to see Dr. Jones' improvements to his property due to the very tall wall of dirt  
14 that was installed by Dr. Jones in 2010. She said that it has been stated that the CR Conservation-  
15 Recreation District is intended to protect the public health by restricting development in areas subject  
16 to frequent or periodic floods and to conserve the natural and scenic areas generally along the major  
17 stream networks of the County. She asked for whom the intent to conserve is for? She said that their  
18 view of the natural and scenic area has been destroyed by the wall of dirt topped by tall grasses,  
19 weeds and thistle and will be depreciated even further by the sound of planes/helicopters landing in  
20 the field next to their small patio and fish pond. She said that they can only imagine that their  
21 weekends will be totally disrupted by "fly-ins" and their pets terrified by many "fly-overs" if this  
22 RLA is allowed to go forward.

23  
24 Ms. Wright Hall stated that one of the major concerns is the rezoning from CR to AG-1. She said  
25 that they did not receive a mailing regarding these cases and had to download the information and  
26 maps from the website. She said that she finds it very interesting that they were not notified or  
27 included in the mailing since they are immediate neighbors to the north of the proposed runway. She  
28 said that from the maps they downloaded from the website they see that all of the property around the  
29 approximately 13 acres in question is classified as Conservation-Recreation. She said that according  
30 to the petition Dr. Jones has been growing and selling hay from his property although she has not  
31 witnessed any hay growing on the runway. She said that even if Dr. Jones is growing and selling hay  
32 they do not understand what would be different from changing the zoning from CR to AG-1  
33 therefore the only reason for the requested rezoning is to allow the Heliport/RLA. She said that thus,  
34 their concerns immediately address the issue of the Heliport/RLA and not the growing of crops. She  
35 said that for this reason alone the zoning should not be changed to agriculture because the intent is  
36 not for agriculture.

37  
38 Ms. Wright Hall stated that Dr. Jones indicated that he is engaged in many other activities related to

6/16/11

1 agriculture such as pollination and crop inspection which are not restricted because of the limitations.  
2 She said that it is her understanding that the majority of Dr. Jones' property is in Douglas County and  
3 apparently his helicopter and airplane are also housed in Douglas County. She said that she and her  
4 husband do not believe that moving his aircraft to Champaign County would benefit his crops grown  
5 in Douglas County. She said that Paragraph 7.A. on Page 5 of 17 of the Preliminary Draft Finding  
6 of Fact dated June 10, 2011, states that the petitioners are engaged in a number of agricultural  
7 activities which is the growing and selling of hay and rezoning to AG-1 allows for more efficient use  
8 of the land. She said that the Jones' do not intend to grow and sell hay they intend to construct a  
9 Heliport/RLA therefore the argument in Paragraph 7.A. is not relevant.

10  
11 Ms. Wright Hall stated that another concern that she and her husband have is safety and public  
12 health. She said that the intent of the CR District is to protect the public health but it is their belief  
13 that construction of a Heliport/RLA in such a rural area served by only by volunteer fire protection  
14 puts their property and all of the property surrounding the proposed Heliport/RLA at high risk. She  
15 said that there is no way that one can protect the safety and public health of the neighborhood which  
16 is in close proximity to the proposed site if there were to be a crash, or an explosion, a fire due to  
17 leaking fuel or a toxic spill of chemicals. She said that already there has been a crop sprayer that  
18 landed on the subject property to restock fuel and chemicals. She said that with all of the earth  
19 moving that has been done to the property they fear the contamination of groundwater and the water  
20 well which they drink water from.

21  
22 Ms. Wright Hall stated that from the drawings that they downloaded from the website they cannot  
23 exactly tell where the hanger will be built. She said that they understand from talking to others that  
24 the hangar is proposed to be constructed back by the Embarras River and even the best methods  
25 cannot prevent fuel from falling to the ground. She said that she would assume that Dr. Jones  
26 intends to have a fuel tank on the property which is a concern for toxicity to the soil along the river in  
27 a flood zone. She said the fuel, oil or other chemicals or any accidental runoff could escape and be  
28 incorporated into the water causing pollution and doing damage beyond any that she can imagine.

29  
30 Ms. Wright Hall stated that in addition they are concerned about traffic. She said that their home and  
31 the proposed RLA is just past what is locally called "the three-mile curve" on Illinois Route 130.  
32 She said that some traffic greatly accelerates past the three-mile curve with drivers in a hurry passing  
33 slower drivers. She said that there have been many accidents along this stretch of highway and in  
34 front of their home they have witnessed many close calls with reckless passing. She said that she  
35 wonders what the impact would be of a reckless passer and a plane coming in for a landing  
36 approaching from the east across Illinois Route 130 because it could be disastrous. She said that if  
37 there were planes or helicopters landing or stored in the proposed hangar she is sure that the traffic  
38 along Illinois Route 130 and on Dr. Jones' driveway would increase.

6/16/11

1  
2 Mr. Wright Hall stated that she and her husband have read in the petition that Dr. Jones has offered  
3 to assist the law enforcement agencies. She applauds him for offering his services to help others  
4 however she would imagine that some “call outs” could be in the middle of the night thus causing  
5 much noise and disturbance to sleeping neighbors from loud plane or helicopter engines and lights  
6 on the runway. She said that she does not see in Dr. Jones’ petition for lights on the runway so if  
7 there were evening or night activity this could cause a real safety issue on an unlit airstrip. She asked  
8 what is the cutoff time for landing on a dark RLA and what are the enforcement measures for the  
9 landings and the take offs. She said that they would assume that the air traffic in and out of the RLA  
10 would be increased because in addition to his recreation and farming landings and take offs he would  
11 have to take off and land during law enforcement assistance. She said that Dr. Jones indicated in his  
12 testimony that he would only use the Heliport/RLA twice per month but with all of his other  
13 activities it seems that there would be more air traffic.

