#### 2 MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING 3 CHAMPAIGN COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 4 1776 East Washington Street 5 Urbana, IL 61802 6 7 **DATE:** February 29, 2024 **PLACE: Shields-Carter Meeting Room** 8 1776 East Washington Street TIME: Urbana, IL 61802 18 6:30 p.m. **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Brian Andersen, Chris Flesner, Lee Roberts, Thaddeus Bates 11 12 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** 13 Cindy Cunningham, Jim Randol, Ryan Elwell 14 15 **STAFF PRESENT:** John Hall, Susan Burgstrom, Stephanie Berry, Charlie Campo 16 17 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Fatima Salazar, Pedro Palzan, Troy Parkhill, Abby Heckman, Debra Griest, 18 Ray Griest, Becky Kesler 28

### 1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

24 25

### 2. Roll Call and Declaration of Quorum

26 27

21

22 23

The roll was called, and a quorum declared present.

28 29

30

31

Mr. Hall stated that the Board had a quorum, but the Board is without their regular chair, so when the chair isn't present, the Board members that are present have to elect among themselves a chair for the evening and entertained a motion for nominations or volunteers, they do have to have a chair. He said he wishes they had the Jeopardy music to play at a time like this.

32 33 34

Mr. Andersen stated that he would volunteer as long as he could get some help, he doesn't want to make any mistakes.

35 36 37

Mr. Hall entertained a second motion.

38 39

Mr. Andersen moved, seconded by Mr. Flesner, to nominate Mr. Andersen as the chair for tonight's meeting. The motion carried by voice vote.

40 41 42

Mr. Anderson informed the audience that anyone wishing to testify for any public hearing tonight must sign the Witness Register.

43 44 45

# 3. **Correspondence** – None

46 47

**4. Minutes** – January 25, 2024

48 49

Mr. Anderson requested a motion to approve the January 25, 2024, minutes.

50

Mr. Roberts moved, seconded by Mr. Flesner, to approve the minutes from January 25, 2024. The motion carried by voice vote.

I	
2	
3	

5. Audience participation with respect to matters other than cases pending before the Board -None

4 5

**6. Continued Public Hearings** – None

6 7

7. **New Public Hearings –** 

8 9

# Case 128-S-24

10 Petitioner: Fatima Salazar and Pedro Palzan, d.b.a. Roof Panther and K2 Builders LLC

11 12

13

14

Request: Authorize a Special Use Permit for a Neighborhood Home Occupation that exceeds the maximum allowed number of vehicles in the AG-2 Agriculture Zoning District per Section 7.1.1. of the Zoning Ordinance, subject to the proposed variance in Case

131-V-24.

15 16 17

18

19

A 0.43-acre lot in the Southeast Quarter of the Northeast Quarter of Section 10, Township 19 North Range 9 East of the Third Principal Meridian in Urbana Township, commonly known as the residence with an address of 903 North High

Cross Road, Urbana.

20 21

22

### Case 131-V-24

Location:

23 Petitioner:

Location:

Fatima Salazar and Pedro Palzan, d.b.a. Roof Panther and K2 Builders LLC

24 25

26

27

Authorize a Variance for a Neighborhood Home Occupation with parking that is 0 Request: feet from the front lot line and side lot lines in lieu of the minimum required 10 feet from the front lot line and 5 feet from the side lot lines in the AG-2 Agriculture Zoning District, per Section 7.4.1 A.3. of the Zoning Ordinance.

28 29 30

31

32

A 0.43-acre lot in the Southeast Quarter of the Northeast Quarter of Section 10, Township 19 North Range 9 East of the Third Principal Meridian in Urbana Township, commonly known as the residence with an address of 903 North High Cross Road, Urbana.

33 34 35

37

38

39

40

41

36

Mr. Anderson informed the audience that this case is an Administrative Case, and as such, the County allows anyone the opportunity to cross-examine any witness. He said that at the proper time, he will ask for a show of hands from those who would like to cross-examine, and each person will be called upon. He said that those who desire to cross-examine do not have to sign the Witness Register but will be asked to clearly state their name before asking any questions. He noted that no new testimony is to be given during the cross-examination. He said that attorneys who have complied with Article 7.6 of the ZBA By-Laws are exempt from cross-examination. He asked if the petitioner would like to outline the nature of their request.

42 43 44

Mr. Anderson informed the audience that anyone wishing to testify for any public hearing tonight must sign the witness register by which you solemnly swear that the evidence that you present will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth so help you God.

46 47

45

48 Mr. Anderson invited the petitioner to make a statement outlining the nature of their request prior to 49 introducing evidence.

