

1
2
3 **MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING**

4 **CHAMPAIGN COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

5 **1776 E. Washington Street**

6 **Urbana, IL 61801**

7
8
9 **DATE: June 12, 2014**

PLACE: Lyle Shield's Meeting Room

1776 East Washington Street

Urbana, IL 61802

10
11 **TIME: 7:00 p.m.**

12 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Debra Griest, Marilyn Lee, Brad Passalacqua, Eric Thorsland

13
14 **MEMBERS ABSENT :** Catherine Capel, Roger Miller, Jim Randol

15
16 **STAFF PRESENT :** Connie Berry, John Hall, Andrew Levy

17
18
19 **OTHERS PRESENT :** Steve Burdin, Chad Osterbur, Herb Schildt, Eric Sebens, Don Wauthier,
20 Brian Wills

21
22
23 **1. Call to Order**

24
25 The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

26
27 **2. Roll Call and Declaration of Quorum**

28
29 The roll was called and a quorum declared present with three members absent.

30
31 Mr. Thorsland informed the audience that anyone wishing to testify for any public hearing tonight must sign
32 the witness register for that public hearing. He reminded the audience that when they sign the witness
33 register they are signing an oath.

34
35 **3. Correspondence**

36
37 None

38
39 **4. Approval of Minutes**

40
41 None

42
43 **5. Continued Public Hearing**

44
45 **Case 766-AM-13 Petitioner: Eric L. Sebens d.b.a. Prairieview Landscaping Request: Amend the**

6-12-14

1 **Zoning Map to change the zoning district designation from the AG-1, Agriculture Zoning District to**
2 **the B-1 Rural Trade Center Zoning District in order to authorize the proposed Special Use in related**
3 **zoning Case 767-S-13. Location: A 5-acre tract in Tolono Township in the East Half of the Southeast**
4 **Quarter of the Northeast Quarter of Section 9 of Township 18 North, Range 8 East of the Third**
5 **Principal Meridian and commonly known as Prairieview Landscaping at 1069 CR 900E, Champaign.**

6
7 **Case 767-S-13 Petitioner: Eric L. Sebens d.b.a. Prairieview Landscaping Request: Authorize the**
8 **following as a Special Use in the B-1 Rural Trade Center Zoning District: Part A. Authorize multiple**
9 **principal buildings on the same lot consisting of the following: (1) a landscape contractor's facility**
10 **with outdoor storage that was originally authorized in Case 101-S-97; and (2) Self-Storage**
11 **Warehouses, providing heat and utilities to individual units as a special use proposed in Part B.**
12 **Authorize the construction and use of Self-Storage Warehouses, providing heat and utilities to**
13 **individual units as a special use. Location: A 5-acre tract in Tolono Township in the East Half of the**
14 **Southeast Quarter of the Northeast Quarter of Section 9 of Township 18 North, Range 8 East of the**
15 **Third Principal Meridian and commonly known as Prairieview Landscaping at 1069 CR 900E,**
16 **Champaign.**

17
18 Mr. Thorsland informed the audience that Case 767-S-13 is an Administrative Case and as such the County
19 allows anyone the opportunity to cross examine any witness. He said that at the proper time he will ask for a
20 show of hands for those who would like to cross examine and each person will be called upon. He requested
21 that anyone called to cross examine go to the cross examination microphone to ask any questions. He said
22 that those who desire to cross examine are not required to sign the witness register but are requested to
23 clearly state their name before asking any questions. He noted that no new testimony is to be given during
24 the cross examination. He said that attorneys who have complied with Article 7.6 of the ZBA By-Laws are
25 exempt from cross examination.

26
27 Mr. Thorsland informed the audience that anyone wishing to testify for any public hearing tonight must sign
28 the witness register for that public hearing. He reminded the audience that when they sign the witness
29 register they are signing an oath. He asked the audience if anyone desired to sign the witness register at this
30 time for Cases 766-AM-13 and 767-S-13.

31
32 Mr. Thorsland asked the petitioner if he desired to make a statement outlining the nature of his request.

33
34 Mr. Eric Sebens, who resides at 3008 Cherry Hills Drive, Champaign, stated that he is present tonight to
35 continue to request the approval for rezoning his property located at 1069 CR 900 E, Champaign, from AG-1
36 to B-1 and the approval for a special use permit to allow the construction of self-storage units. He
37 distributed written responses or comments that he made after he had the chance to review the mailing packet.

6-12-14

1 Mr. Sebens stated that the building time frame plan is to start erecting the farthest east building first within a
2 year of approval and add additional units/buildings to the west as the need dictates and he would project an
3 approximate 3 to 4 year time span between the construction of the first building and each of the next
4 buildings. He said that by the time he reaches the decision to construct the final west building, in
5 approximately 10 years, he would like to determine at that time if the space is better utilized for the
6 landscape contracting business or if it is a better option to construct the final storage building. He said that it
7 is his desire to retain some flexibility with the use of his property as the future dictates by need.

8
9 Mr. Sebens stated that regarding soil erosion at the northwest corner of the site, there is a temporary retaining
10 wall system in place that he built to temporarily prevent any erosion in the grain field west of him until
11 further direction/approval is determined. He said that this temporary system eliminated all erosion this
12 spring until the recent 4 plus inch rain/hail storm event which we experienced in about a two hour time
13 frame on May 21, 2014. He said that during this extreme rain event there was a very minor amount of
14 erosion in this area but this rain event was significant enough to cause flooding for the first time inside the
15 west end of his office building and caused traffic to be stopped on Duncan Road as a result of the water over
16 the road. He said that the simple solution that he installed himself has pretty well curbed the erosion
17 problem and he is confident that the professionally engineered solution will prevent all erosion in this area.

18
19 Mr. Sebens stated that regarding future changes to the landscape facilities and features, all the current
20 locations of the main facility, parking, poly houses and material storage could remain in place until the time
21 the third building is constructed. He said that at that time he would need to relocate the poly-houses, plant
22 materials storage areas, and compost area further to the south and southwest side of the property as there
23 would still be sufficient room for these features. He said that if the future need dictates, and the fourth
24 building is needed, he would like the flexibility to decide at that time if the space is best utilized for storage
25 or for the landscape operation within the boundaries of what the ordinance will allow.

26
27 Mr. Sebens stated that in regards to the septic system, he met with Steve at S & J Wastewater Systems, the
28 original installer of the contracting building's septic system, and by an onsite analysis Steve indicated that
29 the septic system could be relocated to the east side of the existing house.

30
31 Mr. Sebens stated that property line encroachments were corrected early this spring and no additional
32 contracting site improvements are planned for in the future.