14  
15 Dr. Jones indicated that all of his activities are included in the twice a month projection.  
16  
17 She said that if Dr. Jones has already been successfully assisting the law enforcement agencies in his  
18 present location there should be no need to relocate his aircraft to Champaign County.

19  
20 Ms. Wright Hall stated that since there have already been several helicopters and planes that have  
21 landed on this field or have buzzed the property she cannot imagine that the Jones’ helicopter or  
22 plane will be the sole aircrafts to use the proposed RLA. She asked how many planes will be  
23 allowed to be parked and congregate on the property and if there are restrictions what are the  
24 enforcement mechanisms to be utilized. She said that she and her husband are concerned with the  
25 existing wildlife and vegetation of the area. She said that since they have lived in their home they  
26 have attracted hummingbirds, yellow finches and other birds to their yard using feeders and a water  
27 feature. She said that she cannot imagine that increased air traffic over their property would  
28 encourage wildlife to the area but rather discourage it. She said that before the eight to nine feet wall  
29 of dirt to the west of their home was constructed they were able to observe deer grazing in the field  
30 behind their home but since the embankment was created they have not been able to see any deer and  
31 they have been encouraged to graze in an area where aircraft were and will be taking off and landing.  
32 She said that they also wonder about the geese and other birds that are visiting the Jones’ newly dug  
33 pond flying off as a plane is landing or taking off. She said that last evening they observed a blue  
34 heron go behind the berm/barrier to apparently land on the pond.

35  
36 Ms. Wright Hall asked the Board if in the future she and her husband intended to construct anything  
37 within the RLA would they be restricted due to the interference that it may cause the air traffic. She  
38 said that it is their understanding that they would have to obtain special permission from the

6/16/11

1 Department of Transportation if they desired to improve their property with any type of construction.  
2 She asked how the RLA would impact the marketability of their property, property taxes or property  
3 value. She said that she is slowly approaching senior citizenship and eventually she would like to be  
4 able to sell her home but wondered if that will be possible with an RLA behind it.  
5

6 Ms. Wright Hall stated that in summary she requests that the Board deny the rezoning of the subject  
7 property and the issuance of a special use permit for the following reasons: 1) to protect the existing  
8 neighborhood and the property values of the homes in the existing neighborhood; and 2) to protect  
9 the wildlife in the area; and 3) to preserve the scenic value as stated in the Zoning Code as one of the  
10 purposes of the Conservation Recreation classification; and 4) to protect the safety and welfare of  
11 those traveling along Illinois Route 130; and 5) to protect the safety and welfare of the home owners  
12 in the existing neighborhood.  
13

14 Ms. Wright Hall submitted her written statement and photographs of her property and the proposed  
15 RLA as Documents of Record.  
16

17 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Ms. Wright-Hall.  
18

19 Mr. Miller noted that Ms. Wright Hall's comments regarding Dr. Jones' right to build a pond or the  
20 placement of fuel tanks on his property are not relevant to the case. He said that as a property owner  
21 he has the right to store fuel upon his property up until the IEPA mandates their regulations and that  
22 does not pertain to the request.  
23

24 Ms. Wright Hall stated that she believed that the storage of fuel and the tanks placement would be a  
25 safety issue that the Board should consider.  
26

27 Mr. Miller repeated that Dr. Jones storing fuel on his property and impacting the environment has no  
28 impact upon this case because he has every right to store fuel on his property until he violates IEPA  
29 regulations.  
30

31 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any additional questions for Ms. Wright Hall.  
32

33 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Ms. Wright Hall and there were none.  
34

35 Mr. Thorsland asked if the petitioner desired to cross examine Ms. Wright Hall.  
36

37 Mr. Alan Singleton, attorney for Phillip and Sarabeth Jones, asked Ms. Wright Hall is she was  
38 familiar with the construction of a berm for the blockage of noise.

6/16/11

1  
2 Ms. Wright Hall stated no.  
3  
4 Mr. Singleton asked Ms. Wright Hall if she would be surprised to discover that one of the purposes  
5 of the berm was to serve as a noise barrier to the airplane.  
6  
7 Ms. Wright Hall stated that the location of the RLA is not located where the existing berm is located.  
8  
9 Mr. Singleton asked Ms. Wright Hall if she understands where the placement of the proposed hangar  
10 is to be located.  
11  
12 Ms. Wright Hall stated that it was very difficult to tell where the hangar was proposed. She said that  
13 she does not know if it is to be located near the woods or near the existing barn.  
14  
15 Mr. Singleton stated that Ms. Wright Hall discussed public safety and noise. He asked Ms. Wright  
16 Hall to indicate the distance from her residence to Illinois Route 130.  
17  
18 Ms. Wright Hall stated that she is not aware of the exact measurements.  
19  
20 Mr. Singleton asked Ms. Wright Hall if her property abuts Illinois Route 130.  
21  
22 Ms. Wright Hall stated yes.  
23  
24 Mr. Singleton asked Ms. Wright Hall to indicate the speed limit on Illinois Route 130.  
25  
26 Ms. Wright Hall stated that the speed limit on Illinois Route 130 is 65 miles per hour.  
27  
28 Mr. Singleton asked Ms. Wright Hall if the daily traffic includes cars, trucks, semi-trucks,  
29 motorcycles, etc.  
30  
31 Ms. Wright Hall stated yes.  
32  
33 Mr. Singleton asked Ms. Wright Hall if she can hear the noise generated by the traffic on Illinois  
34 Route 130.  
35  
36 Ms. Wright Hall stated yes.  
37  
38 Mr. Thorsland requested that Mr. Singleton keep his questions and comments regarding noise related

6/16/11

1 to the subject property and not Illinois Route 130.

2  
3 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone desired to cross examine Ms. Wright Hall and there was  
4 no one.