Fatima Salazar, 903 North High cross Road, Urbana, stated that she has been a member of this community since 2005 when she came to town to attend the University of Illinois and after that she never left because she fell in love with the town and she met her husband in this town, and they formed their family. She said they own two local businesses here in town and offer exterior services to all of Champaign County, they are a home-based business and as soon as they found out they had to apply for a Special use Permit to be allowed to have more than the allowed vehicles, they did so, and that is why they are here this evening. She said they run their business from home and have their home office, but they bring services to Champaign County residences, so every morning they take off from their home, then meet customers and clients at their home, and they preform exterior services, such as, roofing, siding, gutters, windows, additions, decks, etc. She said to give them a little bit more of information since she realized now that she didn't mention it, so at their home they use their driveway to park their vehicles overnight. She said usually the vehicles that are parked at their home are the trucks that they use to move their dump trailers from jobsite to jobsite; the only time they have all of these vehicles together is in the winter when they aren't working outside, so all of their vehicles are in their driveway during the winter, but during their season they are mainly on jobsites, they might park them overnight in case they get home in the evening, then they have to wait until the next morning for the recycling center to open up, then they take the dump trailers to be dumped. She said in the time they have been living there, they never have had any accidents, or posed a danger to any of their neighbors, and they are here to ask that the Board please allow them to continue to be able to park vehicles at their home. She said their goal is to be able to have a commercial location for their business and they are working towards that goal, but for the time being they are asking the Board if they can be permitted to continue to park their vehicles there until they are able to make that move to purchase a commercial site.

Mr. Andersen asked if the Board had any questions.

Mr. Flesner stated that her last statement, kind of answered the questions that he had for her, so he knows in the paperwork, that they have one employee that works for them, and he usually arrives around 7:30a.m. He said everybody's goal is to expand their business, so in case of expansion, do they have people meet them at the job site or do they come to their property and park their vehicles there as well?

Ms. Salazar said that is correct, they do have one part-time employee at the moment, so he does park his vehicle on their property, then switches into one of their trucks and drives to customers' homes, and he helps them manage the projects.

Mr. Flesner said if he is reading this correctly, but in case of expansion maybe people don't want 15 or 20 vehicles parked on their lot. He asked if there were plans to have employees drive to a jobsite to meet up, take home trucks, or something along those lines.

 Ms. Salazar said they are aware that any reputable company that has a commercial site is able to promote their business and hire more staff, so they understand that it is essential for them to secure that commercial location before they hire more people. She said eventually their goal is to have a commercial location and be able to hire more people, and they are mindful in the sense that they are not going to hire ten to 15 people and have 10 to 15 different cars on their property, and have that become a problem, so they don't plan to have a large number of employees anytime soon.

Mr. Roberts asked how long the remodeling on the house will go on.

Ms. Salazar asked if he meant the current remodeling that is taking place right now.

Mr. Roberts said yes.

Ms. Salazar said she believes their permit allows them one year, but they plan to have it completed before summer.

Mr. Roberts said they have enlarged that house quite a bit, and it looks good.

Mr. Flesner said it really does.

Mr. Andersen asked if there were any more questions from the Board.

 Mr. Hall told Ms. Salazar that his view of vehicles at a home occupation, is that they are business vehicles, and the Zoning Ordinance requires business vehicles, when there are more than four, to be screened. He said in their case given how many vehicles they have indicated on their site plan, he thinks it would require a lot of screening. He said it remains to be seen if the Board will require that, but if they would, he thinks they would need to see a better parking layout that is a little more detailed, but he appreciates what they have done to date. He said they hired the surveyor to survey their lot and they found out that the property is completely wrong in the GIS database, and their lot is much different than what it appears; he thinks there is room for screening. He said the other thing is that there have been some complaints about mud being tracked onto the street from vehicles parking off of the paved area and asked them if they would be willing to add more paved parking if the Board thinks that is necessary. He said that he knows all of this could end up being expensive, and they would need a better site plan to show exactly what they are proposing or what the Board wants to see and asked if they would be willing to do something like that.

 Ms. Salazar said yes Mr. Hall, we are willing to comply with whatever the Board deems necessary. She said in terms of screening, they are not opposed to that; the reason why they are here is because they found out that they had to apply for a Special Use Permit and they want to make sure that they do the right thing, and that they are following the proper ordinances, so if they require them to have screening, they are not opposed to that. She thinks part of the cases were to be allowed to add additional pavement that he mentioned, so they don't have any vehicles parked between where the road meets the grass – the area that causes the mudding issue. She knows that as part of the permit they were asked to move an existing shed that is near the garage, so they plan to move that closer to the south side of the property by where the trees are. She said that will free up that area by the garage, and they plan to pave that area, so they can get every single vehicle off the concerned area that he mentioned.