33
34 Mr. Sebens stated that the revised plan addresses almost all of the issues which were brought up at the last
35 public hearing. He said that he has reduced the amount of units to accommodate bringing the detention
36 basin offline as well as to allow an adequate queue area off of Duncan Road before approaching the entrance
37 gate.

6-12-14

- 1 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Sebens.
2
- 3 Mr. Passalacqua asked Mr. Sebens to clarify his statement indicating that he would like to determine whether
4 the property is better for the landscape business or the storage units. He asked Mr. Sebens if he is indicating
5 that the landscape business may cease to exist.
6
- 7 Mr. Sebens stated that his plans include continuing to operate the landscape business but based on what he
8 has seen recently with a lot of contracting, he is not sure where the landscape contracting business will go in
9 the future.
10
- 11 Mr. Passalacqua stated that if the plan is supposed to indicate up to a 10-year completion it includes four
12 storage units. He said that the plan does not indicate where Mr. Sebens will place spoils, plant materials, or
13 the contents of the existing shed therefore he does not see how Mr. Sebens could operate the landscape
14 contracting business and the rentals at the present scale because all of the usable area that is located in the
15 watershed is all in use now. He said that if Mr. Sebens continues to do only new construction landscaping or
16 retro-fit landscaping or even just a mowing operation he has lost more than half of the property.
17
- 18 Mr. Sebens stated that the construction of the first two storage buildings would have absolutely no effect on
19 the landscape operation because that area is not in use for the landscape business.
20
- 21 Mr. Passalacqua stated that he agrees with Mr. Sebens but when the Board reviews the plan the Board has to
22 approve it at its final stage.
23
- 24 Mr. Sebens stated that he was not sure at what level all of the details needed to be included on the plan.
25
- 26 Mr. Passalacqua stated that an option would be to build the storage units in two stages but that would put
27 Mr. Sebens in a situation where he would need to revisit the Board in six or eight years for a second
28 approval.
29
- 30 Mr. Sebens stated that he intends to build all four buildings but it will be quite a ways down the road. He
31 said that at that point and time he will be in his early 60's and would say to himself that it may be easier to
32 build a few more storage units rather than continuing to manage a landscaping operation.
33
- 34 Mr. Passalacqua stated that if the Board is to approve the project everything needs to be indicated on a final
35 plan regardless of the time span for construction.
36
- 37 Mr. Sebens stated that he did not realize that current and future plans should be indicated on the plans.
38

6-12-14

1 Ms. Lee stated that at the March 13, 2014, public hearing she asked Mr. Reifsteck if he paid for the 8-inch
2 tile that was installed and Mr. Reifsteck indicated that the tile was only a 6-inch tile and that he did indeed
3 pay for the tile. She said that the plan received on June 5, 2014, indicates that on the west end of the
4 property a proposed 8-inch PVC outlet pipe which will connect to an existing 6-inch inlet. She said that an
5 8-inch pipe going into a 6-inch pipe does not work.

6
7 Mr. Sebens stated that he will have to have his engineer comment on Ms. Lee's question.

8
9 Mr. Thorsland stated that he will call Mr. Sebens' engineer, Chad Osterbur, to testify and answer the Board's
10 questions.

11
12 Mr. Thorsland asked Mr. Sebens to indicate how many hoop houses are on the property currently.

13
14 Mr. Sebens stated that there are two hoop houses currently.

15
16 Mr. Thorsland stated that the plan only indicates one hoop house.

17
18 Mr. Sebens stated that in the long range he is only indicating one but there could potentially be two hoop
19 houses or one large hoop house in the area indicated.

20
21 Mr. Thorsland asked if the new hoop building could be larger than the 20' x 30' hoop house indicated on the
22 plan.

23
24 Mr. Sebens stated that the standard size is 20' x 30'. He said that if the need for the storage of plant
25 materials increases then he could build a larger hoop house or build two at that location. He said that he
26 currently has two hoop houses and occasionally he will use the second one but it is generally an overflow
27 hoop house.

28
29 Mr. Thorsland stated that the plan only indicates one hoop house and as Mr. Passalacqua previously
30 mentioned the Board has to review what is submitted by the petitioner. He said that the plan only indicates
31 one hoop house and testimony has indicated that the construction may occur in two different phases. He said
32 that it is hard for the Board to approve two different ideas therefore the petitioner must indicate exactly what
33 they are going to do and not what they may want to do. He said that Mr. Passalacqua suggested that perhaps
34 the construction could occur in two phases therefore a site plan would be required for each phase. He said
35 that one site plan would indicate the first two buildings and the other site plan would indicate the second two
36 buildings.

37
38 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were additional questions for Mr. Sebens and there were none.

6-12-14

1
2 Mr. John Hall, Zoning Administrator, stated that it is good information that the buildings will be constructed
3 east and west. He asked Mr. Sebens if he had given thought to how to ensure that the crushed stone
4 pavement does not begin to short circuit drainage directly into the swale or directly into the Duncan Road
5 ditch. He said that the nature of crushed stone paving is that when it is driven over it changes and after 10
6 years there will be a significantly different surface of crushed stone. He said that since we know that Mr.
7 Sebens will begin with the easternmost building, at a staff level, it has been discussed whether there is a need
8 for some sort of retaining wall to get the drainage from the easternmost building routed to the detention
9 basin. He said that adequate detention will be required as more impervious area is being added. He said that
10 it is good information that the buildings will be constructed east to west but now we have to make sure that
11 the drainage system is designed to drain that way from day one until the fourth building is constructed. He
12 said that he is curious that when the 4-inch rain in two hours was recently received if the materials on the site
13 were moved around much because there appears to be more than one acre of exposed earth and when there is
14 a 4-inch rain received on exposed earth there will be a lot of sedimentation.

15
16 Mr. Sebens stated that there was a little bit of movement. He said that he inspected the site today and it
17 appeared that the water which came across Duncan Road eroded out the farmer's field as well. He said that
18 he believes that he has enough of a buffer around his piles at this point and time where the erosion off of the
19 piles still remains on his property.

20
21 Mr. Hall stated that the north detention basin is fairly shallow and the existing area is crushed stone and it is
22 unknown what use is being proposed when the detention basin is built but he assumes Mr. Sebens is still
23 considering crushed stone. He said that he also assumes that Mr. Sebens is hoping that the detention basin is
24 still a usable parking lot or something but when the basin is built and an outlet is installed the County needs
25 to make sure that the outlet is not blocked during a rain event and that the detention volume is there. He said
26 that he wants the Board to consider what is needed to have a north detention basin which works well over the
27 next 20 years and will not fill up with things that will get moved around during a heavy rain and will not be
28 parked with vehicles so that there is only one-half the amount of volume that is required. He said that the
29 detention basin should not be filled with materials in ten years when people forget that the area is actually a
30 detention basin.