5  
6 Mr. Thorsland called Mr. Larry Hall to testify.

7  
8 Mr. Larry Hall, who resides at 177 CR 1600E, Villa Grove, IL, stated that his residence is  
9 immediately adjacent from the subject property. He stated that if we were before the Board with  
10 merely the question as to whether it was okay for Dr. Jones to land his helicopter or his aircraft  
11 behind his home then he would care less because he has no issue with the practice. He said he has  
12 not had a lot of notice of this request therefore he is not as prepared as he would like to be but he and  
13 his neighbors have some concerns, which appear to be challenged, and those concerns need to be  
14 addressed. He said that as he familiarize himself with the options and the things that present  
15 themselves as possibilities for having an established Heliport/RLA he finds that a whole different  
16 story appears. He said that there are a lot of options that present themselves which causes him  
17 concern. He said that not recently but he has seen many helicopter landings on the subject property  
18 but the most recent occurrence with an airplane was approximately three weeks ago when an airplane  
19 was flying very close to the runway. He said that he is sure that the airplane was closer than 200 feet  
20 from Illinois Route 130. He said that he has heard a lot of reference regarding the clearance  
21 requirements at the end of the runway for safety although he has not heard reference regarding the  
22 side clearance or protection. He said that part of the request is for a waiver of a special use standard  
23 condition required by Section 6.1 that requires a runway safety area to be located entirely on the lot.  
24 He said that he would assume that there has to be a safety area requirement for the side because he  
25 has seen news captions where airplanes miss runways and end up on the sides. He said that his  
26 property is one of the residential lots that are mentioned in the memorandum as being north and east  
27 of the petitioner's residential/agricultural property. He said he has heard a lot of concerns regarding  
28 the trees and he understands those concerns but he is more concerned about the safety of his family  
29 and neighbors. He said that he measured the site, by stepping it off not by the use of a tape, and the  
30 only thing that separates his residential property from the approach of the runway is Dr. Jones'  
31 driveway. He said that the runway or at least the area that is being mowed is approximately 108 feet  
32 from his property line and 135 feet from his bedroom which is darn close to a landing plane. He said  
33 that he chuckled at the challenge regarding noise and yes it is true that he and his wife do hear traffic  
34 noise from Illinois Route 130. He said that if noise was an issue the level of noise during  
35 construction of the pond and berm should have been addressed because there were several weeks  
36 when he and his wife could not use their back patio for company because you could not hear a decent  
37 conversation due to the construction equipment noise. He said that the County Board appeared to be  
38 concerned about wind farms being located in the CR District due to the sweep of the blades of the

6/16/11

1 windmills although he could see the same if not worse effect of the blades of a helicopter.

2  
3 Mr. John Hall stated that the side transition is a slope of 4:1 for a distance of 85 feet to the edge of  
4 the runway and as far as he can see this area is entirely contained on Dr. Jones' property. He said  
5 that the primary surface area is also contained on the subject property therefore the proposed RLA  
6 meets all of the RLA basic requirements. He said that Mr. Larry Hall addresses a good point in that  
7 more than the basic requirement may be required when a residence is 27 feet from the property line.  
8 He said that he does not know if it would make Mr. Larry Hall feel any better if he was aware that  
9 his residence is 60+ feet outside of the area where there should be no construction allowed. He  
10 asked Mr. Larry Hall to indicate what reasonable distance he would feel comfortable with as a  
11 separation from his residence to the RLA.

12  
13 Mr. Larry Hall stated that he cannot imagine that a new buyer of his home would not have a concern  
14 that the home was immediately adjacent to an RLA. He said that if the Heliport/RLA was to be  
15 allowed he would not have as much of an issue with landing a helicopter as he does with the term  
16 Heliport. He said that a Heliport can mean a lot of the things and it could be used extensively in the  
17 future for other uses. He said that he has had friends which live near an approved area where ultra-  
18 lights land and in no time there are 20 to 30 landing. He said that he sees a great potential for more  
19 than one ownership of helicopters landing on the approved Heliport/RLA. He said that he believes  
20 that there should be a limitation that the Heliport/RLA shall be exclusively for the private use of the  
21 owner. He said that he does know why the Heliport approval cannot be approved without the RLA  
22 because the landing area is to the back of the subject property and has limited impact on the  
23 neighbors along Illinois Route 130. He said that he sees no need for the RLA because it takes little  
24 time to get anywhere by air and there is an airport at Tuscola or Champaign. He said that he believes  
25 that if the Board authorizes the request without conditions then they may be opening up a can of  
26 worms because everything in the past has lead to tonight's meeting and everything has been done  
27 progressively.

28  
29 Mr. John Hall asked Mr. Larry Hall if he will not be happy with the RLA as it is proposed with no  
30 buffering and there is no way to mitigate the safety issues as well as the property value issues raised  
31 by the RLA being that close to his dwelling.

32  
33 Mr. Larry Hall stated yes.

34  
35 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Larry Hall and there were none.

36  
37 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Mr. Larry Hall and there were none.

38

6/16/11

1 Mr. Thorsland asked if the audience if anyone desired to cross examine Mr. Larry Hall and there was  
2 no one.

3  
4 Mr. Thorsland asked if the petitioner desired to cross examine Mr. Larry Hall and the petitioner  
5 declined.

6  
7 Mr. Thorsland called Ms. Sarabeth Jones to testify.

8  
9 Ms. Sarabeth Jones declined to testify at this time.

10  
11 Mr. Thorsland called Mark Fisher to testify.