Mr. Hall said okay and thanked her.

Mr. Andersen asked if anyone would like to cross-examine this witness. Seeing none, he thanked Ms. Salazar and told her that they had someone else that would like to testify for this case, and if she could have a seat for a minute.

Ms. Salazar thanked them.

Mr. Andersen called Debra Griest to the testimony microphone and asked her to state her name and address.

Debra Griest, 1802 Cindy Lynn Street, Urbana, stated that she owns the property at 3210 East Anthony Drive, which is directly northeast of the subject property and offset by the intersection. She served on the

# AS APPROVED 03/28/24

Champaign County Zoning Board of Appeals for 15 years and chaired it ten of those years and sympathizes with the difficult decision they have in front of them. She said the purpose of her appearance tonight is to formally object to the approval of the Special Use Permit and Variance requested in Cases 128-S-24 and 131-V-24. She has observed the growth and operations of these two businesses since the owners purchased the property and began operations several years ago and since then the businesses have steadily grown, which is a good thing. She said although somewhat seasonal, the number of commercial and employee vehicles on this site continues to increase and become problematic. She said operations of the businesses appear to be seasonal as one might expect in the roofing and construction business, and during the busy times of the year there are vehicles, trailers, and equipment that are frequently parked in the yard, ditch, and along the roadway. She said several vehicles show up at the subject site each day and workers take the commercial vehicles and trailers to the work sites, but employee and family member vehicles remain at the site and on multiple occasions the vehicles have parked on the non-impervious surfaces leaving ruts in the road ditches resulting in tracking large amounts of mud onto the roadway, and she is the one that complained about mud on the roadway.

Ms. Griest said the petitioner states that they have only one non-family member employee, which is a regular employee, and that may be accurate at this time. She said these family member employees do not appear to live in the residence at the subject site, which creates the same traffic and parking problem as regular employees. She is requesting that non-resident family member employees be considered as regular employees, as they impact the operations and neighborhood in the same manner as regular employees. She said the subject site is a single-family residence located among other single-family residences and should be regulated in such a manner. The subject site borders a single-family residence within the City of Urbana on the south boundary line. She said Anthony Drive borders two sides of the property, which is the only access to the surrounding homes and farmland beyond the subject property, and when vehicles are parked on or near the roadway, it restricts access to these properties and eliminates the ability of the farmers to access their fields and the other residents to receive services. She said vehicles have been parked on the shoulder of the roadway resulting in the garbage truck being unable to provide garbage pick-up for the other residences on the street.

Ms. Griest said although conceptually, she supports Neighborhood Home Occupation businesses, but she strongly believes that these are not suitable Neighborhood Home Occupation businesses at this location. She said that this lot does not even meet the minimum lot size requirement for a rural lot under the current Zoning Ordinance being less than a half-acre. She understands the lot was developed prior to the existing Zoning Ordinance, but the Neighborhood Home Occupation regulations were developed with the current lot size requirements in mind, and this lot was specifically designed for residential use and does not contain adequate space for the additional proposed businesses operations. She said it is not like a customary rural lot under today's standards with extra square footage and significant setbacks; the current operations significantly detract from the intended residential use of the property and negatively impact the appearance of the neighborhood. She said this request is not even minimally suited for the requested operations at this location, the existing operations have already impacted the ability of the neighbors to receive services, and the existing operations have outgrown the available space and need to be permanently downsized or relocated to a commercial space.

Ms. Griest regrets that the petitioner believes they do not have the financial resources to move operations to a commercial location, however, they have demonstrated significant recent growth, substantial modifications to the residence, and stated continued and anticipated growth. She said other companies in the same businesses in the county are certainly able to provide similar services at competitive prices while operating from commercial locations, therefore, she does not believe that the claim of financial constraint is a valid justification for approving this request and should be removed from the summary of evidence

#### **AS APPROVED 03/28/24**

and not considered as justification for the approval of this request. She holds no ill-will toward the petitioners or their businesses, but simply believes this is not a suitable location for the commercial operations they are conducting and requests that the ZBA deny their request – she has prepared copies for everyone.

Mr. Andersen asked if there were any questions from the Board or Staff. Seeing none, he asked if anyone would like to cross-examination this witness. Seeing no one, he thanked Ms. Greist and asked if anyone else would like to present testimony. Seeing no one, he entertained a motion to close the Witness Register for Cases 128-S-24 and 131-V-24.

