

1 Ms. Lee stated that prior to the meeting she discussed two very minor corrections to the February 26, 2015,
2 minutes with staff.

3

4 **The motion carried.**

5

6

7 **5. Continued Public Hearing**

8

9 **Case 769-AT-13 Petitioner: Zoning Administrator Request to amend the Champaign County Zoning**
10 **Ordinance by amending the Champaign County Storm Water Management Policy by changing the**
11 **name to the Storm Water Management and Erosion Control Ordinance and amending the reference**
12 **in Zoning Ordinance Section 4.3.10; and amend the Storm Water Management and Erosion Control**
13 **Ordinance as described in the legal advertisement which can be summarized as follows: I. Revise**
14 **existing Section 1 by adding a reference to 55 ILCS 5/5-15-15 that authorizes the County Board to**
15 **have authority to prevent pollution of any stream or body of water. (Part A of the legal**
16 **advertisement); and II. Revise existing Section 2 by merging with existing Sections 3.1 and 3.2 to be**
17 **new Section 2 and add purpose statements related to preventing soil erosion and preventing water**
18 **pollution and fulfilling the applicable requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge System**
19 **(NPDES) Phase II Storm Water Permit. (Part B of the legal advertisement); and III. Add new Section**
20 **3 titled Definitions to include definitions related to fulfilling the applicable requirements of the**
21 **National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Phase II Storm Water Permit. (Part C of**
22 **the legal advertisement); and IV. Revise existing Sections 3.3, 3.4, and 4 and add new Sections 5, 11,**
23 **12, 13, 14, and 15 and add new Appendices C, D, and E. Add requirements for Land Disturbance**
24 **activities including a requirement for a Land Disturbance Erosion Control Permit including Minor**
25 **and Major classes of Permits that are required within the Champaign County MS4 Jurisdictional**
26 **Area; add a requirement that land disturbance of one acre or more in a common plan of development**
27 **must comply with the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency’s ILR 10 Permit requirements; add**
28 **fees and time limits for each class of Permit; add requirements for administration and enforcement**
29 **Permits; and add new Appendices with new standards and requirements for both Minor and Major**
30 **Permits. (Parts D, E, L, M, N, O, T, U, and V of the legal advertisement); and V. Revise existing**
31 **Section 7 to be new Section 6 and add a prohibition against erosion or sedimentation onto adjacent**
32 **properties and add minimum erosion and water quality requirements for all construction or land**
33 **disturbance; and VI. Revise existing Section 5 to be new Section 8 and add a Preferred Hierarchy of**
34 **Best Management Practices. (Part H of the legal advertisement); and VII. Revise and reformat**
35 **existing Section 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and the Appendices and add new Section 18. (Parts G, I, J, P, Q, R,**
36 **S and W of the legal advertisement).**

37

38 **773-AT-14 Petitioner: Zoning Administrator Request to amend the Champaign County Storm Water**
39 **Management and Erosion Control Ordinance that is the subject Zoning Case 769-AT-13, by adding**
40 **the following: A. Add a requirement for a Grading and Demolition Permit for any grading or**

1 **demolition that disturbs an acre or more of land or for any grading or demolition that is part of a**
2 **larger common plan of development in which one acre or more of land disturbance will occur, and**
3 **that is not related to any proposed construction; and B. Add fees for Grading and Demolition Permits;**
4 **and C. Add required information to be provided in the application for a Grading and Demolition**
5 **Permit; and D. Add a requirement that any grading or demolition pursuant to a Grading or**
6 **Demolition Permit shall comply with the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency's ILR 10 General**
7 **Storm Water Permit for Construction; and E. Add a requirement that any demolition pursuant to a**
8 **Demolition Permit shall comply with the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency's regulations**
9 **enforcing the National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants for regulated asbestos; and F.**
10 **Add prohibitions against changing the flow of water and blocking the flow of water; and G. Add other**
11 **requirements related to Grading and Demolition Permits.**

12

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

14

15 Mr. Thorsland informed the audience that anyone wishing to testify for any public hearing tonight must sign
16 the witness register for that public hearing. He reminded the audience that when they sign the witness
17 register they are signing an oath. He asked the audience if anyone desired to sign the witness register at this
18 time.

19

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

21

22 Mr. John Hall, Zoning Administrator, distributed a version of the Storm Water Management and Erosion
23 Control Ordinance dated March 6, 2015, to the Board for review. He said that this version should represent
24 the current version of the Ordinance. He said that this version of the Ordinance includes all of the optional
25 paragraphs and only indicates two kinds of changes to the existing Ordinance. He said that the single
26 underline is new text that was included in the Draft Policy that ELUC reviewed in December, 2013 and the
27 double underline is all of the new text that has been added during the public hearings. He said that the
28 March 6, 2015, version of the Ordinance has been formatted to make sense to ELUC and this is the example
29 of the Ordinance that will be attached to the Final Determination pending the ZBA's final recommendations
30 regarding those optional parts. He said that Appendices E, D and F are not included with the text.

31

32 Mr. Thorsland stated that the mailing included all of the things that the Board discussed at the last meeting
33 regarding abandoned wells and demolition. He said that staff did a fine job in obtaining all of the
34 information that the Board requested and he hopes that the Board had time to review that information. He
35 asked the Board if there were any questions or comments regarding this information.

36

37 Mr. Hall stated that regardless of what happens with Case 773-AT-14, it is very common for staff to receive
38 calls about whether approvals are needed for demolition and staff has never had the need to prepare a
39 checklist for what happens at demolition. He said that even if Case 773-AT-14 is not recommended this
40 information will be useful for the department.

1
2 Mr. Passalacqua asked if this information is only about well abandonment. He said that the Board discussed
3 the possibility of an existing well that is being preserved.
4
5 Mr. Hall stated that information regarding well preservation is in the handouts.
6
7 Mr. Thorsland stated that it is very possible that all of the Board's questions regarding wells have been asked
8 before by someone else and were answered in this information. He said that staff gathered all of the
9 pertinent information and distributed it to the Board for review.
10
11 Ms. Lee stated that Mr. Hall previously indicated that if Champaign County doesn't do anything regarding
12 storm water that the EPA will probably take the County to court. She asked if there was any way that the
13 ZBA could make a recommendation on Case 769-AT-13 and exclude anything outside the MS4
14 Jurisdictional Area and only do the MS4 Jurisdictional Area as required by the EPA.
15
16 Mr. Hall stated that the ZBA can recommend whatever the Board believes is reasonable. He said that the
17 approach he followed while drafting the Ordinance was that once the County has the infrastructure necessary
18 for what is required in the MS4 Jurisdictional Area, why not use it when it is necessary to respond to
19 complaints outside the MS4 Jurisdictional Area.
20
21 Ms. Lee stated that if the Board does not agree with utilizing the Ordinance outside the MS4 Jurisdictional
22 Area then the Board will be forced to deny the request even though they may agree that it should only be for
23 the MS4 Jurisdictional Area.
24
25 Mr. Hall stated no.
26
27 Mr. Thorsland stated that the Board will be going through the Finding of Fact for Case 769-AT-13 and there
28 are decision points regarding other portions of the County but that does not mean that the Board would not
29 recommend the sections that don't apply to the MS4 Jurisdictional Area and the rest it will move forward.
30 He said that a yes vote minus the additional parts means that the case still moves forward and satisfies the
31 EPA requirement and it means that the ZBA does not recommend to the County Board the Ordinance outside
32 of the MS4 Jurisdictional Area. He said that if the ZBA recommends the entire package, inside and outside
33 the MS4 Jurisdictional Area, the County Board will take the ZBA's recommendation under advisement and
34 either approve or deny it, send it back to the ZBA, or make their own recommendations.
35
36 Mr. Thorsland stated that this will be a process of reviewing Case 769-AT-13 and including or not including
37 the parts that are in addition to what is required. He said the parts that are required will more than likely be
38 recommended by this Board because they are required and it is a matter of what the Board does beyond that
39 requirement as to what is recommended to the County Board.
40

1 Ms. Lee asked Mr. Thorsland if the Board's discussion will be noted in the recommendation.

2
3 Mr. Thorsland stated that the two final determinations have places where the Board either recommends or
4 does not recommend or includes or does not include and the Board will go through those places tonight.

5
6 Mr. Hall reminded the Board of the draft evidence under item #16.E on page 27. He said that item #16.E
7 deals with the Ordinance's purpose promoting public health, safety, comfort, morals, and general welfare.
8 He said that the evidence that he has proposed for the Board simply states that once the Board has all of the
9 requirements for the MS4 Jurisdictional Area in place, not using them to solve problems that come up in the
10 rest of the jurisdiction is not promoting public welfare because the Board will be preventing staff from
11 promoting public welfare. He said that if the Board disagrees with the evidence under item #16.E then he
12 will do everything he can to bring it in line with what the Board believes will be a more reasonable statement
13 of fact. He said that if the finding is not up to the Board's satisfaction the case can be continued to a later
14 date but he wants to make sure that if the Optional Minimum Requirements are not recommended by this
15 Board that there is some evidence that he can point to when this case gets to the County Board as to why it
16 was not recommended. He said that it does not establish any new requirement unless there is a valid
17 complaint and it does not add any new fees. He said that the only cost that it imposes upon anyone is the
18 cost to stop damage on other property and he cannot put into words why someone would not recommend that
19 but he would be happy to try if the Board provides guidance.