12  
13 Mr. Mark Fisher, who resides at 195 CR 1600E, Villa Grove, IL, stated that he is the neighbor to the  
14 north of the subject property. He said that in the early 1990's the northern portion of his property,  
15 which is located to the north of the subject property, was used for a junk yard and the ground was  
16 soggy and muddy and had parts of cars, toilets, thorn trees, etc. He said that he and his wife decided  
17 to build a pond as a catch basin therefore removing all of the junk and debris. He said that  
18 approximately two days into the construction of the pond the contractor called to let him know that  
19 Champaign County was at the site regarding zoning. He said that in his younger days he did not  
20 understand what the staff at Champaign County Planning and Zoning did but now he understands the  
21 importance of their job and decision making. He said that over 20 years ago he and his wife  
22 purchased their property for the purpose of enjoying the scenic view to the west and south. He said  
23 that his mother purchased the lot to the south of his property with the intention of building a home  
24 someday and sharing in the scenic view. He said that the scenic view that he is speaking of is  
25 currently zoned CR Conservation-Recreation. He said that as he gets older he greatly appreciates the  
26 preservation of conservation, woodland and natural and historic areas therefore when he reviewed  
27 the petitioner's request he finds himself searching for a valid reason to allow a piece of our historic  
28 natural resource to become an airstrip. He said that the petitioner's reasoning for allowing such a use  
29 is solely for the purpose of agricultural advancement. He said that the petitioner also indicated that  
30 the airstrip was above the base flood elevation although he and his wife watched a multitude of  
31 trucks depositing loads of dirt from the outside sources in the area of the landing strip therefore he  
32 does question the authenticity of the elevations of the proposed airstrip. He said that the petitioner  
33 claims that he is just now being restricted from the intended use although that seems odd since  
34 zoning has not changed since Dr. Jones purchased the property. Mr. Fisher stated that the rezoning  
35 of CR Conservation-Recreation to AG-1 Agriculture on the basis of agricultural reasons, which is the  
36 sole reason of the petition, due to the petitioner's statement that he owns and farms 130 acres of crop  
37 land although over 100 acres of that crop land is located elsewhere. Mr. Fisher asked why Dr. Jones'  
38 does not locate the Heliport/RLA on his other farmland rather than chipping away at more and more

6/16/11

1 of our valued conservation property.

2

3 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Fisher and there were none.

4

5 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Mr. Fisher and there were none.

6

7 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone desired to cross examine Mr. Fisher and there was no  
8 one.

9

10 Mr. Thorsland asked the petitioner if they desired to cross examine Mr. Fisher and the petitioner  
11 indicated no.

12

13 Ms. Capel requested that Mr. Fisher indicate his property location.

14

15 Mr. Fisher stated that his property is located on the northwest corner of Illinois Route 130 and  
16 County Highway 16.

17

18 Mr. Thorsland called Ms. Jean Fisher to testify.

19

20 Ms. Jean Fisher, who resides at 195 CR 1600E, Villa Grove, IL, thanked the Board for taking her  
21 comments. She said that she is Mark Fisher's wife and they have lived at 195 CR 1500E for  
22 approximately 23 years. She said that they have approximately five acres of private farm for which  
23 she has sheep and horses and a fenced grass area that she uses for a training field for dogs and  
24 instruction to the public for class sessions or private dog training lessons. She said that they have  
25 raised two sons on their property. She said that she and Mark have cleared the pasture land of scrub  
26 brush and junk cars and have installed fencing as well as maintained the existing buildings. She said  
27 that they have an abundant amount of wildlife around their property such as indigo buntings,  
28 hummingbirds, goldfinches, flickers, orioles, butterflies, soft shelled turtles, bullfrogs, snakes and  
29 deer.

30

31 Ms. Fisher stated that they own the original home site for the original tract, consisting of 70+ acres,  
32 prior to subdivision. She said that the original tract was a sizeable dairy operation in Crittenden  
33 Township and it encompassed a large area and portions on both sides of the Embarras River. She  
34 said that the property that they currently own was created during the creation of the E. E. Rogers  
35 Subdivision by the previous owner and was completed prior to their purchase. She said that the  
36 subdivision consists of 4 separate lots. She said that the Piercy (Hood) house, located to the south of  
37 their property, was an additional adjacent lot and the Lively (Hall) house which is further south was  
38 the last zoned subdivision lot. She said that the remaining acreage was sold to others and to Phillip

6/16/11

1 Jones, who further sold lots without proper zoning therefore currently requesting variances today.  
2 She said that before the land was further developed and sold she and Mark would frequently walk  
3 through the woods and sift through the dirt with their shoes and uncover a variety of arrowheads  
4 presumably made by the local Indian tribes of the past.  
5

6 Ms. Fisher stated that since the construction and extensive land disruption and 10 foot clay and dirt  
7 berm was placed behind their property, on the Jones' property, not only is it an eyesore but it has  
8 forever changed the idea of conservation, country and wooded property landscape. She said that they  
9 questioned the authenticity of this work and if it could actually be done in a floodplain in the  
10 Conservation-Recreation District and the biggest issue that they were told was the potential of  
11 changing the flow of water and causing flooding and runoff to their properties. She asked if any  
12 engineering assessment had been completed for this project or has a historic preservation survey and  
13 investigation been done to the subject property.  
14

15 Ms. Fisher stated that the frequency and nuisance of low flying planes and helicopters landing over  
16 our persons, buzzing our house, livestock and buildings by which she believes is Dr. Jones. She said  
17 that as a side note Dr. Jones has never made any attempt to discuss his ideas or any problems ensuing  
18 from any groundwork or aeronautical activities with the neighbors.  
19