Mr. Bates moved, seconded by Mr. Flesner, to close the Witness register for Cases 128-S-24 and 131-V-24. The motion passed by voice vote.

Mr. Andersen asked if the Board had any response to the testimony that they heard. Seeing none, he asked Ms. Salazar if she had something else she would like to say.

Ms. Salazar thanked them for allowing her to say a couple more things. She said the testimony that Ms. Griest gave was the first time they have heard of someone having issues with their garbage being picked up, and if they had been made aware of that, then they would have done something to address that. She said they have been renting this property since 2017 and wanted to clarify that, because Ms. Griest had mentioned that they purchased this property and have been doing this for several years, but they just recently purchased the property in 2023. She said while they have shown growth in their company and have their customers in their community to thank for that, they started as a handyman service company and have grown into a full exterior construction company. She said their goal is to eventually have a commercial location, but having a commercial location requires at least one, to one and one-half million dollars to be able to purchase that. She said her husband and her built this business from scratch back in 2017, so everything that they have done, they have learned on the go and are learning as they are growing, and like she mentioned, eventually their goal is to have that commercial location and are working very hard every day to be able to meet that goal, but for the time being, that is why they are here asking for approval of the Special Use Permit, so they can continue to work toward that goal of having that commercial property.

Mr. Andersen asked the Board how they felt about having the petitioner return with a better plan of what the parking situation is going to look like and potentially adding some screening and what not to help alleviate some of the concerns.

 Mr. Flesner said he agrees with some better parking, and please correct him if he is wrong here, but he is curious about if they added a seconded driveway on the property, however, he is not sure of the regulations for driveways per household. He said if they added a rocked driveway on the west side of the house would that make a difference, because they wouldn't see it driving on High Cross Road, but they would see it if they drove down Anthony Drive. He isn't certain how that works yet, but if they added a secondary driveway behind the house, especially now that they have added a large addition to the second story of the house, they wouldn't see it from a main thruway.

 Mr. Hall said granting a second driveway entrance would be up to the highway commissioner, so even if the Board required it, it would be up to the highway commissioner whether he thinks a second driveway should be allowed. He said one thing the Board might want to consider is that a second driveway might be advisable if the petitioner can't accommodate parking by improving where they are already parking. He said putting himself in the position of a neighbor, it's like oh gee, another driveway would be another

eight vehicles, when will this end, so he thinks the Board has to be prepared to know how much is reasonable and how much is too much. He said if the Board wanted the petitioner to investigate that, then check with the highway commissioner to see if they can get a second driveway entrance and what would that look like with the ultimate goal being to minimize the impact on neighbors while still at least accommodating the current number of vehicles and things like that. He said if the Board even thinks that there is room to expand beyond this site plan showing seven vehicles, but not all of them are powered, because some he thinks are trailers.

Ms. Salazar said yes.

Mr. Hall asked her what the break down is on how many are vehicles and trailers.

Ms. Salazar said one enclosed trailer, two dump trailers, two company trucks that are in operation full time, two other company vehicles that are on the property at all times, and their family vehicle.

Mr. Hall said the Board needs to consider that the request is based on this number and do they want to cap that at that.

Mr. Bates said based off those numbers, they are already short; two, two, two, and two individuals – that
 is eight.

Mr. Hall said he was thinking some of those are just their personal vehicles and not their business vehicles.

24 Ms. Salazar agreed.

26 Mr. Bates said one was a family vehicle.

28 Mr. Hall said okay.

30 Mr. Bates said that would give them their seven and they are already expecting more growth.

 Ms. Salazar said she would like to clarify that at the moment they do have those vehicles and as Mr. Flesner asked, they are not planning to purchase any more vehicles other than the ones they already have. She said there is no cause for concern that they are going to bring in more vehicles than what they currently have and cause more of an issue, they are trying to work with the Board in granting them permission to park their vehicles in different areas on the property, so they can get them away from the ditch area.

Mr. Andersen asked why the employees that have the vehicles that are coming and parking there every day don't just take the vehicles home with them, and then the vehicles are not on the property anymore.

 Ms. Salazar said that is something they could consider if that is what the Board feels. She said the only concern with that is, that the employee that they have is a part-time employee, so sometimes he works Monday through Wednesday and every other week he works Monday through Thursday, so if he is taking the vehicle home and they have to use it. She said the reason why they have their four trucks is because they have the power to be able to pull the dump trailers, so if they remove a truck and he keeps it at his home, then now they are down to just one vehicle. She said when they have multiple projects going on and they have to remove dump trailers from customers homes to go take them to the recycling center to dump, then it kind of puts them in a tight spot where they only have one vehicle going and picking up the dump trailers to dump while the projects are ongoing.