31
32 Mr. Passalacqua asked if the north basin is indicated on the plan.

33
34 Mr. Thorsland stated yes. He said that the plan indicates that the following: Construct berm to create
35 natural detention area.

36
37 Ms. Griest stated that a berm and basin are two different things.

38

6-12-14

1 Mr. Hall stated that the berm is the same thing as a dam. He said that when we finally have agreement about
2 the stormwater calculations it might actually be a little deeper but there is an issue that if this is a parking
3 area that the Stormwater Management Policy limits the depth of water in the parking area and this is mainly
4 a convenience for the public but nonetheless it is still a standard. He said that what he wants to focus on
5 tonight is that we do not normally see a drainage plan where direction of drainage is in fact a critical feature
6 that is proposed to be stone which will move over time and that may be okay if we can make sure that it will
7 not create problems or if we can make sure that a certain amount of storage is being provided in the north
8 basin that it will be there and available and not fill up or taken up with other things. Mr. Hall stated that
9 these are things that we really don't have specific regulations for in the Stormwater Management Policy and
10 are things which staff needs guidance from the Board. He said that the notes tonight are helpful and one
11 thing about building east to west once the property is rezoned to B-1 the contractor's facility is by-right
12 therefore the only concern that the Board would have about the contractor's facility would be making sure
13 that the drainage works as it is expected to work and maintaining the minimum separation between the
14 contractor's hoop building and the storage building. He said that the 20 feet minimum separation is required
15 by the Zoning Ordinance. He said that it is not 20 feet from the fence around the self-storage area and it is
16 not 20 feet from the pavement but just between the two buildings and some sort of note on the site plan is
17 necessary so that ten years from now when the second or third building is built the petitioner will realize that
18 they must be 20 feet from the contractor's building.

19
20 Mr. Hall asked Mr. Sebens if he understands that in the future when the contractor's building is by-right that
21 he still needs to obtain Zoning Use Permits for any structures constructed on the property. He said that if a
22 neighbor becomes unhappy about something that is occurring on the property the lack of a permit is an easy
23 complaint for them to make. Mr. Hall encouraged Mr. Sebens to always check with the department to see if
24 a permit is necessary prior to construction.

25
26 Mr. Sebens stated that he may do what Mr. Passalacqua recommended earlier in that he will complete this
27 project in two different phases. He said that buildings #1 and #2 will be in Phase I and if the need is obvious
28 then he will construct buildings #3 and #4 during Phase II.

29
30 Mr. Hall stated that according to the plans, access to the hoop shed is gained by driving around the west side
31 of the storage building. He asked Mr. Sebens if he had considered if driving over the berm to gain access to
32 the hoop building would create a problem in maintaining the berm.

33
34 Mr. Sebens stated that he does not believe that there will be a problem because the berm would have to be
35 constructed of something solid enough that driving over the top of it would not affect the integrity of the
36 berm. He said that he may have to pour concrete or make it out of something solid that will not be pushed
37 down.

38

6-12-14

1 Mr. Hall stated that another request that he would have for the site plan would be to indicate a clear
2 demarcation between anything that is impervious and vegetative area. He said that the way that he
3 understands the plan is that Mr. Sebens is going to have the paved path along the west side of the self-
4 storage going back to the hoop shed and presumably it will be paved in front of the hoop shed therefore all of
5 those impervious surfaces are going to create runoff. He said that some of the runoff will be uncontrollable
6 and will run to the west and that is okay so long as it does not erode but to the extent that the runoff is
7 undetained there must be more control on the detention basin therefore having a site plan clearly indicating
8 paved and unpaved is essential.

9
10 Ms. Lee asked Mr. Sebens if 25 feet between the chain link fence and the first building is large enough to
11 maneuver a pickup truck with a trailer attached. She said that 25 feet may prove difficult for someone who
12 wanted to back into a storage unit to load or unload their items.

13
14 Mr. Thorsland stated that it is typical for most people to drive down the aisles to load and unload and not
15 back in to the units to load and unload. He said that he believes that the typical separation has been met.

16
17 Mr. Sebens stated that based on his research most of the self-storage units have less than 30 feet between
18 them.

19
20 Mr. Passalacqua asked Mr. Sebens if there was a fire hydrant on the water line which runs in front of the
21 property.

22
23 Mr. Sebens stated no, but he does have city water therefore he is investigating the opportunity for a fire
24 hydrant.

25
26 Mr. Thorsland stated that the existing septic tank and leach field for the house is between buildings #1 and
27 #2 and the septic tank and leach field for the contractor's facility building is northeast of the house in the
28 front yard. He said that the plan indicates that the new septic tank and leach field for the house will be
29 relocated to the front of the house.

30
31 Mr. Sebens stated yes.

32
33 Mr. Thorsland asked Mr. Sebens if there was enough room for the two systems to be next to each other.

34
35 Mr. Sebens stated that he had Steve from S & J Wastewater Systems complete a site visit and Steve
36 indicated that the two systems side by side is possible.

37
38 Mr. Thorsland stated that it is his understanding that there needs to be enough room for replacement of both.

6-12-14

1
2 Mr. Hall stated that replacement space is not a requirement of the Ordinance but it can be a requirement by
3 the Board. He said that the septic system requirements have become more rigorous in the past year and
4 someone is not going to be allowed to install a surface discharging system if one does not exist already
5 therefore it is critical to plan for replacement over the long term and still have regular maintenance on the
6 system that they have.
7
8 Ms. Lee asked Mr. Sebens to indicate the distance between the well and the septic tank.
9
10 Mr. Sebens stated that he is not sure of the exact distance but when J & S Wastewater Systems was at the
11 property Steve measured the distance between the existing leach field for the contracting building to the well
12 and Mr. Sebens' believed that Steve told him that the separation had to be 50 feet or more. Mr. Sebens stated
13 that he would assure that both systems are at least 50 feet from the well.
14
15 Mr. Thorsland asked Mr. Sebens if there is only one well on the property.
16
17 Mr. Sebens stated yes.
18
19 Mr. Passalacqua asked Mr. Sebens where water stood on his property during the heavy rain event.
20
21 Mr. Sebens stated that there was water on the front of the property where it crossed Duncan Road. He said
22 that the water was coming down so fast that it was 200 yards over the road for one and one-half miles. He
23 said that he had never seen water across the top of Duncan Road before.
24
25 Ms. Griest asked Mr. Sebens if any of his facilities are connected to city water.
26
27 Mr. Sebens stated that the contractor's facility building and the house is connected to city water.
28
29 Ms. Griest asked Mr. Sebens to indicate what he uses the well for.
30
31 Mr. Sebens stated that he currently has not been using the well.
32
33 Ms. Griest asked Mr. Sebens if he plans to use the well in the future.
34
35 Mr. Sebens stated that he may use the well to water plant materials.
36
37 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any additional questions for Mr. Sebens and there were none.
38

6-12-14

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

2

3 Mr. Thorsland called Chad Osterbur to testify.

4

5 Mr. Thorsland requested that Mr. Osterbur provide a summary of the plan regarding drainage.

6

7 Mr. Chad Osterbur, Engineer with Fehr Graham Engineering and Environmental, stated that there are two
8 different catchment areas. He said that the north basin catches the runoff from the north portion of the site
9 and the south basin will handle the south half. He said that to the north they designed an earthen berm which
10 will block and hold back water and will blend in with the contours to the east. He said he has not discussed
11 the drive and installation of concrete yet.