20 Ms. Fisher stated that due to the following she is against the requested rezoning to AG-1 and the  
21 special use permit for the RLA. She said that the reputation and trustworthiness in the past  
22 concerning applications with IDOT/FAA and disputes with Champaign County Zoning rules and  
23 regulations. Ms. Fisher stated that Anne Haaker of the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency  
24 specifically states "The project area has a high probability of containing significant  
25 prehistoric/historic archeological resources. Accordingly, a Phase I archeological reconnaissance  
26 survey to locate, identify, and record all archeological resources within the project area will be  
27 required." She said that Case 688-S-11, Preliminary Draft Summary of Evidence dated June 16,  
28 2011, Page 5 of 17, Item #7.A. indicates that the Petitioner has testified on the application as follows:  
29 "As applicant is engaged in a number of agricultural activities, the special use permit should be  
30 granted because "uses can and should be accommodated in rural areas if they compliment  
31 agriculture, or supplement farm income" (1.6 Land Use Regulatory Policies). Applicant owns 130  
32 acres farmed in corn and beans, grows sunflowers, soybeans, sugar beets, alfalfa, etc., and uses the  
33 helicopter to pollinate;... Ms. Fisher stated that Dr. Jones has only baled the hay since last year, with  
34 one cutting, and perhaps just one this year. She said that the cutting of hay has not been done on the  
35 subject "rezoned" requested property to AG-1, but has been done on a small scale on the bermed  
36 property behind her home. She said that it would be of great risk and extremely unwise to use an  
37 aircraft to assist in agricultural purposes from this standpoint. She said that she also has an issue  
38 with how many acres are actually within Champaign County that is being utilized for agriculture.

6/16/11

1 She said that Case 688-S-11, Preliminary Draft Summary of Evidence dated June 16, 2011, Page 7 of  
2 17, Item #9.A. indicates that the Petitioner has testified on the application as follows: "As the RLA  
3 and the heliport-RLA will be used to a significant degree for agricultural purposes, the special use  
4 will comply with the agricultural nature of the surroundings in addition to serving and  
5 complimenting agriculture on the parcel itself, neighboring and other lots owned by the applicant."  
6 She reminded the Board that the surrounding properties are zoned Conservation-Recreation and not  
7 agriculture and the grass on the runway strip has to remain low. She said that if the majority of Dr.  
8 Jones' produced crops are in Douglas County, where he has stated his helicopter currently resides,  
9 then in her opinion it can stay in Douglas County. Ms. Fisher stated that a key point that should not  
10 be glossed over is that all land currently adjacent to the proposed rezoning Conservation-Recreation  
11 District to AG-1 is currently in the Conservation District including the land to the south. She said  
12 that if the property in question is allowed to be rezoned to AG-1 it will leave a little remaining strip  
13 being AG-1 with CR all to the north and the south therefore why should an exception be made for  
14 approximately 12 acres that cannot be farmed upon because it is housing a runway. She said that  
15 neighbors purchased their property for the conservation, wildlife, country living atmosphere, with  
16 little disturbance or intrusion from urban areas or neighbors. She said that Case 687-AM-11,  
17 Preliminary Draft Summary of Evidence dated June 16, 2011, Item #6.B excludes her property as  
18 well as her neighbor's to the south and minimalized as to their location, property type subdivision in  
19 the proximity to Mr. Jones' property.

20  
21 Ms. Fisher stated that according to ILCS Administrative Code Section 16.160, "anybody conducting  
22 business or residence must notify IDOT and apply for a permit to add or change any buildings in the  
23 area, up to 20,000 feet horizontally from the end of the aeronautical landing strip. She said that this  
24 presents a problem for all neighbors in the vicinity and presents a tremendous hardship for those of  
25 us who have already purchased more expensive zoned subdivision property with a desire to build  
26 improvements; and 8. In an economically depressed housing market such as the current trend, this  
27 furthermore, places an unnecessary restriction on their property but undoubtedly will devalue their  
28 property and those within the afore mentioned distance. Ms. Fisher stated that IDOT personnel has  
29 told her that anything within a three mile radius must be considered in the flight path of a runway  
30 such as, houses, farm buildings, etc.

31  
32 Ms. Fisher stated that Dr. Jones has indicated that he now has a jet-turbine, dual rotor, former  
33 military helicopter which is a bigger, more powerful helicopter and along with it a louder sound and  
34 noise pollution. She said that ILCS Administrative Code Section 14.410, Responsibility and  
35 Authority of the Pilot, states the following: a) Careless or Reckless Operation (1) No pilot shall  
36 operate an aircraft in a careless or reckless manner so as to endanger the person or property of  
37 another. (2) Examples: a) Buzzing, diving on, or flying in close proximity to livestock, homes, any  
38 structure, aircraft vehicle, vessel, person or group of persons. Ms. Fisher stated that she believes that

6/16/11

1 Dr. Jones has done this on numerous occasions. She continued with ILCS Administrative Code  
2 Section 14.410 as follows: 2(b) Proximity of aircraft. No pilot shall operate an aircraft in proximity  
3 to or relative to other aircraft so as to create a collision hazard. Ms. Fisher stated that approximately  
4 one and one-half mile from the subject property TriCat Farms lands a helicopter on their property  
5 and it is her understanding that the TriCat helicopter does not have to file a flight plan nor discuss  
6 with other helicopters as to what their flight plan will be. She said that she has video tape of a  
7 "Mash type" helicopter crop dusting in front of her house and going over Illinois Route 130. She  
8 said that Illinois Route 130 is not just a method of transportation for people to travel back and forth  
9 to Champaign but is used for a lot of over-sized loads therefore tall vehicles, heavy vehicles, vehicles  
10 in tow and trailers. She noted that the helicopter that was flying very low had no identifying marks  
11 on it. She said that she has also witnessed an airplane flying in the same field as the helicopter and  
12 has one of these flights on video. She said that she does not have video of Dr. Jones landing his  
13 helicopter on this same day but it was a very busy weekend and there were at least four different  
14 aeronautical aircraft flying around and it was hard to tell who was coming or going.