Mr. Andersen asked if Mr. Flesner had a question.

Mr. Flesner said yes, he is trying to think how to word this and is guessing this is the best way for him to start and asked her how many employees they have.

Ms. Salazar said that they have one part-time employee, and it goes back to the question that they asked about growth. She said part of the reason they are not able to retain full-time employees is because they don't have a location, so if they were to put themselves into the shoes of someone looking to work with them, they don't have a location, then they might think twice about applying to work with them, because they don't have a commercial location, but they only have one part-time employee right now.

Mr. Flesner said that is where his question lies and he hopes he is not out of order saying this, but the Board just asked you about a take home truck for an employee to get one vehicle removed their driveway, that still leaves them with another vehicle there for the other owner or whomever would drive that. He said their two employees are already covered with vehicles, so he guesses he is confused with that, they are worried about it, because he works three days one week and four days the next week, and if they have two projects going on, he guesses he is confused by that, so he apologizes.

Ms. Salazar said she was answering the question on the suggestion that was made about if an employee takes a truck home with him, then that way he doesn't have to bring his vehicle on site. She said the only concern with that is on the days that he is off work, that vehicle is going to be on his property.

Mr. Flesner asked if they still had another vehicle.

2728 Mr. Flesner said okay.

Ms. Salazar said yes.

30 Mr. Bates asked if they have four company vehicles for one employee.

Ms. Salazar said they are different, so she will try to explain it.

34 Mr. Bates asked if they had one employee for four vehicles, that is yes or no.

36 Ms. Salazar said they have one part-time employee.

Mr. Bates said for four vehicles.

Ms. Salazar said the four vehicles are different, so they have a Mazda.

Mr. Bates said he understands, he has seen the vehicles because he has been there, but something is not adding up here. He asked if this business only has one part-time employee.

45 Ms. Salazar said one part-time employee.

47 Mr. Bates asked if anybody else works.

Ms. Salazar said that her and her husband are co-owners, and they wear multiple hats in their business, so

they are engaged in the full operation of the business working from 6:00 a.m. to midnight every single day.

Mr. Bates said that would be a total of three employees and asked if that was correct.

Ms. Salazar said yes.

Mr. Bates said three total employees at this company.

10 Ms. Salazar said yes.

Mr. Bates said that was the question and this point he is not comfortable moving forward with the way this plan sits. He said the only recommendation that he could come up with is to either potentially look at an offsite location for rental or a proposed screening plan.

16 Mr. Flesner said he agrees with the new information.

Mr. Andersen said it looks like there is somebody else that would like they want to speak on this and would the Board entertain reopening the Witness Register for Cases 128-S-24 and 131-V-24.

Mr. Bates moved, seconded by Mr. Flesner, to reopen the Witness Register for Cases 128-S-24 and 131-V-24. The Motion passed by voice vote.

Mr. Andersen asked if Pedro Palzan could please state his name and address prior to his testimony.

Pedro Palzan, 903 North High Cross Road, Urbana, stated that he is co-owner of the two companies that were just mentioned – Roof Panther and K2 Builders. He said first of all he really wants to thank the Board for hearing him out and Ms. Griest for bringing her complaints to them, because this is the first time that they have had complaints, they usually have nothing but compliments from their direct neighbors. He said their neighbors have said ever since they have started renting that they have been improving, because they believe that if they are going to be in business, then they have to project that from their own living, so that is their mindset. He said someone is always going to see him around the house picking up limbs, cleaning up, and spreading some grass seed here and there. He really wants to share his strategy with them, because they experienced growth, and thanks to the community, it has been really great growth. He said it is also because they like to do things right, and that being said, there is questions like the vehicles not adding up to the employees, they had one other employee that was part-time, but they had to fire him last year because he was not responsible and they had another employee that would come in maybe one or two days because he would rather do Uber, and as his wife, Ms. Salazar, had mentioned, they haven't been lucky enough to retain the right employees, because they don't have a location to secure them a good work site on where to start the day and have a breakroom or bathroom – properly for the employees.