12

13 Mr. Osterbur stated that the basin is designed per the Ordinance which is detaining for a 50 year event at the
14 existing 5-year and that is what the volume accounts for in both basins as well as the size of the outlet. He
15 said that when the volume is attained the head water will be calculated at a certain discharge which is how
16 the two 8-inch outlets were sized. He said that there was a question regarding the 6-inch tile and they had
17 originally designed that as a culvert so that it would daylight through the berm itself onto the surface and
18 again that is a 50-year event and during most rain events that would only be a trickle. He said that he was
19 initially intending for that to drain onto the surface and it was suggested that they connect it into the tile to
20 eliminate erosion but the main path of drainage would be on the surface therefore if they go ahead and tie
21 into the inlet and the 6-inch tile cannot handle it during a 50-year event it would just bubble out on to the
22 ground and continue to drain out on the surface. He said that the 6-inch tile is more of a low-flow tile for
23 smaller rain events.

24

25 Ms. Lee asked Mr. Osterbur if the 8-inch tile will be connected in to the 6-inch tile.

26

27 Mr. Osterbur stated yes.

28

29 Ms. Lee stated that the circumference of an 8-inch tile is a lot different than a 6-inch tile.

30

31 Mr. Osterbur stated that if the tile was not there we would still be discharging out on the ground. He said
32 that the 6-inch tile is essentially there to handle smaller rain events. He said that the 8-inch tile will not be
33 running full except during a 50-year event in which case the 6-inch tile isn't handling that anyway.

34

35 Mr. Thorsland asked if there would be a standpipe.

36

37 Mr. Osterbur stated that there is already a structure there so they would connect into that.

38

6-12-14

- 1 Mr. Thorsland asked if this is the same for the south basin.
2
3 Mr. Osterbur stated that will basically be a culvert discharging out onto the surface into the swale.
4
5 Mr. Thorsland stated that it was suggested that perhaps Mr. Sebens construct the first two storage units and
6 then only having the stone driveway encompass those first two but there is a desire, or mandate, to make sure
7 that it functions to run into that. He said that the south detention basin is set up, elevation wise to catch the
8 runoff if there is no stone further to the west to bring in buildings #3 and #4.
9
10 Mr. Osterbur stated that we could design it in a temporary space to make sure that it could get there. He said
11 that it should not be much of a problem.
12
13 Mr. Thorsland stated that temporary could potentially be 10 years.
14
15 Ms. Lee asked Mr. Osterbur to indicate how deep the south detention basin will be.
16
17 Mr. Osterbur stated that the south detention basin is approximately 4 feet total at the lowest point.
18
19 Mr. Thorsland stated that the north basin is 3 feet at the lowest point but there is some consideration that it
20 will still be crushed stone and will house vehicles. He said that hopefully vehicles will not be in the area
21 when there is 3 feet of water.
22
23 Mr. Osterbur asked Mr. Sebens if he was planning on parking vehicles in that area.
24
25 Mr. Sebens stated yes. He said that only company vehicles would be parked in that area.
26
27 Mr. Thorsland stated that if all four buildings and the hoop building were all constructed and the access
28 happens behind building #4 to the west then someone is going to be driving over the berm which is almost
29 one foot high. He said that the site plan needs to indicate how the berm will not become zero feet in height.
30
31 Mr. Osterbur stated that he can make some accommodations for that concern.
32
33 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any additional questions for Mr. Osterbur and there were none.
34
35 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Mr. Osterbur.
36
37 Mr. Hall asked Mr. Osterbur if there may be a need to somehow restrain the east edge of the stone paving so
38 that from the beginning and 20 years in to the future it is in fact draining into the basin and not into the

6-12-14

1 swale.

2

3 Mr. Osterbur stated that the intent was to pitch everything so that it has a low point running down the middle
4 of the drive and nothing is running off.

5

6 Mr. Hall asked Mr. Osterbur if he believes that stone paving will hold up pretty well.

7

8 Mr. Osterbur stated that they have 1 to 2 percent slopes which will drain pretty well with stone.

9

10 Mr. Thorsland stated that the plan indicates flow lines in the gravel therefore there will be a “v” channel
11 down the center of the buildings and to the roadway.

12

13 Mr. Osterbur stated that Mr. Thorsland was correct.

14

15 Mr. Hall asked Mr. Osterbur if the ground surface at the edge of the pavement needs to be protected or
16 guarded from erosion when the water gets to the detention basin and runs off the pavement.

17

18 Mr. Osterbur stated that if we try to spread it out level rather than at a single discharge point we will
19 eliminate that a little bit but there are things that we can do to keep that from eroding away. He said that
20 there are also products that can be investigated to assist as well.

21

22 Ms. Lee asked Mr. Osterbur why the drainage would not go to the south of building #1 with an elevation
23 point of 710 feet in lieu of the detention basin of 712 feet.

24

25 Mr. Osterbur stated that they will build up the ground a little bit to pitch it to the center of the drive to the
26 west. He said that they will be building it up to avoid anything running directly into the swale.

27

28 Mr. Hall stated that he assumes that there will be some sort of armoring at the end of the culvert of the basin
29 to slow down the water as it comes out.

30

31 Mr. Osterbur stated that rip rap would be installed.

32

33 Mr. Hall stated that we have a requirement in the Policy that if there is not at least a 2% slope that there
34 needs to be under drains. He asked Mr. Osterbur if a 2% slope can be put in the south basin.

35

36 Mr. Osterbur stated that it was set up to be a 2% slope and the north one is naturally steeper than that.

37

38 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board and staff if there were any additional questions for Mr. Osterbur and there

6-12-14

1 were none.

2

3 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone desired to cross examine Mr. Osterbur and there was no one.

4

5 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone else desired to sign the witness register to present testimony
6 regarding Case 766-AM-13 & 767-S-13 at this time and there was no one.