20
21 Ms. Griest stated that in the Summary of Evidence does not specifically read like the testimony that Mr. Hall
22 just presented.

23
24 Mr. Hall stated that usually his verbal statements are not as grammatical as he would like them to be and it is
25 difficult to write the way you speak.

26
27 Mr. Thorsland stated that item #16.E specifically states that one purpose of the zoning regulations and
28 standards that have been adopted and established is to promote the public health, safety, comfort, morals and
29 general welfare. The proposed amendment with the Optional Minimum Requirements in Section 6 and
30 disregarding ILR10 compliance outside of the MS4 Jurisdictional Area, WILL promote the public health,
31 safety, comfort, morals, and general welfare throughout the County, based upon the following. (1) The
32 Optional Minimum Requirements do not require erosion and sedimentation controls to be put in place until
33 there is a valid complaint of erosion and/or sedimentation on adjacent land. Mr. Thorsland stated that the
34 text is a distinct version of what Mr. Hall said in that it does not put any burden upon anyone until they do
35 something wrong. Mr. Thorsland stated that the Optional Minimum Requirements are not applicable to
36 MS4 compliance and the intent of paragraph 6.1F and subsection 6.4 and 6.5 is to authorize the Zoning
37 Administrator to require actions to be taken for land disturbance pursuant to a Zoning Use Permit if that land
38 disturbance causes erosion or sedimentation on adjacent land. He said that this is a backstop on something
39 that should not be done in the first place and is a more grammatically correct version of what Mr. Hall
40 summarized. Mr. Thorsland suggested that the Board review item #16.E(6).

1
2 Ms. Griest stated that she did review item #16.E(6) but it does not jump out at her. She said that when Mr.
3 Hall summarizes item #16.E as a specific point it becomes very significant but it is buried in the text. She
4 asked if all of the text could be left as written and highlight “do not require” in item #16.E(1).
5
6 Mr. Hall stated that there will be no underlined text in the final version. He asked Ms. Griest if she would
7 like to keep the underlined text, add double underlined text or indicate specific text in bold lettering.
8
9 Ms. Griest stated that she would like something to make the text jump off the page to where it stands out that
10 only when there is a complaint does this begin to become a tool.
11
12 Mr. Passalacqua agreed with Ms. Griest. He said that if it could be clearly stated that there is no net change
13 unless there is a complaint then everyone could swallow this a lot easier.
14
15 Ms. Capel stated that one thing that Mr. Hall stated was that it won’t add any additional public expense
16 which is a clear and positive statement.
17
18 Mr. Thorsland stated that perhaps the “do not require” in item #16.E(1) should be indicated in bold italics or
19 underlined.
20
21 Mr. Hall stated that the following statement could be added to the last sentence in item #16.E(1): only a valid
22 complaint triggers enforcement of the Optional Minimum Requirements. He said that he would also add this
23 statement as a new #16.E(7).
24
25 Ms. Griest stated that she would make the statement as a new item #16.E(1) and renumber everything else
26 because much like a flow chart if there is no complaint everything else becomes irrelevant.
27
28 Mr. Thorsland stated that if the Board is comfortable the Board could begin reviewing the Finding of Fact
29 for Case 769-AT-14.
30
31 Ms. Griest asked Mr. Hall if the Board will be reviewing the Draft Finding of Fact dated January 15, 2015.
32
33 Mr. Hall stated yes. He said that it is up to the Board whether they would like to take some time during the
34 meeting to verify that the Draft Ordinance dated March 6, 2015, represents all of the changes to date. He
35 said that if there is something in particular that a Board member was interested in that has been changed then
36 he encouraged the Board to take the time to verify that the text is in the Draft Ordinance as it should be. He
37 said that most of the changes had to do with Section 4 and the last changes that are mentioned on the pink
38 sheet, Guide to Case 769-AT-13, are the minor edits from the State’s Attorney’s office (Attachment III to the
39 Supplemental Memorandum January 15, 2015); and the Revised Requirement for Stockpiles (Attachment
40 JJJ to the Supplemental Memorandum dated January 15, 2015; and Proposed Revisions to Paragraphs 4.1.B.

1 and C. (Supplemental Memorandum dated March 6, 2015). He said that the revisions to Paragraphs 4.1.B
2 and C. have always been one of the more problematic of this Draft Ordinance. He said that the present Draft
3 Ordinance is the simplest version that there ever has been distributed to the Board for review and he believes
4 that it does convey everything that it needs to convey. He said that he wants to make sure that every member
5 on the Board is convinced that this is the version that they expect the public to see.
6

7 Mr. Hall stated that on page 49 of the Draft Finding of Fact dated January 15, 2015, indicates the proposed
8 amendment and is what will be recommended to the County Board.

9 1. Revise Section 4.3.10 of the Zoning Ordinance to be as follows:

10 4.3.10 Storm Water Management and Erosion Control Ordinance

11 A. Any USE or CONSTRUCTION for which a Zoning Use Permit is required shall
12 also comply with the relevant requirements of the *Champaign County Storm Water*
13 *Management and Erosion Control Policy*.

14 B. The limits on maximum LOT COVERAGE contained in Section 5.3
15 notwithstanding, no more than 16 percent of the surface of any LOT or LOTS in
16 common ownership on January 1, 1998, shall consist of impervious area,
17 including paving consisting of gravel and rock and including any specific impervious
18 area addition adjacent public STREETS that is required to accommodate the USE
19 or CONSTRUCTION, unless the LOT is exempt pursuant to, or complies with , the
20 *Storm Water and Erosion Control Policy*.
21

22 2. Change the title of the Champaign County Stormwater Management Policy to be Champaign County
23 Storm Water Management and Erosion Control Ordinance and revise the text to be as follows:
24

25 Mr. Thorsland stated that if the Board has any questions during their review of the Ordinance then now
26 would be a good time to voice those questions to staff.
27

28 Ms. Lee asked if page 49 of the Draft Finding of Fact only changes the name of the Policy and nothing else.
29

30 Mr. Passalacqua asked Mr. Hall if he increased the stockpile from 100 cubic yards to 150 cubic yards. He
31 said that Section 11.5 of the *Draft Storm Water and Erosion Control Policy* still states 100 cubic yards.
32

33 Mr. Hall stated that Section 11.5 is the part that applies to the MS4 Jurisdictional Area and that was left at
34 100 cubic yards because it is really what the EPA would expect to see.
35

36 Ms. Lee stated that Paragraph 13.A.(2)a.(b) on Page 5 of the Draft Finding of Fact for Case 769-AT-13,
37 discusses land disturbance. She said that previously the Board and staff discussed that the Policy would only
38 be for land disturbance of one acre or more but Subparagraph 13.A.(2)a.(b) states the following: If adopted,
39 the minimum erosion control and water quality requirements will authorize the Zoning Administrator to
40 require actions to be taken for land disturbance pursuant to any Zoning Use Permit if that land disturbance

1 causes erosion or sedimentation on adjacent land and thereby minimize impacts on adjacent properties.
2
3 Mr. Hall stated that the Optional Minimum Requirements apply to any Zoning Use Permit Application. He
4 said that the Optional Minimum Requirements only apply when there is a violation.
5
6 Mr. Passalacqua stated that it is confusing because it is included in Case 769-AT-13 and Subparagraph
7 13.A.(2)a.(b) begins with the following: "If adopted." He said that it is an option in Case 773-AT-14.
8
9 Mr. Hall stated that Case 769-AT-13 has three optional parts and they are as follows: 1. Optional Minimal
10 Requirements; and 2. Requiring ILR10 compliance outside of the MS4 Jurisdictional Area; and 3. Requiring
11 the minimum \$50 fee for the Minor LDEC Permit. He said that Case 773-AT-14 has no optional parts
12 because the entire thing is optional and it would only be recommended if the Optional Minimum
13 Requirements are recommended. He said that he now realizes that calling the Optional Minimum
14 Requirements as requirements makes it sound like they require something to be done but that is the way it is.
15
16 Ms. Griest asked Mr. Hall if renaming the Optional Minimum Requirements to Optional Minimum
17 Standards would be a less confusing nomenclature.
18
19 Mr. Hall stated that he would be more than happy to bring this back using that nomenclature if that would
20 help. He said that if everywhere that states requirements would be changed to standards the idea might get
21 across that something only happens if it needs to happen.
22
23 Ms. Griest stated that changing requirements to standards might clarify it.
24
25 Mr. Hall stated that he would be more than happy to just state right now that anywhere where it says
26 Optional Minimum Requirements or Minimum Requirements to change it to Optional Minimum Standards
27 or Minimum Standards.
28
29 Mr. Randol agreed.
30
31 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if they were comfortable with this proposed change the Board indicated yes.
32
33 Ms. Lee stated that she still believes that Subparagraph 13.A.(2)a.(b) on page 5 of the Draft Finding of Fact
34 still makes it in the all of the unincorporated areas of the County and not just in the MS4 Jurisdictional Area.
35
36 Mr. Hall stated that Subparagraph 13.A.(2)a.(b) is dealing with the Optional Minimum Standards which only
37 kick in when there is a valid complaint. He asked Ms. Lee if there is some reason that the Board can put
38 down on paper as to why we shouldn't have an enforceable standard when one landowner is causing land
39 erosion or sedimentation on an adjacent landowner.
40

1 Ms. Lee stated that she feels that this was originally done for the MS4 Jurisdictional Area which is what the
2 County is required to do, but this goes beyond the MS4 Jurisdictional Area therefore the Board is being
3 forced to decide that if they do not like everything that is in the Policy then they should say no. She said that
4 she is in favor of doing all of this in the MS4 Jurisdictional Area because that is what the County is required
5 to do but when we get into the entire unincorporated area we are dealing with an area that isn't just the MS4
6 Jurisdictional Area.