15  
16 Ms. Fisher stated that a mentioned crop dusting business, which requires special licensing and  
17 registration,  
18 and ensuing use of toxic chemicals creates a potential for chemical spills. She asked if this should  
19 really be happening in a floodplain Conservation District or in such close proximity to people and  
20 animals. She said that chemical spills usually require evacuation of surrounding properties which  
21 presents a hardship for those of us with livestock.

22  
23 Ms. Fisher stated that Dr. Jones' original application was for an airport and runway RLA use for  
24 fixed wing aircraft therefore we should expect him to land a fixed wing aircraft. She said that it  
25 appears that everything that has been presented to the Board is for a heliport even though there is  
26 area and distance for landing of fixed wing aircraft it is labeled as a Heliport not a fixed wing aircraft  
27 landing strip which has different requirements than a Heliport. She asked who will monitor and  
28 enforce the proper use of the Heliport. She asked if Champaign County Zoning will ensure that it  
29 only be used for Dr. Jones' private helicopter because the Champaign County Ordinance indicates  
30 that Heliports are private. She asked if Dr. Jones will land other aircraft such his airplane or his  
31 father's plane, which he has already done, or will any person that has an aircraft be allowed to land.  
32 She asked how the Conservation District will then protect the public health and preservation and  
33 conservation of the natural scenic area.

34  
35 Ms. Fisher stated that in summary the protection of conservation and preservation of a Conservation  
36 District is of the utmost importance. She said that the areas are needed for the beauty, peacefulness,  
37 environmental habitat for all species preservation and protection and water flow and filtration. She  
38 said that conservation uses are being lost nationally, statewide and regionally. She said that it is her

6/16/11

1 opinion that the Board's biggest decision to refuse the rezoning of CR Conservation-Recreation  
2 District to AG-1 Agriculture and refuse the special use for an RLA should stem from law abiding,  
3 taxpaying citizens who stand to be most advertently affected. She said that they are the people who  
4 have the most to contend with in the disturbance of construction, peace, the potential of property  
5 restrictions and depreciation in land values. She said that the Board must preserve the peacefulness  
6 of our country and natural setting and ensure its integrity as it has been for the previous decades.  
7  
8 Ms. Fisher submitted her prepared statement and photographs as Documents of Record.  
9  
10 Mr. Thorsland stated that he did not recall the application mentioning crop dusting.  
11  
12 Mr. Hall stated that Dr. Jones' application does not suggest that the RLA will be utilized for crop  
13 dusting. He said that the request is for an RLA and Heliport.  
14  
15 Mr. Thorsland clarified that an RLA is for fixed wing aircraft.  
16  
17 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Ms. Fisher and there were none.  
18  
19 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Ms. Fisher and there were none.  
20  
21 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone desired to cross examine Ms. Fisher and there was no  
22 one.  
23  
24 Mr. Thorsland asked if the Petitioner desired to cross examine Ms. Fisher and the petitioner declined.  
25  
26 Mr. Mark Fisher requested the opportunity to re-address the Board.  
27  
28 Mr. Thorsland granted Mr. Fisher's request.  
29  
30 Mr. Mark Fisher asked the Board if crop dusting becomes a right if the subject property is rezoned to  
31 AG-1.  
32  
33 Mr. Hall stated that the County is in court regarding this very issue. He said that it is his position as  
34 the Champaign County Zoning Administrator that if a farmer is having crop dusting done on his land  
35 then the crop duster can land on the farmland in accordance with all of the normal rules of aviation  
36 safety and an RLA is not required to do such. He said that IDOT recommends having an RLA if the  
37 intent is to land on the property on a regular basis but infrequent landing of an aircraft while they are  
38 servicing the agricultural land is not an issue with him.

6/16/11

1

2 Mr. Fisher asked Mr. Hall if his position includes the storage of chemicals and pesticides on the  
3 property.

4

5 Mr. Hall stated that as long as the storage of chemicals and pesticides are in compliance with all of  
6 the Illinois Department of Agriculture regulations then yes.

7

8 Mr. Thorsland called Mr. Damon Hood to testify.

9

10 Mr. Damon Hood declined to testify at this time.

11

12 Mr. Thorsland called Dr. William J. Jones to testify.

13

14 Dr. William J. Jones declined to testify at this time.

15

16 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone desired to sign the witness register to present testimony  
17 regarding Cases 687-AM-11 and 688-S-11.

18

19 Mr. Thorsland called Mr. Joshua Fisher to testify.

20

21 Mr. Joshua Fisher, who resides at 195 CR 1600E, Villa Grove, IL, stated that he is the son of Mark  
22 and Jean Fisher. He said that he would like to discuss the principal of the matter. He said that he  
23 would not be comfortable with the ZBA approving the requested rezoning and special use permit.

24

25 Mr. Fisher stated that he understands the he is young and many people may write his testimony off  
26 due to his inexperience. He said that John Locke, British philosopher and author, spoke about life  
27 and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property, and pursuing and obtaining  
28 happiness and safety. Mr. Fisher stated that a part of the American dream is owning a home and it is  
29 the biggest investment that most people make in their lives. He said that most people do not live in  
30 the same house all of their life therefore the houses near the subject property will either be sold or  
31 given to a family member and having a Heliport/RLA will greatly diminish the value of those homes.  
32 He said that as a college student, at the age of 20, he views the community and the area of his college  
33 residence therefore he does not understand why such a practice was not taken into account when the  
34 subject property was purchased. Mr. Fisher stated that rezoning the property will have a lot of  
35 reciprocations to the neighborhood and the numbers cannot be argued with in that many people will  
36 take the close proximity of an RLA into consideration when purchasing a home in the neighborhood.

37 He said that he would never want to live near an airport. He said that part of the reason why people  
38 move to the country is for the freedom and privacy of doing what you want to do but part of that

6/16/11

1 freedom and privacy is peace and quiet.

2

3 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Joshua Fisher and there were  
4 none.