7

8 Mr. Thorsland requested that Mr. Sebens return to the microphone to address the Board.

9

10 Mr. Thorsland stated that he would either like to see one complete plan with all four buildings in one phase
11 or two complete plans indicating the two phases. He said that the final plan should include the relocation of
12 the hoop house, the berm and how it will be affected by vehicles driving over it, and relocation of the septic
13 tank and leach fields. He asked Mr. Sebens if the house was occupied.

14

15 Mr. Sebens stated yes.

16

17 Mr. Thorsland stated that the septic system must be adequate for the house and the Board sometimes requires
18 a backup leach field area. He said that it appears that a backup area of the home's leach field area will be
19 hard to achieve because the well is behind the house and a lot of the rest of the property is either waterway or
20 crushed stone. He asked Mr. Sebens if he is considering a two phase approach to this project.

21

22 Mr. Sebens stated that he would like to give the two phase approach some thought but that is probably the
23 route that he will take.

24

25 Mr. Thorsland stated that if a two phase approach is taken the plan for Phase One should indicate the
26 location of the gravel and if it doesn't end at building #4 the Board needs more detail regarding the drainage.
27 He said that as Ms. Lee questioned the direction of the water to get to the detention rather than heading
28 straight to the swale, which is much lower. He said that this would take away having to worrying
29 about what happens with the north berm area. He said that the Board would like to see where the
30 contractor's facility buildings are located and where the landscape activities will occur. He said that J & S
31 Wastewater could indicate where the septic system which is located under the gravel will be relocated.

32

33 Mr. Sebens stated that the concern regarding the relocation of the septic system was the reason why he called
34 Steve from J & S Wastewater. He said that Steve visited the site and took measurements and determined
35 that relocation of the septic system was possible to the front of the property.

36

37 Mr. Thorsland stated that he understands the verbal indication from J & S Wastewater but the final plan
38 needs to indicate where the septic system will be relocated. He said that this Board requires a complete site

6-12-14

1 plan from the petitioner so that there are no questions during the process and the Board is completely aware
2 of what they are approving. He said that Mr. Sebens has gotten a very good start in responding to the
3 Board's concerns with the site plan but more work does need to be done.

4
5 Mr. Sebens stated that if he does complete the project in two phases he wonders if Mr. Osterbur would
6 suggest installing a smaller basin.

7
8 Mr. Thorsland stated that Mr. Sebens will need to converse with his engineer regarding the two phase plan
9 and the final plan.

10
11 Mr. Passalacqua stated that if the project is completed in two phases he would try to design the existing
12 facility areas for parking, material storage, spoils, in a way that he will not have to redesign it during Phase
13 II. He said that Prairieview Landscaping can occur in the northern portion of the property and the storage
14 facility in the southern portion. He said that if the engineering design was to accommodate both operations
15 now it would make Phase II go a lot smoother. He said that he does not believe that Mr. Sebens would be
16 saving much money to undersize the detention basin because we have probably had the two most remarkable
17 rain events in 15 years. He said that Mr. Sebens does have a good neighbor but it behooves Mr. Sebens to
18 assure that the engineering for the detention basin is adequate and does not cause issues with adjacent
19 properties.

20
21 Mr. Thorsland stated that drawing the plans on paper is a lot cheaper than moving the dirt in the future.

22
23 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any additional questions.

24
25 Ms. Griest asked Mr. Hall if Mr. Sebens was to come back before the Board with two plans, Phase I and
26 Phase II, would that fall within the scope with what was advertised for approval or would Mr. Sebens have to
27 come back for a second case for Phase II.

28
29 Mr. Hall stated that it could be done as part of this public hearing and it would be completely consistent.

30
31 Ms. Griest informed Mr. Sebens that what she would hope to see as a Board member would be that in Phase
32 I all of the existing contractor items' locations are clearly indicated on the drawing and then similarly for
33 Phase II. She said that the current drawing does not indicate some of the existing operational outdoor
34 storage aspects and she understands that Mr. Sebens may not move the outdoor storage areas until the second
35 set of buildings are constructed but they still need to be drawn on the plans. She said that once Mr. Sebens
36 receives approval the buildings and the outdoor storage areas have to be sited in those locations indicated on
37 the plan and he will not have the latitude and flexibility to move them around wherever he may decide later.

6-12-14

- 1 Mr. Sebens stated that perhaps two separate plans for Phase I and Phase II should be completed.
2
- 3 Mr. Thorsland stated that it would be helpful if Mr. Sebens would visit the Department of Planning and
4 Zoning so that he could review the two phase site plans for a recent self-storage unit case that was recently
5 approved. He said that the site plans for the previous case clearly indicated the two phases and was most
6 helpful for the Board.
7
- 8 Mr. Passalacqua asked if the Board could approve both phases so that Mr. Sebens would not have to come
9 back before the Board at a later date.
10
- 11 Mr. Hall stated yes.
12
- 13 Ms. Lee stated that the plan indicates that the five year intensity on the south basin is five inches per hour
14 and the north basin is 5.4 per hour. She asked why there is a difference in intensity.
15
- 16 Mr. Hall stated that the intensity is based on the time of concentration.
17
- 18 Mr. Thorsland asked Mr. Sebens if he had any questions for the Board or staff.
19
- 20 Mr. Sebens stated no. He said that he understands that the Board would like to see two different drawings
21 indicating the project in the two phases.
22
- 23 Mr. Hall stated that he would like to hear the Board's thoughts about the use of the north detention basin and
24 if they are concerned about what goes inside that basin.
25
- 26 Mr. Passalacqua stated that he does believe that the north detention basin is a good area for parking vehicles.
27
- 28 Mr. Thorsland stated that the new site plan needs to indicate where the trucks and trailers for the landscape
29 operation will be parked.
30
- 31 Mr. Passalacqua stated that he has crushed gravel on his business lot and he has to grade it every year. He
32 said that he only has one truck which goes across the rock each day for five to six days per week and the
33 drive has to be graded to keep the water out of the area. He said that within six months the water begins to
34 stand and it has to be graded again therefore he does not know if a special condition is necessary to restrict
35 parking in the north detention basin or whether the condition should indicate that the detention basin must be
36 maintained.
37
- 38 Mr. Hall asked Mr. Passalacqua to indicate his opinion regarding maintenance of the crushed gravel as the

6-12-14

1 drainage conduit in the self storage area.

2
3 Mr. Passalacqua stated that it is his personal experience that the crushed stone moves quite a bit and he has
4 limited traffic. He said that the area that he has to grade is a relatively wet location during heavy rain events
5 and by design the center of the lanes take on a lot of movement of water. He said that he is just concerned
6 about the maintenance of the crushed stone. He said that he understands that crushed stone is less expensive
7 and more permeable than concrete but he will inform the petitioner and the Board that more stone will be
8 required each year.