- Mr. Palzan said the goal is to hire employees and do kind of like what the Board had mentioned on giving the employees a vehicle, because the type of employees that they are looking for are salespeople. He said just like when they see other companies out there driving their truck and taking it to their house; their goal is to be able to hire the right person to become their salesperson or project manager, so their strategy is to get those proper candidates, provide them a vehicle, so they can go and sell the jobs or manage the jobs. He said as of right now they are not planning on buying any more vehicles, because they are still a sixfigure company, they only invest and reinvest in their business, that is why they see the improvements that they see, because as he stated earlier, if they project their skills, then people will come to them and

want to hire them. He said that is what happened when they were renting their house, they had some concerns and shared them to their landlord, and he told him he was willing to do the job if he paid for the material, because they really have a big problem with water coming inside of the house and need to get rid of the concrete porch, because it is messing up the rim joist and mice are coming in. He said their landlord told them let's do it, so he upgraded and built a nice front porch, and somebody showed up and said, they really liked what he did and asked if he could build them one.

Mr. Palzan said that has been going on, on, because they see how they perform on their own services, that is what he wanted to share with the Board, they have a plan, and for this year it isn't gaining more vehicles, but hiring the right salesperson to represent them to the community, because they don't want to just hire anybody. He said once they find the right candidate through the proper funnels by doing everything that has to be done like a background check and proper everything, they are going to provide them a vehicle, so they can take it home, then they will have less vehicles at their home. He said one of those vehicles is their Mazda, which was their first vehicle, they haven't moved it and it is dusty; they believe in retaining assets, it their mindset that they don't like to sell stuff, they like to keep their vehicles. He said one of the other vehicles is a small Titan, which was their first business vehicle, and it hasn't been moved and is parked on the side. He said the goal is to have a vehicle for somebody to be able to sell jobs and another vehicle for somebody to be able to manage those jobs, because eventually they are going to grow into a commercial building whenever they reach the right funds to get to that level. He said they might project a lot of growth and that they are wealthy, but they are in the process, and they use everything that they have to reinvest and grow their generational wealth.

Mr. Andersen asked if there were any questions from the Board. Seeing none, he asked if there was any cross-examination for this witness.

Debra Griest, 1802 Cindy Lynn Street, Urbana, asked the petitioner if she heard him testify that they have inoperable vehicles on the site.

Mr. Palzan said yes at the moment they have two small vehicles that they have been parking there, they don't get rid of them, because their goal is that they want to grow, and they want to have a vehicle for somebody to come in and take it home.

Ms. Griest asked him if these were their business vehicles or personal vehicles.

Mr. Palzan said one is a personal vehicle and the small Titan truck was their first business vehicle that they had, it can't pull a lot of weight, so they can't use it for moving all those big trailers.

Ms. Burgstrom asked Mr. Palzan if she heard him correctly; are the vehicles operational that are sitting there or are they not operable.

Mr. Palzan said they are operational and asked if she meant do they function.

Ms. Burgstrom said okay.

45 Mr. Palzan said yes sorry, he misunderstood them, but all of the vehicles function.

Ms. Griest said is there anything that prevents them from putting them in storage since they are not operating them to reduce their footprint.

1 Mr. Palzan said right now there is nothing but financial, but the goal is to hire the right people, so they can give them their own vehicle.

Ms. Griest said okay and thanked him.

6 Mr. Palzan thanked her.

Mr. Andersen thanked them and asked if anybody else would like to cross-examine this witness. Seeing none, he entertained a motion to close the Witness Register.

Mr. Roberts moved, seconded by Mr. Bates, to close the Witness Register for Cases 128-S-24 and 131-V-24. The motion carried by voice vote.

Mr. Andersen said it is looking like they might want to continue this case, and can the Board help out here on what they are specifically looking for from the petitioners.

Mr. Roberts said he thinks the petitioners should look into the what the road commissioner has to say about putting in another driveway on that southwest corner, so they can put a pad back there to park extra vehicles, but he doesn't know how the grade works there, because it looks like there is kind of a deep ditch, but he supposes they could put in a culvert and cover with it rock, and go that direction, then that would enable the petitioners to put some vehicles back there, so they wouldn't be so crowded on the road.

Mr. Andersen said he is thinking that some screening would be a good idea there and asked if that is something the Board would like the petitioners to look into.

Mr. Bates said yes, he thinks screening options would be important.

Mr. Flesner said he agrees with the screening options especially now, since he has looked more at the overview of the house.

Mr. Andersen told the petitioners that the Board was looking for three things from them. He said screening options on the north side, potentially the other driveway access, and maybe a more concrete plan on what the parking situation is going to look like at either location, that is kind of the ask from the Board.

Mr. Palzan said they are not opposed to the screening option, they are here to work this out with the Board and staff, and they appreciate helping with their suggestions and whatever there is that needs to be done. He said the only thing that they need is a little bit of time, because as he stated, they like to reinvest in the company and are going to get to position where they are going to be able to buy a lot and build and go from there and he thanked them.