5

6 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Mr. Joshua Fisher and there were none.

7

8 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone desired to cross examine Mr. Joshua Fisher and there  
9 was no one.

10

11 Mr. Thorsland asked if the petitioner desired to cross examine Mr. Joshua Fisher and the petitioner  
12 declined.

13

14 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone else desired to sign the witness register to present  
15 testimony regarding Cases 687-AM-11 and 688-S-11 and there was no one.

16

17 Mr. Larry Hall requested the opportunity to present a question to the Board and staff.

18

19 Mr. Thorsland called Mr. Larry Hall.

20

21 Mr. Larry Hall stated that it is his understanding that there are a lot of restrictions around an area that  
22 IDOT approved for air traffic. He asked if there were any restrictions regarding the discharge of a  
23 firearm near an air facility.

24

25 Mr. Thorsland stated that he does not have an answer to Mr. Larry Hall's question.

26

27 Mr. Larry Hall stated that there is not one person in attendance tonight who lives near or on the  
28 subject property who does not discharge a firearm periodically and some property owners on a  
29 regular basis.

30

31 Mr. John Hall stated that the Zoning Ordinance does not regulate the discharge of firearms and such  
32 a question should be presented to IDOT.

33

34 Mr. Larry Hall asked Mr. John Hall if staff would pose the question to IDOT or should he call them  
35 himself.

36

37 Mr. John Hall stated that unless the Board directs him to contact IDOT about this issue he would  
38 prefer that Larry Hall contact them. He said that anyone who discharges a firearm should be aware

6/16/11

1 of what the rules are because there are plenty of homes in the area and there is a State Highway  
2 therefore there are a lot of reasons to be concerned about the discharge of firearms.  
3  
4 Mr. Larry Hall stated that there is a lot of wildlife in the area but they are not all friendly.  
5  
6 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Larry Hall and there were none.  
7  
8 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Mr. Larry Hall and there were none.  
9  
10 Mr. Thorsland asked if the Petitioner desired to cross examine Mr. Larry Hall and the petitioner  
11 declined.  
12  
13 Mr. Thorsland stated that at this point the Board needs to give staff direction. He said that staff and  
14 the Board addressed some of the concerns regarding the side transitions and IDOT did visit and  
15 inspect the site. He said that unless the rest of the Board disagrees he is not going to direct staff to  
16 contact IDOT in regards to the discharge of firearms. He said that no final determination will be  
17 given at tonight's meeting therefore the public will have an opportunity to have additional questions  
18 or concerns addressed at a later hearing.  
19  
20 Ms. Julia Wright Hall requested the opportunity to address the Board.  
21  
22 Mr. Thorsland called Ms. Wright Hall.  
23  
24 Mr. Wright Hall asked if IDOT has approved the RLA.  
25  
26 Mr. Thorsland stated that IDOT has visited and inspected the site and IDOT is waiting for the proper  
27 zoning to be approved.  
28  
29 Mr. Wright Hall stated that it was her understanding that before anything could be approved it had to  
30 be presented to the entire public with a 16 day period for input.  
31  
32 Mr. Thorsland stated that the 16 day approval process will not occur until the proper approvals from  
33 Champaign County are completed.  
34  
35 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board, staff, audience and petitioner if there were any questions for Ms.  
36 Wright-Hall and there were none.  
37  
38 Mr. Courson stated that during the wind farm hearings there was an issue with noise pollution

6/16/11

1 therefore should decibel levels for aircraft near surrounding homes be considered.

2  
3 Mr. Hall stated that there is a big difference in the hours each day or month that one would expect  
4 noise. He said that Dr. Jones has testified that the RLA will only be used about twice a month  
5 therefore if it is only used twice per month he cannot imagine that the Board needs to worry about  
6 noise. He said that he has never seen noise analyzed as part of a simple RLA case. He said that the  
7 testimony from most of the neighbors is that the Heliport is far enough away from their properties  
8 that they are not concerned about the noise from the helicopter.

9  
10 Mr. Miller asked Mr. Hall if the RLA was approved and the subject property was sold to a  
11 parachuting business or club could it occur where there were planes running in and out regularly.

12  
13 Mr. Hall stated that the establishment of a parachuting business or club on the subject property  
14 would require a new special use permit and an injunction could be issued to stop the activities until a  
15 special permit is granted. He said that Dr. Jones' frequency of use of the RLA/Heliport may end up  
16 not being a problem for the neighbors although he did not know how to ensure that for the future.  
17 He said that he would encourage Dr. Jones to consider a condition that would allow him to use the  
18 RLA/Heliport as he has testified because such a condition would ensure the Board and neighbors that  
19 future owners would have the same limit. He asked the Board if they desire to have the use of the  
20 RLA/Heliport limited to a certain amount per week or month.

21  
22 Mr. Passalaqua asked Mr. Hall if staff had received any comments from the other four or five  
23 property owners indicated on the map.

24  
25 Mr. Hall stated no, but none of the other houses are as close as the witnesses that the Board has heard  
26 from tonight.

27  
28 Mr. Passalaqua stated that there is a home directly to the north of Larry Hall's residence.

29  
30 Mr. Thorsland stated that the property owner is present at tonight's meeting but declined to testify at  
31 tonight's meeting.

32  
33 Ms. Capel asked if it would be appropriate to have the petitioner to weigh in on a draft condition.

34  
35 Mr. Hall stated that he would rather speak to the petitioner about a draft condition outside of the  
36 public hearing but we would like to know what the Board's thoughts are regarding a draft condition.  
37 He said that he is impressed with Mr. Larry Hall's concern about his home. He said that even though  
38 the home meets every separation requirement it is still very close to the proposed RLA. He said that

6/16/11

1 Dr. Jones has built a sizable berm on the west side of the neighboring properties although there is no  
2 berm on the south side that he is aware of. He said that a berm would assist with noise but it would  
3 also reduce the view of the CR District. He said that he is not aware what would provide the best  
4 compatibility between a house that is 60 to 80 feet away from a runway that is not participating in the  
5 runway's use and has no desire to participate in its use.