9
10 Mr. Sebens stated that at the north end of the property he packed down the dirt with equipment and installed
11 3-inch gravel that locked together. He said that at this time he is able to drive a loaded semi-truck and trailer
12 full of mulch on the drive in the spring and the drive is solid.

13
14 Mr. Passalacqua stated that Mr. Sebens' drive does have a better base than his driveway for his operation.

15
16 Mr. Sebens stated that if the ground is not packed and 3-inch gravel is not brought in it will roll around
17 forever.

18
19 Mr. Hall requested that Mr. Sebens add detail to the site plan indicating the design of the driveway therefore
20 someone will know that it is not compiled of loose gravel. He said that a cross-section indicating the
21 construction of the driveway would be helpful.

22
23 Ms. Lee stated that she still has issues with the 8-inch tile going into the 6-inch tile. She said that the 6-inch
24 tile was not paid for by Mr. Sebens but by Mr. Reifsteck and a greater usage is being forced on that 6-inch
25 tile.

26
27 Mr. Sebens stated that he is not an expert on this topic therefore he will let Mr. Osterbur address Ms. Lee's
28 concern. He said that Mr. Osterbur previously explained that the 8-inch pipe will not be running the full 8-
29 inches and even with the extreme rain event that we recently received in 2 plus hours the self-made detention
30 that he constructed held back 98% of the water. He said that he saw more erosion in adjacent fields than
31 what he had in his area.

32
33 Mr. Hall asked Ms. Lee if she would like to see something from Mr. Reifsteck allowing the connection to the
34 6-inch tile.

35
36 Ms. Lee stated that it would be appropriate for the Board to receive something from Mr. Reifsteck indicating
37 that he would allow connection to the tile that he paid for. She said that Mr. Sebens increased the drainage
38 which required the need for the 6-inch tile originally which she believes violated the *Illinois Drainage Law*.

6-12-14

- 1 She said that agriculture land is all around the subject property and Mr. Sebens will increase the flow
- 2 because he will be creating area where the water will not go into the ground.
- 3
- 4 Mr. Sebens stated that he did speak with Mr. Reifsteck about the connection and Mr. Reifsteck agreed to the
- 5 connection.
- 6
- 7 Mr. Hall stated that a written document or testimony from Mr. Reifsteck would ease the Board's concern
- 8 regarding the proposed connection.
- 9
- 10 Mr. Hall asked the Board if they would like to see anything along the north property line because parking is
- 11 not supposed to be within five feet of the property line. He said that the parking concern is definitely taken
- 12 care of along the west line of the subject property but his sense is that the intent is not to allow parking along
- 13 the north line as well although there is nothing on the plan preventing it.
- 14
- 15 Mr. Passalacqua stated that there was previous testimony regarding the north property line and the
- 16 installation of a fence. He said that the Board received testimony from Mr. Reifsteck regarding his concerns
- 17 related to garbage blowing onto his property.
- 18
- 19 Mr. Thorsland stated that a fence is indicated on the west side of the subject property but not the north.
- 20
- 21 Mr. Hall stated that the minutes are unclear because Mr. Passalacqua was clearly speaking about placing a
- 22 fence on the north side of the subject property and Mr. Reifsteck indicated that a fence would help and that
- 23 he would be in favor of a fence. He said that the Board never actually made it clear that they desired a fence
- 24 on the north side of the subject property but they do have a chance to clarify that desire tonight.
- 25
- 26 Mr. Sebens stated that he spoke to Mr. Reifsteck about the installation of a fence on the north side of the
- 27 property and Mr. Reifsteck indicated that the bulk of the trash comes from the gas station which is located
- 28 southwest of the subject property at the I-57 interchange. He said that the prevailing southwestern winds
- 29 will not carry his trash to Mr. Reifsteck's field to the west and the contractor's building will block any
- 30 blowing trash to the north.
- 31
- 32 Mr. Passalacqua stated that written documentation from Mr. Reifsteck would be helpful for this Board and
- 33 the County Board during their review for approval.
- 34
- 35 Mr. Hall asked Mr. Sebens if a note could be added to the site plan indicating that no parking is allowed
- 36 within five feet of the north lot line.
- 37
- 38 Mr. Sebens stated yes.

6-12-14

1
2 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any additional questions for Mr. Sebens or Mr. Osterbur at this
3 time and there were none.

4
5 Mr. Thorsland requested a continuance date for Cases 766-AM-13 and 767-S-13.

6
7 Mr. Hall stated that July is a very busy month for staff because he is preparing the budget. He said that he is
8 sure that Mr. Sebens would appreciate a decision in July therefore staff will do its best at a staff level to
9 accommodate Mr. Sebens.

10
11 Mr. Thorsland asked Mr. Sebens if a continuance date to July 17th would be acceptable.

12
13 Mr. Sebens stated yes.

14
15 Mr. Thorsland recommended that Mr. Sebens visit the office regarding review of the Irongate Self-Storage
16 approved site plans.

17
18 Mr. Thorsland entertained a motion to continue Cases 766-AM-13 and 767-S-13 to the July 17th meeting.

19
20 **Ms. Griest moved, seconded by Mr. Passalacqua to continue Cases 766-AM-13 and 767-S-13 to the**
21 **July 17th meeting. The motion carried by voice vote.**

22
23 **Case 769-AT-13 Petitioner: Zoning Administrator Request to amend the Champaign County Zoning**
24 **Ordinance by amending the Champaign County Storm Water Management Policy by changing the**
25 **name to the Storm Water Management and Erosion Control Ordinance and amending the reference**
26 **in Zoning Ordinance Section 4.3.10; and amend the Storm Water Management and Erosion Control**
27 **Ordinance as described in the legal advertisement which can be summarized as follows: I. Revise**
28 **existing Section 1 by adding a reference to 55 ILCS 5/5-15-15 that authorizes the County Board to**
29 **have authority to prevent pollution of any stream or body of water. (Part A of the legal**
30 **advertisement); and II. Revise existing Section 2 by merging with existing Sections 3.1 and 3.2 to be**
31 **new Section 2 and add purpose statements related to preventing soil erosion and preventing water**
32 **pollution and fulfilling the applicable requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge System**
33 **(NPDES) Phase II Storm Water Permit. (Part B of the legal advertisement); and III. Add new Section**
34 **3 titled Definitions to include definitions related to fulfilling the applicable requirements of the**
35 **National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Phase II Storm Water Permit. (Part C of**
36 **the legal advertisement); and IV. Revised existing Sections 3.3, 3.4, and 4 and add new Sections 5, 11,**
37 **12, 13, 14, and 15 and add new Appendices C, D, and E. Add requirements for Land Disturbance**
38 **activities including a including a requirement for a Land Disturbance Erosion Control Permit**

6-12-14

1 including Minor and Major classes of Permits that are required within the Champaign County MS4
2 Jurisdictional Area; add a requirement that land disturbance of one acre or more in a common plan
3 of development must comply with the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency's ILR 10 Permit
4 requirements; add fees and time limits for each class of Permit; add requirements for administration
5 and enforcement Permits; and add new Appendices with new standards and requirements for both
6 Minor and Major Permits. (Parts D, E, L, M, N, O, T, U, and V of the legal advertisement); and V.
7 Revise existing Section 7 to be new Section 6 and add a prohibition against erosion or sedimentation
8 onto adjacent properties and add minimum erosion and water quality requirements that are required
9 for all construction or land disturbance; and VI. Revise existing Section 5 to be new Section 8 and add
10 a Preferred Hierarchy of Best Management Practices. (Part H of the legal advertisement); and VII.
11 Revise and reformat existing Section 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and the Appendices and add new Section 18.
12 (Parts G, I, J, P, Q, R, S and W of the legal advertisement).