Mr. Andersen asked the Board what they were thinking about for the possible date for the continuance, it looks like the first date is April 11, 2024, but they have a solar case that day.

44 Mr. Bates asked if that would be enough time.

Mr. Andersen asked Mr. Palzan if that would be enough time for them on April 11, 2024.

Mr. Flesner said he is sorry, but he doesn't remember which solar issue this is and asked if this is the one by Homer.

1	
2	Mr. Andersen said yes.
4	Mr. Flesner said okay.
6 7	Ms. Burgstrom said Sidney.
8 9	Mr. Andersen said Sidney.
10 11	Mr. Flesner said between Homer and Sidney.
12 13	Mr. Andersen said Frito Lay.
14 15	Mr. Flesner said yes.
16 17 18	Mr. Andersen asked Mr. Palzan if that would be enough time for him to get back to the Board and staff with the information that they have requested.
19	Mr. Palzan asked if it was April 1, 2024.
21 22	Ms. Burgstrom said April 11, 2024.
23 24	Mr. Palzan said April 11, 2024, that should be enough time.
25 26	Mr. Andersen asked Mr. Palzan if he thinks he can be ready by April 11, 2024 with the Boards requests.
27 28 29	Mr. Hall asked Ms. Burgstrom if she thought they would have enough time on April 11, 2024 given the issues with the solar farm.
30 31	Ms. Burgstrom said yes.
32 33 34	Mr. Flesner said he is concerned about the other residents in that neighborhood hearing about it and the meeting having ten times more people there, that is why he was curious about April 11, 2024.
35 36	Ms. Burgstrom said all those neighbors were notified.
37 38	Mr. Flesner said okay, nope, perfect.
39 10	Ms. Burgstrom said that is one thing that –
41 12	Mr. Flesner said that works for him then.
13 14	Mr. Andersen said he doesn't think there were nearly as many concerned neighbors on this case. He entertained a motion to continue Cases 128-S-24 and 131-V-24 on April 11, 2024.

Mr. Flesner moved, seconded by Mr. Roberts, to continue Cases 128-S-24 and 131-V-24 on April 47 11, 2024. The motion carried by voice vote.

48 49

Mr. Andersen thanked the petitioners.

Mr. Palzan thanked them.

Mr. Bates asked Mr. Hall if this would go before or after the solar farm case.

Mr. Hall said normally it would go after, but the Board can rearrange that agenda how they see fit.

## Case: 129-AM-24

Petitioner: Troy Parkhill

Request: Amend the Zoning Map to change the zoning district designation from the R-1 Single Family Residence Zoning District to the B-4 General Business Zoning District.

Location:

A 1.81-acre tract in the Northeast Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of Section 15, Township 20 North Range 7 East of the Third Principal Meridian in Mahomet Township with an address of 503 South Lake of the Woods Rd, Mahomet.

Mr. Anderson informed the audience that anyone wishing to testify for any public hearing tonight must sign the witness register for that public hearing.

Troy S. Parkhill, 365 Wayne Street, Mahomet, stated that they were requesting to rezone this property and back when he was younger it was a bakery called Donaldson's Wedding Cakes and Bakery, and it is adjacent to the rest of their property in that general area and it has industrial behind it, commercial to the south, and residential to the north, they just picked up the property and paid a small fortune for it. He said they are looking to do an apartment type situation in the top of it with general business in the bottom and it will be another roofer, and he is looking to put in a little show room and have a spot where he can store some shingles, rolls of tar paper, and stuff like that, then he will have some dump trailers and stuff he will need to park out back of this property.

Mr. Andersen asked if there were any questions from the Board for this witness.

Mr. Parkhill said it fits in on what is going on in that area.

Mr. Bates asked if he already has a company that is interested in this.

Mr. Parkhill said Abraham Martinez with Topline, he is currently in Mahomet on Illinois Route 47 and runs a nice business that is always organized.

Mr. Andersen said just to be clear, the business already has commercial property and is looking to relocate their business here.

Mr. Parkhill said no, this property fronts the commercial property, well no, commercial properties to the south of them have industrial behind them, but he is in Mahomet in a building that he has been renting.

Mr. Andersen said okay, that is what he wanted to confirm, he is already in a commercial property even though he might be renting it.

Mr. Parkhill said he would imagine it is commercial.

1 Ms. Burgstrom said correct, commercial.

Mr. Parkhill said yes, but his lease is coming up in December 2024.