7
8 Mr. Passalacqua stated that with the wording that Mr. Hall has presented to the Board it does not make any
9 change on anyone unless there is a complaint filed.

10
11 Mr. Hall stated that the County has development which occurs next to drainage ditches in organized drainage
12 districts and for example, in Hensley Township someone needed fill for their construction and rather than
13 getting the fill material from the 12 acres that was outside the drainage ditch easement they got it next to the
14 Beaver Lake Drainage Ditch. He said that the person who did this received a letter from the Beaver Lake
15 Drainage District within one week indicating that they do not want anything happening to their drainage
16 ditch where the fill material was removed. He said that removing fill from a drainage ditch easement is
17 probably not something that he could do anything about under this Ordinance but if they had made a
18 stockpile next to the drainage ditch when they excavated the fill causing sedimentation into the ditch he
19 could require them to correct that with the Optional Minimum Standards. He said that without the Optional
20 Minimum Standards he could not do a thing. He said that back in the 90's there was a subdivision
21 constructed near Lake of the Woods and one summer weekend there was big rain storm which caused
22 sedimentation into the Lake of the Woods and no one had any regulations that could do anything about it.
23 He said that the only thing that the Optional Minimum Standards would do is presumably make sure that it
24 didn't happen again because that is the problem with having something that kicks in when there is a
25 complaint. He said that he would never propose anything more than this for the other 99% of the County's
26 jurisdiction.

27
28 Mr. Thorsland asked Ms. Lee if she would be more comfortable with the Ordinance if the "Optional
29 Minimum Requirements" were changed to "Optional Minimum Standards". He asked if Mr. Hall's
30 explanation regarding the drainage districts helped.

31
32 Mr. Hall stated that his point was that we have no protection for drainage ditches unless we have the
33 Optional Minimum Standards in the other 99% of our jurisdiction and it will be between the drainage district
34 and the landowner.

35
36 Mr. Thorsland stated that, as an example, his pet peeve as a two-wheeled traveler is a dirt covered road when
37 a new house is started. He said that once the construction begins you can look forward to about four months
38 of three acres of dirt in the street rather than on the lot, thus creating a mess. He said that the Ordinance
39 would give staff the mechanism to require the contractor to clean up the road.

1 Ms. Lee stated that it is being said that this is all complaint driven although Subparagraph 13.A.(2)a.(a)
2 indicates the following: The “minimum erosion control and water quality requirements” in Section 6.1, 6.4
3 and 6.5 are proposed to be required in the entire unincorporated area for any land disturbance and/or
4 construction.

5
6 Mr. Hall stated that perhaps the following revision will help: The “minimum erosion control and water
7 quality requirements” in Section 6.1, 6.4 and 6.5 are proposed to be required in the entire unincorporated
8 area for any land disturbance and/or construction that causes erosion and sedimentation on adjacent land.

9
10 Ms. Griest asked Mr. Hall if he is carefully choosing those words so as to indicate that by causing erosion
11 and sedimentation on adjacent land that staff has probably received a complaint.

12
13 Mr. Hall stated that Ms. Griest was absolutely correct. He assured everyone that staff will not be cruising the
14 County’s roads looking for erosion and sedimentation.

15
16 Ms. Lee agreed with Mr. Hall’s revision of Subparagraph 13.A(2)a.(a).

17
18 Mr. Hall stated that he wants to be clear that the stockpile requirements in Section 6.4 of the Draft Policy
19 that applies to 150 cubic yards. He said this is a requirement that states that staff is going to make sure that
20 150 cubic yard stock stockpiles are no closer than 50 feet to the top of a stream or drainage ditch and no
21 closer than 30 feet to a property line or township highway ditch. He said that this is something that applies
22 even if there is no problem but the whole point is that if you provide that much separation then there really
23 should not be a problem.

24
25 Mr. Passalacqua stated that this makes perfect sense because that is the worst type of material for moving
26 around.

27
28 Mr. Thorsland stated that there are two things that create the biggest problems which are the stockpiles when
29 they go forward with construction and when a good gravel base is not put down to provide a parking and off
30 -loading area.

31
32 Mr. Passalacqua stated that the County does not require it.

33
34 Mr. Hall stated that Mr. Passalacqua was correct in that the County does not require the good gravel base but
35 when they are tracking mud onto the street and do not clean it off at the end of the day and staff receives a
36 complaint staff can contact them. He said that a repeated occurrence will cause him to recommend the
37 installation of a stabilized construction entrance or they will receive a Notice of Violation.

38
39 Mr. Thorsland stated that during recent construction near his farm a two foot culvert and two small loads of
40 gravel was placed onto the grass and driven across and within one day the culvert was converted to two

1 vertical stovepipes with very little gravel and it stayed like that for approximately four weeks. He said that
2 every night the entire front yard was in the street. He said that this would be the kind of thing that would
3 trigger a complaint to staff.
4

5 Mr. Hall stated that there is nothing in this Ordinance which states that if the Zoning Administrator is driving
6 in the County and sees construction without a stabilized construction entrance or dirt on the road during the
7 day outside of the construction entrance that it is a problem but what is a problem or violation is if there is
8 dirt on the road after the job site is shut down for the day. He said that staff will not be driving around the
9 County looking for things like that and staff has to receive a complaint. He noted that this is all complaint
10 driven.
11

12 Ms. Lee asked Mr. Hall if he or the Board has the authority to file a complaint to staff if they find dirt on the
13 road after a job site is shut down for the day.
14

15 Mr. Hall stated that he would not want to take this to a court of law and indicate that the complaint came
16 from the Zoning Administrator because that is not the intent. He said that he will not say that a future
17 Zoning Administrator would not do so but he believes that it would be foolish to do so because it is clearly
18 not the intent.
19

20 Mr. Thorsland stated that this is not a police action ordinance but is merely setting minimum standards and
21 using them as tools to solve complaints in the rest of the County. He said that it doesn't give authority for
22 the office to go out there and catch you in the act or patrol the area but is a way to address a complaint with a
23 definition and a standard. He said that someone is going to call staff and indicate that his neighbor's entire
24 front yard is in his in-ground pool and currently staff could only indicate that it is a civil matter between the
25 two landowners. He said that if there is a minimum standard for controlling more than one acre of land
26 disturbance that may end up in the neighbor's pool then staff could notify the neighbor and indicate why this
27 cannot happen.
28

29 Ms. Lee asked Mr. Hall if the Board could file a complaint.
30

31 Mr. Hall stated that he would leave it up to the Board members but if they would file a complaint against a
32 property and the property becomes the subject of a zoning case the filing Board member would need to
33 abstain from the case.
34

35 Mr. Thorsland stated that since the Board members have accepted their position on the Board they have to
36 filter themselves. He said that every property could potentially wind up before the Board. He said that the
37 Zoning Administrator and the Board should never be the police of the County. He said that there have been
38 many times that he would like to file a complaint but it would not be appropriate for him to do so as a
39 member of this Board.
40

1 Ms. Griest asked Mr. Hall if the remedy for the pool situation is still a matter between the two neighbors
2 because the Ordinance is only giving the Zoning Administrator the authority to indicate that they should stop
3 doing it.

4
5 Mr. Hall stated that the only tool that he has is to tell the landowner to cease sedimentation into the pool and
6 if it happens again they will be required to install erosion controls. He said that if the landowner refuses to
7 install the erosion controls then staff could take them to court.

8
9 Ms. Griest asked Mr. Hall if the Ordinance gives the Zoning Administrator the authority to require the
10 erosion controls after the first incident.

11
12 Mr. Hall stated yes, but he has been in Champaign County long enough to know that he is not going to make
13 anyone do anything over something that happens one time but two times is the trigger. He said that he will
14 tell them once but he is not going to try to make anyone do anything if they refuse to until it happens a
15 second time.

16
17 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if they were ready to review the Finding of Fact for Case 769-AT-13 and the
18 Board indicated yes.

19
20 Mr. Thorsland asked Mr. Hall why “morals” is included in Paragraph 2.0 (e) of the Ordinance.

21
22 Mr. Hall stated that back in 1920 when President Hoover was writing the model *Zoning Enabling Act* there
23 were a lot of moral issues that zoning ordinances were intended to address. He said that obviously we do not
24 do a lot with morals in the modern zoning regulation and it has to be objectified into some bizarrely named
25 use that can only occur in certain locations.

26
27 Mr. Thorsland read LRMP Goal 1 as follows: Champaign County will attain a system of land resource
28 management planning built on broad public involvement that supports effective decision making by the
29 County. He said that staff has recommended that the proposed text amendment will NOT IMPEDE the
30 achievement of LRMP Goal 1.

31
32 The Board agreed with staff’s recommendation for LRMP Goal 1.

33
34 Mr. Thorsland read LRMP Goal 2 as follows: Champaign County will collaboratively formulate land
35 resource and development policy with other units of government in areas of overlapping land use planning
36 jurisdiction. He said that staff has recommended that the proposed text amendment will NOT IMPEDE the
37 achievement of LRMP Goal 2.

38
39 The Board agreed with staff’s recommendation for LRMP Goal 2.