13
14 **Case 773-AT-14 Petitioner: Zoning Administrator Request to amend the Champaign County Storm**
15 **Water Management and Erosion Control Ordinance that is the subject Zoning Case 769-AT-13, by**
16 **adding the following: A. Add a requirement for a Grading and Demolition Permit for any grading or**
17 **demolition that disturbs on acre or more of land or for any grading or demolition that is part of a**
18 **larger common plan of development in which one acre or more of land disturbance will occur, and**
19 **that is not related to any proposed construction; and B. Add fees for Grading and Demolition Permits;**
20 **and C. Add required information to be provided in the application for a Grading and Demolition**
21 **Permit; and D. Add a requirement that any grading or demolition pursuant to a Grading or**
22 **Demolition Permit shall comply with the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency's ILR 10 General**
23 **Storm Water Permit for Construction; and E. Add a requirement that any demolition pursuant to a**
24 **Demolition Permit shall comply with the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency's regulations**
25 **enforcing the National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants for regulated asbestos; and F.**
26 **Add prohibitions against changing the flow of water and blocking the flow of water; and G. Add other**
27 **requirements related to Grading and Demolition Permits.**

28
29 Mr. Thorsland called Cases 769-AT-13 and 773-AT-14 concurrently.

30
31 Mr. Thorsland informed the audience that anyone wishing to testify for any public hearing tonight must sign
32 the witness register for that public hearing. He reminded the audience that when they sign the witness
33 register they are signing an oath. He asked the audience if anyone desired to sign the witness register at this
34 time.

35
36 Mr. Thorsland asked the petitioner if he would like to make a brief statement regarding the requests.

37
38 Mr. John Hall, Zoning Administrator, distributed a new handout which is a table which responded to

6-12-14

1 comments received on the Draft Ordinance. He said that in some instances the table includes a staff reply
2 and in areas where the comment resulted in a change staff has tried to actually include the specific language
3 which was changed. He said that the fourth cell at the top of page 4 of the table indicates the following:
4 Regarding 4.2.E., could drainage districts be exempt as there is a statewide permit and conditions. Mr. Hall
5 said that the following will be inserted in Section 4.2, LAND DISTURBANCE activities by or for a
6 recognized Drainage District. He said that this may not be the exact language but staff does intend to add the
7 exemption for drainage district activities.

8
9 Mr. Hall stated that at the previous meeting regarding these cases there was a question regarding driveway
10 maintenance, which was a wonderful question because there are large areas of Champaign County where
11 there are no streets to many homes and there is only a shared driveway. He said that while making the
12 maintenance of those shared driveways require a permit would give them some incentive of making the
13 shared driveways a public road it is easier to exempt them which is consistent with what we do elsewhere.
14 He reminded the Board that in some portions of the County this will be pretty important.

15
16 Ms. Griest asked Mr. Hall if this exemption will only include shared driveways or will it include all
17 driveways.

18
19 Mr. Hall stated that it will include all driveways.

20
21 Mr. Hall stated that he had hoped to have a written document regarding the overall approach as to why we
22 are proposing so many options for the County Board but he was unsuccessful therefore tonight he would like
23 to provide a brief synopsis of that approach. He said that staff is only proposing the Grading and Demolition
24 Permit in the very slight chance that the County Board chooses to require compliance with ILR10 and if they
25 do then they should add the Grading and Demolition Permit. He said that if the County Board decides not to
26 require compliance with ILR10 outside of the MS4 area then he does not believe that adding a Grading and
27 Demolition Permit will provide any benefit. He said that most of the benefit for people who have neighbors
28 who are changing grades and regrading and doing things like that, most of the benefits will come in with
29 those minimum standards. He said that the minimum standards make it clear that you are not supposed to
30 cause erosion or sedimentation on to your neighbor and you are supposed to minimize it. He said that you
31 are not supposed to be changing drainage drastically or tracking mud on to the roads or if you do you are
32 supposed to clean it off. He said that these minimum standards are the kinds of things that are supposed to
33 help people. He said that there are no standards related to Grading and Demolition Permits and the only
34 reason why they were proposed was if the County Board wants to require ILR10 compliance.

35
36 Mr. Thorsland clarified that the Board will also take testimony at this time for Case 773-AT-14.

37
38 Mr. Hall stated that he could envision a table that could be added in as a Document of Record to help County

6-12-14

1 Board members in the future.

2

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

4

5 Mr. Thorsland stated that the one thing that stood out was addressing the issue of the long private drives. He
6 said that roughly a standard drive has to be one-half mile before it is one acre. He said that there are not a lot
7 of these drives but there are some located in the County and some of those drives are shared drives with
8 other homes rather than one private home. He said that he believes that it is a good call to have something
9 addressing that because that is not the intent of the proposed permit to affect those things but has a lot more
10 to do with what the Board spoke about at the last meeting.

11

12 Mr. Hall stated that another thing that he did not hear any discussion about at the last public hearing was the
13 primary way to defuse the impact this regulation might be to change the minimum lot size in the AG and CR
14 Districts. He said that he does not know if Board members thought much about this proposal and if the
15 Board does not see this change as a benefit then that is fine but he just wanted to remind the Board that we
16 had mentioned it.

17

18 Mr. Passalacqua stated that the change to minimum lot size was .9 acre instead of 1 acre so that the lot would
19 fall under the wire.

20

21 Mr. Hall stated that Mr. Passalacqua was correct. He said that the .9 acre, by definition, would not be
22 disturbing one acre.

23

24 Mr. Thorsland stated that a lot of times there is a one acre lot and if you take away the road right-of-way,
25 which is hopefully not going to be disturbed either, the lot would fall into less than one acre of disturbance.
26 He said that his Board has had variances because a one acre lot was not a true one acre lot minus the right-
27 of-way. He asked if the density would be increased if the minimum lot size is reduced to .9 acre and what is
28 used as a definer because a corner lot in CR or AG would have two right-of-ways. He asked if having two
29 road right-of-ways would consider the minimum lot size and what standard frontage would be used.