6  
7 Ms. Capel stated that seems like there are a lot of residences really close to the proposed RLA and in  
8 her experience with RLA's in Champaign County that is not common.

9  
10 Mr. Hall stated that the County has approved one residential airport and the runway does run back up  
11 to about half of the lots but all of the homes are further away than the Hall residence.

12  
13 Mr. Passalacqua asked if the residential airport, by design, is for residents who own airplanes.

14  
15 Mr. Palmgren stated that he lives at the residential airport and half of the current residents are not  
16 pilots or airplane owners which is an unfortunate circumstance for the other owners. He said that  
17 many of those residents complain because there is not enough airplane activity. He said that two of  
18 the resident's properties back right up to the airstrip and it doesn't seem to be an issue. He said that  
19 the neighborhood has not seen a drop in property values although there have not been a lot of sales  
20 lately.

21  
22 Mr. Passalacqua stated that the two situations cannot be compared because a fly-in neighborhood is a  
23 lot different than an after the fact airstrip.

24  
25 Mr. Thorsland asked Mr. Passalacqua if he is suggesting condition.

26  
27 Mr. Passalacqua stated no. He said that the two situations cannot be compared to each other.

28  
29 Mr. Thorsland stated that the Board should review all of the new evidence although staff would like  
30 direction from the Board.

31  
32 Ms. Capel stated that staff should discuss the frequency of use with the Petitioner so that perhaps a  
33 draft condition could be proposed. She said that if twice a month is the anticipated amount then four  
34 times per month should be an adequate limit.

35  
36 Mr. Courson stated that staff should also discuss operational hours. He said that night time use is an  
37 issue that should be considered.

38

6/16/11

1 Mr. Thorsland stated that he reviewed the Administrative Code regarding marking and he did not see  
2 anything about hours of operation although the Code does require a lighted wind indicator. He said  
3 whether the Code implies whether an RLA can be used at night or not it may be a condition that the  
4 Board may want to consider.

5  
6 Mr. Courson stated that if the Petitioner does not plan on flying at night then the Board could place a  
7 limitation on late evenings or early morning hours unless it was a life or death emergency.

8  
9 Mr. Passalacqua stated that the Board should not ignore the fact that Dr. Jones does assist the police  
10 and emergency services therefore we would want that to be permissible.

11  
12 Mr. Hall stated that if assisting law enforcement and emergency services is included as part of the  
13 justification then the Board could ensure that future owners would also be willing to do the same.  
14 He said that the Petitioner has come before the Board with a specific proposal and if the Board finds  
15 it acceptable the Board should make sure that it is an acceptable proposal for all future owners.

16  
17 Mr. Passalacqua asked Mr. Hall if such a condition was approved would the ZBA be responsible for  
18 enforcing that condition.

19  
20 Mr. Hall stated yes.

21  
22 **Mr. Courson moved, seconded by Mr. Schroeder to continue Cases 687-AM-11 and 688-S-11 to**  
23 **July 28, 2011. The motion carried by voice vote.**

24  
25 **Case 689-AM-11 Petitioner: Charles T. and Shelly Sollers Request to amend the Zoning Map**  
26 **to allow for the establishment and use of 1 single family residential lot in the CR Conservation-**  
27 **Recreation District by adding the Rural Residential Overlay (RRO) Zoning District. Location:**  
28 **An approximately 6 acre tract of land that is located in the West Half of the North Half of the**  
29 **Northeast Quarter of Section 27 of Crittenden township and that is located approximately one-**  
30 **half mile west of the intersection of County Highway 16 and Illinois Route 130 and located on**  
31 **the South side of County Highway 16 (CR 200N)**

32  
33 **Case 690-AM-11 Petitioner: Benjamin Shadwick and Jennifer Shadwick Request to amend**  
34 **the zoning Map to allow for the establishment and use of 1 single family residential lot in the**  
35 **CR Conservation-Recreation Zoning District by adding the Rural Residential Overlay (RRO)**  
36 **Zoning District. Location: An approximately 5.3 acre tract of land that is located in the West**  
37 **Half of the North Half of the Northeast Quarter of Section 27 of Crittenden Township and that**  
38 **is located approximately 2,000 feet west of the intersection of County Highway 16 and Illinois**

6/16/11

1 **Route 130 and located on the south side of County Highway 16 (CR200N).**

2  
3 **Mr. Palmgren moved, seconded by Mr. Courson to continue Cases 689-AM-11 and 690-AM-11**  
4 **to the July 28, 2011, meeting. The motion carried by voice vote.**

5  
6  
7 **7. Staff Report**

8  
9 **A. May, 2011 Monthly Report**

10  
11 Mr. Hall briefly reviewed the May, 2011 Monthly Report with the Board. He said that as of mid-  
12 June staff has received three new zoning cases therefore we have already exceeded the zoning cases  
13 for 2010. He said that the County hopes to be advertising for an Associate Planner soon. He said  
14 that he is sure that the Board is aware that a wind farm application was submitted in Vermilion  
15 County therefore Champaign County should expect one relatively soon therefore staff and the ZBA  
16 should expect a busy fall.

17  
18 **8. Other Business**

19  
20 None

21  
22 **9. Audience Participation with respect to matters other than cases pending before the**  
23 **Board**

24  
25 None

26  
27 **10. Adjournment**

28  
29 The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

30  
31  
32  
33  
34 Respectfully submitted

ZBA

AS APPROVED AUGUST 11, 2011

6/16/11

1 Secretary of Zoning Board of Appeals  
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

- 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