40

1 Mr. Thorsland read LRMP Goal 3 as follows: Champaign County will encourage economic growth and
2 development to ensure prosperity for its residents and the region. Goal 3 has three objectives and no
3 policies. The proposed text amendment WILL/WILL NOT IMPEDE the achievement of Goal 3 in a similar
4 manner as for the Purpose of the Zoning Ordinance.
5

6 Mr. Hall stated that the Board may want to review item #16.B before making a recommendation that way if
7 the Board believes there is a problem with item #16.B it should be reflected in item #8. He said that item
8 #16.B is the purpose statement regarding conservation of the value of land, buildings and structures
9 throughout the County. He said that the evidence under item #16.B. summarizes the fact that the USEPA
10 did do a national level cost analysis using whatever information that they had in 1998. He said that he does
11 not believe that the analysis is terribly relevant to this although one of the first questions asked when we
12 proposed this ordinance was, will there be a benefit cost analysis. He said that we updated the Bloomington
13 cost for a typical lot and found out that regardless of what the USEPA found out in 1998 the costs to an
14 individual lot owner are a lot higher than what they predicted. He said that these things are already in place
15 in the City of Champaign and it is up to the Board to decide how much of a brake that has put on
16 development.
17

18 Ms. Lee asked if he is just talking about the MS4 Jurisdictional Area.
19

20 Mr. Hall stated that he is talking about everywhere in the City of Champaign, City of Urbana and Savoy.
21

22 Ms. Lee stated that the only argument that she can see regarding Champaign County not encouraging
23 development is that adjacent counties do not have these rules and they are not required to have these rules in
24 their MS4 Jurisdictional Area therefore the developers may move to the adjacent counties for their
25 development.
26

27 Mr. Passalacqua stated that the entire State of Illinois is required to have these rules.
28

29 Ms. Griest asked Mr. Hall if the adjacent counties already have these rules related to the ILR10 in place and
30 Champaign County is the last county to be implementing this.
31

32 Mr. Hall stated that the ILR10 applies everywhere and the only other county which borders Champaign
33 County that has an MS4 Jurisdictional Area is McLean County. He said that Douglas and Vermilion
34 counties do not have zoning and there is a variation in standards. He said that Piatt and Ford counties do
35 have zoning but they do not have an MS4 Jurisdictional Area requirement although ILR10 does apply.
36

37 Mr. Passalacqua stated that these requirements are not going to be a reason for a developer to leave
38 Champaign County.
39

40 Ms. Griest stated that a developer is not going to drive that far to build in an adjacent county just because of

1 this regulation because the cost to locate at that distance and commuting back and forth to a work location in
2 Champaign County would far exceed the additional cost.

3
4 Mr. Thorsland agreed.

5
6 Mr. Hall stated that the cost analysis is only relevant to our MS4 Jurisdictional Area because these standards
7 do not apply outside of the MS4 Jurisdictional Area.

8
9 Ms. Griest recommended that the proposed text amendment WILL NOT IMPEDE the achievement of Goal 3
10 in a similar manner as for the Purpose of the Zoning Ordinance and the Board agreed.

11
12 Mr. Thorsland read LRMP Goal 4 as follows: Champaign County will protect the long term viability of
13 agriculture in Champaign County and its land resource base. He said that staff recommends that the
14 proposed text amendment will NOT IMPEDE the achievement of Goal 4.

15
16 The Board agreed with staff's recommendation for LRMP Goal 4.

17
18 Mr. Thorsland read LRMP Goal 5 as follows: Champaign County will encourage urban development that is
19 compact and contiguous to existing cities, villages, and existing unincorporated settlements. He said that
20 staff recommends that the proposed text amendment will NOT IMPEDE the achievement of Goal 5 in
21 general.

22
23 The Board agreed with staff's recommendation for LRMP Goal 5.

24
25 Mr. Thorsland read LRMP Goal 6 as follows: Champaign County will ensure protection of the public health
26 and public safety in land resource management decisions. He said that staff recommends that the proposed
27 text amendment will NOT IMPEDE the achievement of Goal 6.

28
29 The Board agreed with staff's recommendation for LRMP Goal 6.

30
31 Mr. Thorsland read LRMP Goal 7 as follows: Champaign County will coordinate land use decisions in the
32 unincorporated area with the existing and planned transportation infrastructure and services. He said that
33 staff recommends that the proposed text amendment will NOT IMPEDE the achievement of Goal 7.

34
35 The Board agreed with staff's recommendation for LRMP Goal 7.

36
37 Mr. Thorsland read LRMP Goal 8 as follows: Champaign County will strive to conserve and enhance the
38 County's landscape and natural resources and ensure their sustainable use. He continued to read Objective
39 8.4 as follows: Champaign County will ensure that new development and ongoing land management
40 practices maintain and improve surface water quality, contribute to stream channel stability, and minimize

1 erosion and sedimentation. He said that staff recommends that the proposed text amendment will HELP
2 ACHIEVE LRMP Goal 8 and Objective 8.4 and Policy 8.4.2. He noted that Mr. Hall previously added new
3 language to Policy 8.4.2 making it clear that it helps achieve Policy 8.4.2 because it provides a standard that
4 can be applied when a complaint is received to assist staff in resolving that complaint.

5
6 Mr. Thorsland read Objective 8.4.5 as follows: Champaign County will ensure that non-point discharges
7 from new development meet or exceed state and federal water quality standards. He said that staff
8 recommends that the proposed amendment WITH OR WITHOUT the Optional Minimum Requirements in
9 Section 6 and WHETHER OR NOT ILR10 compliance will be required by the County outside of the MS4
10 Jurisdictional Area, WILL ACHIEVE Policy 8.4.5.

11
12 Mr. Thorsland read Objective 8.5 as follows: Champaign County will encourage the maintenance and
13 enhancement of aquatic and riparian habitats. He said that staff recommends that the proposed text
14 amendment will NOT IMPEDE the achievement of Objective 8.5 and Policy 8.5.2.

15
16 Mr. Thorsland read Objective 8.6 as follows: Champaign County will encourage resource management
17 which avoids loss or degradation of areas representative of the pre-settlement environment and other areas
18 that provide habitat for native and game species. He said that staff recommends that the proposed
19 amendment will NOT IMPEDE the achievement of Objective 8.6, Policy 8.6.1 and Policy 8.6.2.

20
21 Mr. Hall stated that an alternative view of Policy 8.5.1 would be that since we are not requiring it to apply
22 by-right throughout our whole jurisdiction, why would it not be impeding the achievement of that objective;
23 we are avoiding doing it so why isn't it impeding.

24
25 Ms. Lee asked what we would be avoiding.

26
27 Mr. Passalacqua stated that we would be avoiding it by not making it a requirement but an optional standard.

28
29 Mr. Thorsland stated that if we do not adopt the option then we are impeding.

30
31 Mr. Hall stated no. He said that even in adopting the option we are impeding because we are not making it a
32 requirement. He said that there is something to be said for this view and he is not arguing for it but he wants
33 to make sure that we have as good a product to present to the County Board as possible and as long as the
34 ZBA has considered it and does not believe that it is not relevant then he would be happy.

35
36 Mr. Passalacqua stated that the wording could be revised to state that the Optional Minimum Standards
37 provides the Zoning Administrator with the tools to enforce the protection of those things. He said that the
38 County Board could not indicate that we are not protecting it because we are but we are not making it
39 another layer of requirements.

1 Mr. Hall stated that the first underlined sentence in item #13.B(2) could be revised as follows: The proposed
2 text amendment will NOT IMPEDE the achievement of Policy 8.5.1 because the erosion and sedimentation
3 controls required by this Case 769-AT-13 are not intended to preserve existing habitat, enhance degraded
4 habitat, or restore habitat but the Optional Minimum Standards will prevent damage to habitat when a valid
5 complaint is received. He said that this will assist staff if the Champaign County Forest Preserve District
6 complains about someone causing erosion or sedimentation or a drainage district complains about erosion
7 sedimentation into their ditch. He said that the primary purpose is not to protect but when we are made
8 aware of damage being done this will allow something to be done about it.

9
10 The Board agreed with staff's recommendation.

11
12 Ms. Griest asked Mr. Hall if the second underlined sentence in item #13.B(2) should be stricken or does it
13 become repetitive.

14
15 Mr. Hall stated no, because it reinforces the point.

16
17 Mr. Thorsland stated that the Board should keep in mind that the recommendation for Policy 8.4.2 indicates
18 that if the Optional Minimum Standards in Section 6 are approved the proposed text amendment will HELP
19 ACHIEVE Policy 8.4.2. He said that this text means that should the Board approve it this will HELP
20 ACHIEVE it.

21
22 Mr. Hall asked if the Board does not recommend the Optional Minimum Standards, should we change
23 anything that is written in Policy 8.4.2. He said that hopefully nothing would need to be changed but if the
24 Optional Minimum Standards are not recommended that would not be available and likewise for item
25 #13.A.(2)(a)b) at the top of page 6. He asked if the Board does not recommend ILR10 compliance outside of
26 the MS4 Jurisdictional Area should the sentence at the top of page 6 be changed. He said that he would
27 recommend that the Board work through the Finding of Fact and then make a decision regarding those kinds
28 of things.

29
30 Mr. Thorsland stated that if the Optional Minimum Requirements are not approved then it no longer HELPS
31 ACHIEVE. He said that the Board can come back to this.