30

31 Mr. Hall stated that he would also recommend reducing the frontage as well but most of the lots that we see
32 are 200 foot wide lots. He said that the statutory right-of-way width is 60 feet therefore it the center of the
33 right-of-way would be 30 feet on either side. He said that we do not consider the road right-of-way as part of
34 the minimum lot area so the minimum lot is not nearly one acre but 1.15 acres to make up for the right-of-
35 way. He said that the change that he was talking about was what is currently required, which is one acre, and
36 reduce it to something like .9 and there is still that .15 acre that is still right-of-way on the minimum size lot.

37 He said that there really are not that many minimum size lots in the County because most people want more
38 than one acre.

6-12-14

1
2 Mr. Thorsland asked Mr. Hall if the future impact of reducing the minimum lot size is very small but would
3 be big when it relates to this Ordinance and who requires a permit. He said that we could save the County
4 and staff a lot of time and people a lot of money if we consider changing the minimum lot size.

5
6 Ms. Griest stated that she disagrees. She said that Mr. Hall stated that there are so few lots coming in at the
7 one acre minimum that changing it from one acre to .9 acres is probably going to have a negative impact and
8 it seems not the best practice to change it just for the sake of changing it when the impact is not going to be
9 significant. She said that where we are seeing impacts requiring variances are on older lots that were
10 previously platted many years ago when the right-of-way was not taken out of the one acre minimum area.
11 She said that there are some lots out in the County that are platted that are not built upon that included the
12 right-of-way at one acre and now when they go to build the lot is already under the one acre of disturbed area
13 by counting it without the right-of-way.

14
15 Mr. Thorsland stated that if they strip the whole lot.

16
17 Ms. Griest stated that even if they strip all of the buildable area, when you take the right-of-way out of play
18 they have less than one acre to begin with.

19
20 Mr. Hall stated that he hates to be the bearer of bad news to the County Board unless he has a little bit of
21 good news to throw along with it because then it is not the County that is causing someone to have to put up
22 erosion controls on their lot. He said that the County would have done all it could to have reduced that
23 requirement but if those people still want their two acres graded to within an inch of its life then they have
24 the right to do that but we are not going to make them. He said that the County is going to make them have
25 .9 acre.

26
27 Mr. Thorsland stated that when we talk about the development of a five acre lot and someone wants to
28 construct a home many people want to claim a portion of the lot as agriculture so that they pay less in
29 property taxes. He asked Mr. Hall if the County has the less than one acre aspect then hopefully they will be
30 careful to not disturb less than one acre so that they do not trip the need for a permit.

31
32 Mr. Hall stated that if the County Board is not going to require compliance with ILR10 it is primarily a moot
33 point but there is still a state law that can be enforced by the IEPA and he would hope that we would at least
34 make people aware of the state law even though we do not require compliance. He said that the worst
35 situation would be not telling people that there is a law. He said that reducing the minimum lot size is
36 probably much less critical if the County Board is not going to require ILR10 compliance outside of the MS4
37 area.

38

6-12-14

1 Mr. Thorsland suggested that if a table is provided indicating if the County Board does or does not adopt
2 ILR10 compliance outside of the MS4 area and the impact of proposing or not proposing the .9 acre
3 requirement, such a table would be easier for the Zoning Board of Appeals, especially those members who
4 are absent tonight, and the County Board to see what has been considered and discussed.

5
6 Mr. Hall stated that he is not attempting to obtain a decision tonight but just wanted the Board to discuss the
7 option. He said a minimum lot size reduction would require a separate text amendment and legal
8 advertisement.

9
10 Mr. Thorsland stated that the Board may want to see just a little more about the driveways although the
11 direction that it is going appears to be perfectly acceptable to the Board. He said that staff previously
12 indicated that any enforcement regarding driveways would be complaint based anyway.

13
14 Mr. Hall stated that at this point it isn't even a question therefore any complaint received will not be valid.

15
16 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were additional questions for Mr. Hall and there were none.

17
18 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone desired to sign the witness register to present testimony for
19 Cases 769-AT-13 and 773-AT-14 and there was no one.

20
21 Mr. Thorsland requested a continuance date for Cases 768-AT-13 and 773-AT-14.

22
23 Mr. Hall stated that July is a very busy month for staff but the two cases could be continued to the July 31st
24 meeting.

25
26 Mr. Thorsland entertained a motion to continue Cases 769-AT-13 and 773-AT-14 to the July 31, 2014,
27 meeting.

28
29 **Ms. Griest moved, seconded by Ms. Lee to continue Cases 769-AT-13 and 773-AT-14 to the July 31,**
30 **2014, meeting. The motion carried by voice vote.**

31
32 **6. New Public Hearings**

33
34 None

35
36 **7. Staff Report**

37
38 None

6-12-14

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

8. Other Business

A. Review of Docket

Mr. Hall stated that a case has been scheduled for the August 14th meeting although staff has not received the application to date. He said that if we are very luck the case will not materialize but at this point, based on the State’s Attorney’s Office determination it has been added to the docket. He said that he does not believe that it will be a controversial case and he resents that we even have to have it as a case but it is our jurisdiction therefore it is our case. He said that the case involves the solar farm located on the University of Illinois’ property for the University of Illinois.

Mr. Hall stated that he was asked if the ZBA is always this busy and he responded by indicating that the ZBA this year is nowhere as busy as it was last year at this time.

Mr. Thorsland requested that the Board notify staff of any vacations or anticipated absences from meetings. He said that this information will assure that a quorum will be in attendance.

Ms. Griest stated that it is possible that she will not be in attendance for the July 17th meeting. She said that she will confirm her attendance as soon as possible.

Mr. Passalacqua asked Mr. Hall if staff had any received any information regarding the contracting business located on Market Street with the assumed residences inside of the building.

Mr. Hall stated that staff processed the Change of Use Permit and there was no reason to not approve it. He said that the next step will be to complete the inspection.

Mr. Passalacqua asked Mr. Hall if staff requires copies of plumbing permits, etc.

Mr. Hall stated no.

9. Audience Participation with respect to matters other than cases pending before the Board

None

10. Adjournment

Mr. Thorsland entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting.

ZBA

AS APPROVED JULY 17, 2014

6-12-14

1 **Ms. Griest moved, seconded by Mr. Passalacqua to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried by voice**
2 **vote.**

3

4 The meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

5

6

7

8

9 Respectfully submitted

10

11

12

13

14 Secretary of Zoning Board of Appeals

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
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41

DRAFT SUBJECT TO APPROVAL DRAFT ZBA //

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8