32
33 Mr. Thorsland read Policy 8.5.2 as follows: The County will require in its discretionary review that new
34 development cause no more than minimal disturbance to the stream corridor environment. He said that staff
35 recommends that the proposed text amendment will NOT IMPEDE the achievement of Policy 8.5.2 for the
36 same reasons as for Policy 8.5.1.

37
38 The Board agreed with staff's recommendation for Policy 8.5.2.

39
40 Mr. Thorsland read Objective 8.6 as follows: Champaign County will encourage resource management

1 which avoids loss or degradation of areas representative of the pre-settlement environment and other areas
2 that provide habitat for native and game species. He said that staff recommends that the proposed
3 amendment will NOT IMPEDE the achievement of Objective 8.6. He said that staff also recommends that
4 the proposed text amendment will NOT IMPEDE Policy 8.6.1 and 8.6.2.

5
6 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if, with the revisions and additions, are they happy with all of the
7 recommendations for the LRMP Goal 8 and the Board stated yes.

8
9 Mr. Thorsland read LRMP Goal 9 as follows: Champaign County will encourage energy conservation,
10 efficiency, and the use of renewable energy sources. He said that staff recommends that the proposed text
11 amendment will NOT IMPEDE the achievement of LRMP Goal 9 and the Board agreed.

12
13 Mr. Thorsland read LRMP Goal 10 as follows: Champaign County will promote the development and
14 preservation of cultural amenities that contribute to a high quality of life for its citizens. He said that staff
15 recommends that the proposed text amendment will NOT IMPEDE the achievement of Goal 10 and the
16 Board agreed.

17
18 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if, with the revisions and additions, they are happy with all of the
19 recommendations for all of the LRMP Goals, Policies and Objectives and the Board stated yes.

20
21 Mr. Thorsland stated that the Board will now review the evidence regarding the purpose of the Zoning
22 Ordinance.

23
24 Mr. Thorsland read item #16.B as follows: The proposed amendment WITH OR WITHOUT the Optional
25 Minimum Requirements in Section 6 and WHETHER OR NOT ILR10 compliance will be required by the
26 County outside of the MS4 Jurisdictional Area, WILL/WILL NOT conserve the value of real estate
27 throughout the County.

28
29 Ms. Griest stated that she believes that it WILL conserve the value of real estate throughout the County.
30 She said that she doesn't think that the factor changes with or without the optional requirements in the
31 outlying jurisdictions, but within the MS4 Jurisdictional Area where there is infrastructure it is vitally
32 important to help conserve the value of those real estate parcels.

33
34 The Board agreed with Ms. Griest.

35
36 Ms. Lee asked Mr. Hall if he can do anything about water pollution that travels into the unincorporated area
37 as a result of something that has occurred inside the City of Champaign, City of Urbana or Savoy.

38
39 Mr. Hall stated that a lot can be done as long as it is done with the proper approvals. He said that our
40 Ordinance accepts anything that is a similar or a better ordinance would allow therefore if the City of

1 Champaign decided to reroute a stream and they received the necessary approvals from IDNR and the Corps
2 of Engineers then there would be nothing that the County could do about it.

3
4 Ms. Lee asked Mr. Hall if he would have any authority if there were no approvals from a governmental
5 entity and the water pollution from these municipalities affected the rural areas.

6
7 Mr. Hall stated that he doubts it because our rules do not apply inside the incorporated area.

8
9 Mr. Thorsland stated that the recourse would probably be with that entity.

10
11 Ms. Lee stated that something could travel to the rural areas that did not originate from the rural area.

12
13 Mr. Hall stated that a perfect example was after they built Lowe's they were putting so much storm water
14 into the farm tiles that it showed up in the farm fields causing serious erosion. He said that it is just like all
15 of the plastic sacks that blow from all of the development along north Prospect onto the surrounding fields.

16
17 Mr. Thorsland read item #16.E. as follows: the proposed amendment WITH Optional Minimum
18 Requirements in Section 6 and disregarding ILR10 Compliance outside of the MS4 Jurisdictional Area,
19 WILL promote the public health, safety, comfort, morals, and general welfare throughout the COUNTY.

20
21 Mr. Hall reminded the Board of the added text to Subparagraph (1) and read revised Subparagraph (1) as
22 follows: The Optional Minimum Standards *do not* require erosion and sedimentation controls to be put in
23 place until there is a valid complaint of erosion and/or sedimentation on adjacent land. Only a valid
24 complaint triggers the enforcement of the Optional Minimum Standards.

25
26 The Board agreed.

27
28 Mr. Thorsland read item #19 as follows: Regarding the alternative versions of the text amendment that the
29 County Board may adopt: A. As described in the ELUC Memorandum dated 10/29/13, the Draft Ordinance
30 includes certain "minimum erosion control and water quality requirements". He noted that "requirements
31 should be changed to "standards".

32
33 Mr. Hall stated that in this instance he would place (standards) in parenthesis after "requirements" because
34 the previous document did refer to those as requirements.

35
36 Mr. Thorsland continued to read item #19.A as follows: in Section 6.1, 6.4 and 6.5 that are proposed to be
37 required in the entire unincorporated area for any land disturbance and/or construction. These minimum
38 erosion control requirements (standards) are not required for compliance with the NPDES requirements
39 outside of the MS4 Jurisdictional Area and that is why the County Board has the option of not requiring
40 these minimums outside of the MS4 Jurisdictional Area. The Zoning Board of Appeals HAS/HAS NOT

1 included paragraph 6.1F. and Sections 6.4 and 6.5 in their recommendation to the County Board.

2
3 Mr. Passalacqua recommended that the Zoning Board of Appeals HAS included paragraph 6.1F. and
4 Sections 6.4 and 6.5 in their recommendation to the County Board.

5
6 The Board agreed.

7
8 Ms. Lee requested that Mr. Thorsland pause the review for a moment so that she may review Section 6.1.

9
10 Mr. Hall noted that Section 6.1 appears on page 18 of the Draft Ordinance dated 3/6/15.

11
12 Mr. Hall stated that he would recommend striking Subparagraph e. at the top of page 33 of 49 of the Draft
13 Finding of Fact. He said that he recommends striking the second Subparagraph e. in the middle of page 33
14 of 49 as well as Subparagraph e. on page 34, Subparagraph f. on page 35, Subparagraph e. at the top of page
15 36 and Subparagraph f. at the bottom of page 36, Subparagraph e on page 37, Subparagraph e. at the top of
16 page 38.

17
18 Mr. Thorsland informed Ms. Lee that she does not have to agree with Mr. Passalacqua's recommendation.

19
20 Ms. Lee stated that during a previous meeting the Board discussed being more than 30 feet from the
21 centerline of a drainage swale. She said that Section 6.4.D.1(b) of the Draft Storm Water Management and
22 Erosion Control Ordinance dated 3/6/15, states that a stockpile shall be not less than 30 feet from the
23 centerline of a drainage swale that is indicated as an intermittent stream on a United States Geological
24 Survey 7.5 Minute Quadrangle Map. She said that Section 6.4.D.1(b) states that the Stockpiles shall not be
25 less than 50 feet from the top of the bank of a drainage ditch or stream.

26
27 Mr. Thorsland stated that these are things that the Board just hammered through and Mr. Hall indicated that
28 the MS4 Jurisdictional Area is a little different than the rest of it.

29
30 Mr. Hall stated that everything is standardized in that it is within 50 feet of the top of the bank of a drainage
31 ditch or stream and 30 feet within the centerline of a drainage swale.

32
33 Mr. Passalacqua asked Mr. Hall why 30 feet within the centerline of a drainage swale.

34
35 Mr. Hall stated that 30 feet is a common dimension that we see for things like easements for just a dry swale.

36
37 Mr. Thorsland read item #19.B as follows: The ELUC Memorandum dated 10/29/13 and the Draft
38 Ordinance that was attached did not adequately address compliance with the Illinois EPA's ILR10 General
39 Stormwater Permit but compliance with the ILR10 Permit was included in the legal advertisement for this
40 text amendment. The County Board has the option of not requiring compliance with the ILR10 outside of

- 1 the MS4 Jurisdictional Area except for Floodplain Development Permits and the Zoning Board of Appeals
2 HAS/HAS NOT recommended requiring compliance with the ILR10 outside of the MS4 Jurisdictional Area.
3
- 4 Ms. Griest stated that this means that it gives the Zoning Administrator the tools for enforcement because the
5 language indicating “requiring compliance” triggers a thought in her mind that there is an automatic action
6 that must take place rather than it being complaint driven.
7
- 8 Mr. Hall stated that the option is whether to have staff require documentation regarding ILR10 compliance
9 from someone who comes in for a permit and indicates that they are disturbing more than one acre.
10
- 11 Ms. Griest stated that if they are subject to ILR10 they should have to submit evidence of their permits.
12
- 13 Mr. Hall stated that the EPA website is pretty easy to use for staff to determine if someone has an ILR10
14 permit or not.
15
- 16 Mr. Passalacqua stated that this is just the State making the County more of a long arm of the law on their
17 behalf.
18
- 19 Mr. Hall stated that the question is whether we want to assist in that or not. He said that it is completely
20 optional that we assist outside of the MS4 Jurisdictional Area.
21
- 22 Ms. Lee stated that ILR10 is only required when there is more than one acre of disturbance.
23
- 24 Mr. Thorsland stated that this is asking if the County wants to assist in making sure that people are held to
25 that requirement.
26
- 27 Mr. Hall stated that the way that the Draft Ordinance is written, staff will always tell someone when ILR10
28 applies but this is taking the next step in requiring a copy of the documentation proving that they have
29 applied. He said that he is not expecting this part of the Ordinance to be recommended or adopted by the
30 County Board but he thinks that some people would think that if it is a requirement then why is it a big deal.
31
- 32 Mr. Passalacqua stated that this is just going to slow up staff and place another layer on them for review of
33 something that someone has or hasn’t done and he disagrees with it.
34
- 35 Mr. Hall stated that this will not make them comply but means that staff could not grant a permit until we
36 know that they comply.
37
- 38 Mr. Passalacqua stated that this will just slow things down in the office to a screeching halt.
39
- 40 Mr. Randol stated that if they are supposed to do it then they should have done it.

1

2 Ms. Griest asked Mr. Hall to indicate what the downside to staff is if this is not recommended for approval
3 by the ZBA or approved by the County Board.

4

5 Mr. Hall stated that he does not believe that there is any downside but on the other hand it is not a
6 tremendous benefit either. He said that if it applies staff will ask for a piece of paper and nothing will be
7 processed until staff receives it and if it doesn't apply staff still has to inform them about ILR10 because we
8 want them to know. He said that we don't want someone to not know that they are violating ILR10.

9

10 Mr. Thorsland stated that the aspect remains whether we ask Mr. Hall to verify it or not.

11

12 The consensus of the Board was the following: The County Board has the option of not requiring
13 compliance with the ILR10 outside of the MS4 Jurisdictional Area except for Floodplain Development
14 Permits and the Zoning Board of Appeals HAS NOT recommended requiring compliance with ILR10
15 outside of the MS4 Jurisdictional Area.

16

17 Mr. Hall recommended that item #19.2(c)(9) be stricken and the Board agreed.

18

19 Mr. Thorsland read item #19.C. as follows: The ELUC Memorandum dated 10/29/13 and the Draft
20 Ordinance that was attached included an optional \$50 fee for the proposed Minor Land Disturbance Erosion
21 Control (LDEC) Permit. The Zoning Board of Appeals HAS/HAS NOT recommended requiring a fee for
22 the Minor LDEC Permit. He recommended that item #19.C(1)(e) be stricken and the Board agreed.

23

24 Mr. Hall stated that the Board could recommend a higher fee because the legal advertisement only discussed
25 a fee.

26

27 Ms. Lee asked Mr. Hall if we are discussing one acre or more again.

28

29 Mr. Hall stated that we are discussing that in the MS4 Jurisdictional Area it is one acre or more or less than
30 that if it is part of a larger plan of development. He said that going back to one of the very first things that
31 we found out, if we get an application for a rural house in the MS4 Jurisdictional Area that is one acre and is
32 being converted from farmland, we would require them to comply with ILR10. He said that a small
33 subdivision, which is very unlikely that it would be with the County if it were in the MS4 Jurisdictional
34 Area, that is less than one acre on a lot and is part of a larger part of a planned development a LDEC Permit
35 will be required and staff will have to help that person draft their own erosion and sedimentation control
36 plan. He said that one of our zoning technicians already has a seat for a training class this year so that they
37 can indeed help someone with their erosion and sedimentation control plan and the \$50 will help offset some
38 of those costs.

39

40 Ms. Lee asked Mr. Hall to explain the difference between this and getting the ILR10.

1
2 Mr. Hall stated that the option for the ILR10 is only for outside of the MS4 Jurisdictional Area but this is a
3 fee for a Land Disturbance Permit which will only happen inside the MS4 Jurisdictional Area.
4
5 Mr. Thorsland asked Mr. Hall how often staff will have something like this.
6
7 Mr. Hall stated that he does not know if staff will ever do a Minor LDEC Permit because minor means that
8 you are part of a larger development and that generally means that you are doing it pursuant to a municipal
9 approval and not part of our jurisdiction. He said that if the Board does not recommend this fee it isn't like
10 the County is going to lose a huge amount of money for those permits because it is hard to say how often
11 they will even apply but on the other hand if we ever see one, staff will be putting much more time in to it.
12 He said that for a minor permit staff will have to review for a silt fence, a stabilized construction entrance
13 and make sure that stockpiles are in the right location.
14
15 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff has already developed a checklist or guide for this process.
16
17 Mr. Hall stated no. He said that portions of staff are already slated for training this year.
18
19 Mr. Thorsland asked Mr. Hall if the training costs money.
20
21 Mr. Hall stated yes.
22
23 Mr. Thorsland stated that \$50 will not make people run away from the MS4 Jurisdictional Area.
24
25 Mr. Hall stated that at times staff discovers that people have either over or under paid their permit fee
26 therefore if \$50 is the only difference it will be fairly minor compared to what the real costs will be.
27
28 Mr. Randol stated that more than likely the cities will annex it anyway. He said that he is in favor of the \$50
29 fee and recommends that the Zoning Board of Appeals HAS recommended requiring a fee for the Minor
30 LDEC Permit and the Board agreed.
31
32 Mr. Thorsland read item #20.A(1)(e) as follows: The Zoning Board of Appeals has reviewed the Draft
33 handout and found it to be ACCURATE/INACCURATE in summarizing the proposed amendment and
34 anticipate that the proposed DRAFT handout will be HELPFUL/UNHELPFUL in communicating the
35 erosion and sediment control requirements.
36
37 Mr. Thorsland recommended that the Draft handout is ACCURATE and is HELPFUL and the Board agreed.
38
39 Mr. Thorsland read item #20.A(2)(c) as follows: The Zoning Board of Appeals has reviewed the revised
40 application form and determined that the revised application form should be ADEQUATE/INADEQUATE

1 for use upon adoption of the proposed amendment.

2
3 Mr. Thorsland recommended that the application form should be ADEQUATE and the Board agreed.

4
5 **Summary Finding of Fact for Case 769-AT-13:**

6
7 From the documents of record and the testimony and exhibits received at the public hearing conducted on
8 February 13, 2014; March 13, 2014; May 29, 2014; June 12, 2014; July 13, 2014; September 11, 2014;
9 December 11, 2014; January 15, 2015; the Zoning Board of Appeals of Champaign County finds that:

10
11 1. Regarding the effect of the proposed text amendment on the Land Resource Management Plan
12 (LRMP):

13 A. **Regarding Goal 8 Natural Resources:**

- 14 • It will **HELP ACHIEVE** Objective 8.4 that states “**Champaign County will work**
15 **to ensure that new development and ongoing land management practices**
16 **maintain and improve surface water quality, contribute to stream channel**
17 **stability, and minimize erosion and sedimentation.”** because it will **HELP**
18 **ACHIEVE** the following:

- 19 • Policy 8.4.5 states “**The County will ensure that non-point discharges**
20 **from new development meet or exceed state and federal water quality**
21 **standards.” WITH OR WITHOUT the Optional Minimum Standards in**
22 **Section 6 and WHETHER OR NOT ILR10 Compliance will be required**
23 **by the County outside of the MS4 Jurisdictional Area; and**
24 • Policy 8.4.2 that states “**The County will require stormwater management**
25 **designs and practices that provide effective site drainage, protect**
26 **downstream drainage patterns, minimize impacts on adjacent properties**
27 **and provide for stream flows that support healthy aquatic ecosystems.”**
28 **but ONLY IF the Optional Minimum Standard in Section 6 are**
29 **approved.**

- 30
31 • Based on achievement of the above Objectives and Policies and because it will either
32 not impede or is not relevant to the other Objectives and Policies under this goal, the
33 proposed map amendment will **HELP ACHIEVE Goal 8 Natural Resources.**

34
35 B. **The proposed text amendment will NOT IMPEDE the following LRMP goal(s):**

- 36 • **Goal 1 Planning and Public Involvement**
37 • **Goal 2 Governmental Coordination**
38 • **Goal 3 Prosperity**

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

- **Goal 4 Agriculture**
- **Goal 5 Urban Land Use**
- **Goal 6 Public Health and Safety**
- **Goal 7 Transportation**
- **Goal 9 Energy Conservation**
- **Goal 10 Cultural Amenities**

C. Overall, the proposed text amendment will **HELP ACHIEVE** the Land Resource Management Plan.

2. The proposed Zoning Ordinance text amendment will **HELP ACHIEVE** the purpose of the Zoning Ordinance because:

- The proposed amendment **WITH or WITHOUT the Optional Minimum Standards in Section 6 and WHETHER OR NOT ILR10 compliance will be required by the County outside of the MS4 Jurisdictional Area, WILL** conserve the value of real estate throughout the COUNTY (Purpose 2.0 (b); see Item 16.B).
- The proposed amendment **WITH the Optional Minimum Standards in Section 6 and disregarding ILR10 compliance outside of the MS4 Jurisdictional Area, WILL** promote the public health, safety, comfort, morals, and general welfare throughout the (Purpose 2.0 (e); see Item 16.E).

3. Regarding the alternative version of the text amendment:

- A. The Zoning Board of Appeals **HAS** recommended the optional “minimum erosion control and water quality requirements” and included paragraph 6.1F. and Section 6.4 and 6.5 in their recommendation to the County Board.
- B. The Zoning Board of Appeals **HAS NOT** recommended requiring compliance with the ILR10 outside of the MS4 Jurisdictional Area and subparagraph 4.1A.4.c. in the 12.5.14 Draft **IS NOT** included in the recommendation to the County Board.
- C. The Zoning Board of Appeals **HAS** recommended requiring a fee for the Minor Land Disturbance Erosion Control Permit and paragraph 12.4B. **IS** included in the recommendation to the County Board.

4. Regarding public outreach to implement the amendment:

- A. The Zoning Board of Appeals has reviewed a Draft handout for the proposed amendment and found it to be **ACCURATE** in summarizing the proposed amendment and anticipate that the proposed Draft handout will be **HELPFUL** in communicating the erosion and sediment

1 control requirements.

- 2 B. The Zoning Board of Appeals has reviewed the revised Land Disturbance and Zoning Use
3 Permit application form and determined that the revised application form should be
4 **ADEQUATE** for use upon adoption of the proposed amendment.

5
6 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone desired to present testimony regarding Case 769-AT-13.

7
8 Mr. Thorsland called Herb Schildt to testify.

9
10 Mr. Herb Schildt, who resides at 398 CR 2500N, Mahomet, stated that in the 3/6/15 Draft Storm Water
11 Management and Erosion Control Ordinance one of the issues during previous discussion was whether the
12 enforcement was based on complaints. He said that Section 6.4.A., located on page 19, includes the
13 following: However, the lack of EROSION and SEDIMENT controls shall not itself be a violation of this
14 Ordinance unless such controls are required pursuant to either the requirements of Section 6.4.D, or a LAND
15 DISTURBANCE EROSION CONTROL PERMIT, or a STORM WATER DRAINAGE PLAN, or as such
16 controls may be required by the ZONING ADMINISTRATOR pursuant to an enforcement action. Mr.
17 Schildt stated that in order to be consistent the following text should be added at the end of the sentence:
18 “based on a valid complaint”.

19
20 Mr. Hall stated that Mr. Schildt’s recommendation sounds reasonable.

21
22 Mr. Schildt stated that Section 6.5, General Enforcement, located on page 21, should also include the same
23 text at the end of the sentence.

24
25 Mr. Hall stated that Section 6.5 could read as follows: In the event that any CONSTRUCTION or LAND
26 DISTURBANCE that is not subject to the requirement for a LAND DISTURBANCE EROSION
27 CONTROL PERMIT causes EROSION or SEDIMENTATION on any adjacent property or any adjacent
28 street or adjacent drainage ditch, roadside ditch, or stream, the ZONING ADMINISTRATOR shall take such
29 enforcement actions, pursuant to a valid complaint, as are necessary and authorized by Section 9.1.1 and
30 Section 10 of the Zoning Ordinance and consistent with Land Disturbance Erosion Controls (Section 11) in
31 this Ordinance to prevent continued EROSION or SEDIMENTATION.

32
33 The Board agreed with the revision to Section 6.5.

34
35 Mr. Hall thanked Mr. Schildt for his comments.

36
37 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone else desired to present testimony regarding Case 769-AT-13 and
38 there was no one.

39
40 Mr. Thorsland closed the witness register.

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

Mr. Thorsland asked Mr. Hall if there were any new Documents of Record.

Mr. Hall stated that there are a lot of new Documents of Record which need to be added. He said that new item #15: Supplemental Memorandum for Case 769-AT-13 dated January 15, 2015, with attachments: FFF thru JJJ; and new item #16: Supplemental Memorandum for Case 769-AT-13 dated March 6, 2015, with attachments: BBB thru MMM; and new item #17: Supplemental Memorandum for Case 773-AT-14 dated March 6, 2015, with attachments: A and B; and new item #18: Supplemental Memorandum for Case 773-AT-14 dated March 12, 2015, with attachment A; and new item #19: Supplemental Memorandum for Case 773-AT-14 dated March 20, 2015, with attachments: A-H; and new item #20: Revised Draft *Storm Water Management and Erosion Control Ordinance* dated 3/6/15 (with annotations).

Mr. Hall stated that regarding item #2 of the amendment, located on page 49 of the Draft Preliminary Finding of Fact dated January 15, 2015, the italicized statement under all of the optional parts, included in the 3/6/15 Draft *Storm Water Management and Erosion Control Ordinance* which were recommended by the Zoning Board of Appeals will indicate that the ZBA has recommended adoption of the optional paragraph but will be removed if the County Board chooses not to adopt. He said that for ILR10, Paragraph 4.1.A.4.c. which is on page 14 of the 3/6/15 Draft *Storm Water Management and Erosion Control Ordinance*, will show up as stricken and the note underneath will indicate that Paragraph 4.1.A.4.c is optional and was not recommended for approval by the ZBA. He said that the County Board will be able to see what was stricken and if they want to add it back in it will be easy for them to do so.

Mr. Thorsland entertained a motion to adopt the Summary of Evidence, Documents of Record and Findings of Fact as amended.

Ms. Griest moved, seconded by Ms. Capel to adopt the Summary of Evidence, Documents of Record and Findings of Fact as amended. The motion carried by voice vote.

Mr. Thorsland entertained a motion to move to the Final Determination for Case 769-AT-13.

Mr. Passalacqua moved, seconded Ms. Griest to move to the Final Determination for Case 769-AT-13. The motion carried by voice vote.

Final Determination for Case 769-AT-13:

Ms. Griest moved, seconded by Ms. Capel that pursuant to the authority granted in Section 9.2 of the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance, the Zoning Board of Appeals of Champaign County determines that:

The Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment in Case 769-AT-13 should BE ENACTED by the County Board in the form attached hereto.

Mr. Thorsland requested a roll call vote.

The roll was called as follows:

Lee-yes	Passalacqua-yes	Randol-yes
Capel-yes	Griest-yes	Thorsland-yes

Mr. Hall stated that the following dates should be added at the beginning of the Findings of Fact and the Summary of Evidence: February 26, 2015; March 12, 2015; and March 26, 2015.

Mr. Thorsland called for a five minute recess.

The Board recessed at 8:52 p.m.
The Board resumed at 9:00 p.m.

Mr. Thorsland stated that the Board will now review Case 773-AT-13.

Mr. John Hall, Zoning Administrator, stated that the Board has not discussed the changes that were made to this amendment and perhaps the Board has no concerns but he wanted to touch base before the Board got too deep in the finding.

Mr. Thorsland asked Mr. Hall if he is referring to the Board’s concerns regarding water wells.

Mr. Hall stated yes. He said that as it happens a requirement has recently been established for abandoned septic tanks. He said that when he checked last fall there were no requirements for abandoned septic tanks but now there are requirements. He said that an abandoned septic tank has to be pumped out and made dysfunctional which is already a requirement that is being enforced by the health department but the draft amendment states that if a principal building is being demolished and is not being replaced then the water well and septic tank must be addressed. He said that if the principal building is not a single family dwelling or a multi-family building with four or fewer units then the asbestos abatement requirements will also apply. He said that if someone is not disturbing one acre then no permit is required but these optional minimum standards still apply. He said that most of the demolition that staff will see will either be demolition of an old home after a new home is constructed or an old garage or shed that is being demolished. He said that for the most part, he does not expect staff to see very many demolition permits or even grading permits. He said that the way that this amendment is structured is that the optional minimum standards apply even if you are not disturbing an acre. He said that he has done his best to not make the other parts of this amendment any more burdensome than they already are.

1
2 Mr. Passalacqua stated that this is much like a 10' x 10' garden shed in that even though a permit is not
3 required it must be built within the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.
4
5 Mr. Hall stated yes.
6
7 Ms. Lee asked Mr. Hall to explain any exceptions with this amendment.
8
9 Mr. Hall stated that agriculture would be exempt. He said that if a farmer is tearing down an old farmstead
10 and is going to reclaim the land for farming it would be called agriculture and would be exempt.
11
12 Mr. Randol asked if a farmer has to seal the existing water well.
13
14 Mr. Hall stated that sealing the existing water well still applies but staff is not issuing a permit therefore staff
15 does not have to ask about it. He said that the way that this Ordinance is written, all of the exemptions that
16 apply in Case 769-AT-13 also apply here.
17
18 Ms. Lee asked if utility companies have to comply with this ordinance.
19
20 Mr. Hall stated that utility companies do not have to do anything with us.
21
22 Mr. Thorsland stated that at the last public hearing for this case the Board requested that staff obtain
23 information regarding wells and septic systems. He asked the Board if there were any questions regarding
24 the information that staff distributed to the Board for review.
25
26 Mr. Passalacqua stated that the only commentary about reuse is in the first paragraph of the Administrative
27 Code Section 920.120.
28
29 Mr. Hall stated yes. He said that the *Administrative Code* mentions reuse and he did not believe that Case
30 773-AT-14 needed to be burdened by it.
31
32 Mr. Thorsland stated that Mr. Burdin gave testimony at the last public hearing regarding the care that he took
33 to protect his well. Mr. Thorsland stated that he believes that people will take care of their existing wells
34 because they are a big investment.
35
36 Mr. Hall stated that staff did find an example of one county health department that has made explicit
37 provisions for reuse but our own health department does not have any explicit rules, although they are open
38 to that idea. He said that this is all up to the Health Department.
39
40 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any further questions and there were none.

1
 2 Mr. Thorsland stated that the Board could now review the Summary Finding of Fact on page 13 of the
 3 Preliminary Draft Finding of Fact dated January 15, 2015.
 4

5 **Summary Finding of Fact for Case 773-AT-14:**
 6

7 From the documents of record and the testimony and exhibits received at the public hearing conducted on
 8 May 29, 2014; June 12, 2014; July 13, 2014; September 11, 2014; December 11, 2014; January 15, 2015,
 9 the Zoning Board of Appeals of Champaign County finds that:

10 1. Regarding the effect of the proposed text amendment on the Land Resource Management Plan
 11 (LRMP):

12 A. **Regarding Goal 8 Natural Resources:**

- 13 • **If the Optional Minimum Standards in Related Case 769-AT-13 are approved, It**
 14 **WILL HELP ACHIEVE** Objective 8.4 that states “**Champaign County will work**
 15 **to ensure that new development and ongoing land management practices**
 16 **maintain and improve surface water quality, contribute to stream channel**
 17 **stability, and minimize erosion and sedimentation.”** because it **WILL HELP**
 18 **ACHIEVE** the following:
 - 19 • Policy 8.4.2 that states “**The County will require stormwater management**
 20 **designs and practices that provide effective site drainage, protect**
 21 **downstream drainage patterns, minimize impacts on adjacent properties**
 22 **and provide for stream flows that support healthy aquatic ecosystems.”**
 - 23 • Based on achievement of the above Objectives and Policies and because it will either not
 24 impede or is not relevant to the other Objectives and Policies under this goal, the proposed
 25 map amendment will **HELP ACHIEVE Goal 8 Natural Resources.**

26
 27 B. The proposed text amendment will **NOT IMPEDE** the following LRMP goal(s):

- 28 • **Goal 1 Planning and Public Involvement**
- 29 • **Goal 2 Governmental Coordination**
- 30 • **Goal 3 Prosperity**
- 31 • **Goal 4 Agriculture**
- 32 • **Goal 5 Urban Land Use**
- 33 • **Goal 6 Public Health and Safety**
- 34 • **Goal 7 Transportation**
- 35 • **Goal 9 Energy Conservation**
- 36 • **Goal 10 Cultural Amenities**

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

C. Overall, **IF the Optional Minimum Standards in Related Case 769-AT-13 are approved**, the proposed text amendment will **HELP ACHIEVE** the Land Resource Management Plan.

2. The proposed Zoning Ordinance text amendment will **HELP ACHIEVE** the purpose of the Zoning Ordinance but only **IF the Optional Minimum Standards in Related Case 769-AT-13 are approved**, because:

- The proposed text amendment will HELP conserve the value of land, BUILDINGS, and STRUCURES throughout the COUNTY (Purpose 2.0(b); see Item 16.B.).
- The proposed text amendment will HELP promote the public health, safety, comfort, morals, and general welfare (Purpose 2.0 (e); see Item 16.E.).

The Board agreed with the Summary Finding of Fact as written.

Ms. Griest noted that item #8 on page 3 of the Finding of Fact for Case 773-AT-14 should indicate WILL NOT IMPEDE.

Mr. Hall stated that item #16.B. on page 7 should indicate that the Zoning Board of Appeals HAS included Sections 6.1, 6.4 and 6.5 in their recommendation to the County Board in related Case 769-AT-13.

Mr. Hall stated that the following dates should be added to the Summary Finding of Fact: February 26, 2015; March 12, 2015; and March 26, 2015.

Mr. Thorsland asked Mr. Hall to indicate the new Documents of Record for Case 773-AT-14.

Mr. Hall stated that it would be sufficient to indicate during this public hearing that the same new Documents of Record for Case 769-AT-13 are relevant to Case 773-AT-14.

Ms. Griest stated that the Documents of Record should be revised to indicate Case 769-AT-13 and not Case 769-AT-14.

Mr. Hall stated that the Documents of Record for Case 773-AT-14 will be made similar to the Documents of Record for Case 769-AT-13.

Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any additional questions related to Case 773-AT-14.

Mr. Thorsland stated that there are no names on the witness register for Case 773-AT-14 and asked the audience if anyone desired to sign the witness register to present testimony at this time and there was no one.

1 Mr. Thorsland entertained a motion to adopt the Summary of Evidence, Documents of Record and Findings
2 of Fact as amended.

3
4 **Ms. Capel moved, seconded by Mr. Randol to adopt the Summary of Evidence, Documents of Record
5 and Findings of Fact as amended. The motion carried by voice vote.**

6
7 Mr. Thorsland entertained a motion to move to the Final Determination for Case 773-AT-14.

8
9 **Ms. Griest moved, seconded by Ms. Capel to move to the Final Determination for Case 773-AT-14.
10 The motion carried by voice vote.**

11
12 **Final Determination for Case 773-AT-14:**

13
14 **Ms. Capel moved, seconded by Mr. Randol that pursuant to the authority granted by Section 9.2 of
15 the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance, the Zoning Board of Appeals of Champaign County
16 determines that:**

17 **The Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment to amend the Storm Water Management and
18 Erosion Control Ordinance requested in Case 773-AT-14 should BE ENACTED by
19 the County Board in the form attached hereto.**

20
21 Mr. Thorsland entertained a roll call vote.

22
23 The roll was called as follows:

24			
25	Griest-yes	Lee-yes	Passalacqua-yes
26	Randol-yes	Capel-yes	Thorsland-yes
27			

28 Mr. Hall thanked the Board and indicated that both cases will be at the Environment and Land Use
29 Committee Meeting on April 9, 2015, in the John Dimit Meeting Room.

30
31 Ms. Lee stated that page 1 of the March 20, 2015, Supplemental Memorandum for Case 773-AT-14
32 indicates an item D.

33
34 Mr. Hall stated that item D was included in the legal advertisement but was not included in the Ordinance
35 because after it was included in the legal advertisement for Case 773-AT-14 the issue was dealt with in a
36 different manner in Case 769-AT-13 therefore item D. was not part of the recommendation for Case 773-
37 AT-14.

38
39 Ms. Lee stated that the legal advertisement is still out there.

40

1 Mr. Thorsland stated that sometimes the initial legal advertisement does not accurately reflect what is done
2 by the Board six months or more after it is published.

3
4 Mr. Hall stated that he will let the ZBA know if the County Board decides to add it.

5
6 Ms. Lee asked Mr. Hall if he believes that is a possibility.

7
8 Mr. Hall stated no.

9
10 **6. New Public Hearings**

11
12 None

13
14 **7. Staff Report**

15
16 None

17
18 **8. Other Business**

19 A. Review of Docket

20
21 Mr. Thorsland stated that he will be absent from the April 16, 2015, meeting. He noted that since there will
22 only be five members scheduled for the April 16th meeting it is very important for the Board to notify staff of
23 any absences. He said that he will be present for the April 30th meeting although Mr. Passalacqua and Ms.
24 Capel will be absent therefore only four members are scheduled to be present for that meeting. He requested
25 that the Board call staff immediately if they are unable to attend the April 30th meeting so that the meeting
26 can be cancelled.

27
28 Mr. Hall stated that there may reason to cancel the April 30th meeting anyway because staff has not received
29 a complete application for Case 795-S-14. He said that he is hoping that the petitioners can work with the
30 Village of Savoy but he will continue to indicate the case on the docket until he finds out something
31 otherwise. He said that the only case that could be ready for the Board's review on April 30th would be Case
32 685-AT-11. He said that Cases 799-AM-15, 800-S-15 and 801-V-15 will open on April 16th but will not be
33 completed at that hearing. He said that the Board could decide at the April 16th meeting if Cases 799-AM-
34 15, 800-S-15 and 801-V-15 should be continued to the April 30th meeting and if not there may not be a need
35 for the April 30th meeting.

36
37 Ms. Lee asked Mr. Hall if staff has received any new information regarding Case 792-V-14.

38
39 Mr. Hall stated that Ms. Chavarria has received a few things regarding Case 792-V-14 and the petitioner is
40 working on the requested information for the Board.

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

Mr. Thorsland stated that the Board should consider cancelling the April 30th meeting tonight.

Mr. Hall stated that at the County Board meeting last week the text amendment for Case 791-AT-14 received a protest from the City of Urbana although he personally believes that it was a misguided protest. He said that the County Board approved Case 791-AT-14 and Case 797-AM-15 at their March 19, 2015. He noted that only one County Board member did not vote for approval of Case 791-AT-14.

Mr. Thorsland stated that considering the possibility of at least two Board members being absent for the April 30th meeting the Board may want to cancel the meeting tonight.

Ms. Lee asked staff if they knew the status of the vacant Board seat.

Mr. Hall stated that whether or not the April 30th meeting should be cancelled should not be based on the presence of a new Board member. He said that what is critical is that it is possible that only a bare quorum of experienced Board members could be present at the April 30th meeting.

Ms. Griest stated that even if Cases 799-AM-15, 800-S-15 and 801-V-15 were continued to the April 30th meeting she cannot believe that with a bare quorum present that the petitioner would want to move to a final determination because it certainly limits their opportunities for a successful outcome.

Mr. Thorsland stated that even if a new Board member was present for the April 30th meeting that new member was not present for the opening of Cases 799-AM-15, 800-S-15 and 801-V-15 therefore it would be difficult for them to be involved in a final determination.

Mr. Thorsland entertained a motion to cancel the April 30, 2015, Zoning Board of Appeals meeting.

Ms. Griest moved, seconded by Ms. Capel to cancel the April 30, 2015, Zoning Board of Appeals meeting. The motion carried by voice vote.

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.

Ms. Griest moved, seconded by Ms. Lee to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried by voice vote.

1 The meeting adjourned at 9:24 p.m.

2

3

4

5 Respectfully submitted

6

7

8

9

10 Secretary of Zoning Board of Appeals

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
37
38
39
40
41

DRAFT SUBJECT TO APPROVAL DRAFT ZBA //

1
2
3
4