5

Mr. Andersen said for himself, this is kind of similar to the case that they just heard before this case. He has some of the same concerns that he had before with the other case and wants to make sure they are being a good neighbor to everybody, and the fact that the company is leasing a property already, he doesn't know if that would justify changing the zoning for the business.

Mr. Hall said he wanted to let the Board know that they have received a formal protest from the Village of Mahomet, and with Village protests, they don't go into why they are protesting, it is just a simple statement of protest and that triggers the requirement for County Board approval to 17 of 22 members. He said this Board can do what they want with the protest, they could try to figure out if there are issues that could be dealt with. He said with rezoning they don't recommend a lot of conditions, but they have recommended one very simple condition tonight on maintaining a 30-foot wide vegetated buffer along the north boundary of the property, he wouldn't want to get much more complicated from that, because it is legally risky, but again, when they have a municipal protest, the more you know about what the protest is about, then maybe there is something that can be done, but maybe not. He said that he thinks that they are going to get testimony tonight from the Village of Mahomet's Planner, so that will be key testimony, and he apologizes for not having copies of the protest, but again, there wasn't a lot of detail in it and there doesn't need to be, it was just a formal protest.

Mr. Flesner asked Mr. Parkhill if this roofing business would be essentially leasing the entire property, is it just the house and the garage, or is it all three buildings.

Mr. Parkhill said he will be leasing the whole property.

Mr. Andersen said he didn't think that the Board had any more questions, so they are going to move onto the next witness.

31 Mr. Parkhill said okay.

33 Mr. Andersen thanked him.

35 Mr. Parkhill thanked them.

Mr. Andersen said he was going to go off the list here and called Abby Heckman to the testimonymicrophone.

Abby Heckman, Village Planner for the Village of Mahomet and representing the Board of Trustees for the Village of Mahomet, asked if she could ask a question of Mr. Parkhill's testimony or is that not appropriate right now.

Mr. Hall told her that she could ask the Board her questions, then they can elicit a response from Mr. Parkhill.

- Ms. Heckman said great and thanked him. She said as Mr. Hall had mentioned, the Village Board of
  Trustees reviewed the case information that was prepared by the Department of Planning and Zoning staff
- 49 at the Village of Mahomet's meeting this past Tuesday, their Board of Trustees voted to submit a formal

protest, that protest was delivered and filed with the County Clerk yesterday and she does have a copy of it, although Mr. Hall is correct, it doesn't go into detail, but she would be happy to try to provide them additional information.

3 4 5

6

7

8 9

10 11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22 23

1

Ms. Heckman said this property is within the Village of Mahomet's Extraterritorial Jurisdiction (ETJ) and it is adjacent to the Village of Mahomet's limits on three and a quarter of the sides. She said the future land use map for the Village of Mahomet identifies this property as single-family as it has been used up until this point and she would like to point out that right now there is a current residential driveway approach access off of East McDougal Road, so a commercial access would require a permit from the Village of Mahomet for access from East McDougal Road from this property, that has not been permitted or requested at this point. She would like clarification on where they plan to store materials and vehicles, because the current driveway doesn't have access to the rear of the property at all including the outbuilding, so she is curious on how they plan to access that with vehicles and other things without doing any exterior improvements at all, which is what was stated in the written documents provided. She said she would also like to mention that this property she is assuming has a well and septic, she did contact Jeff Blackford with Champaign County Health Department and he indicated that they don't have a record of a septic system being there, but he did say that at the time when this would have been constructed there would have been regulations in place, but they may not have been issuing permits at that time. She said another question would be in the written documents the applicant has stated that it is a functioning septic system, but just because the toilets flush doesn't mean that it is necessarily functioning properly and she is curious as to what proof or investigation has been done related to that, because water and sanitary sewer is available to this site and it is within 300 feet of the property and she would expect that connecting would be an option for them. She said going back to the septic, this property is covered with trees, so trees interfere with leach fields, so she is just curious as to the functionality of the septic system.

242526

27

28

29

30

31

32 33

34

35

36

37

38 39

40

41 42 Ms. Heckman said the Village of Mahomet Board of Trustees is looking to protect the Extraterritorial Jurisdiction, especially things that are directly adjacent and would like consistent development standards with what is provided within the Village of Mahomet. She said from her understanding the State of Illinois building code for commercial properties requires certain building requirements including fire safety between residential and commercial, but she doesn't know if any of those things are being addressed by the petitioner. She said Americans with Disabilities Act parking is usually required as part of an office setting for commercial properties, they just don't have enough information to make a determination on whether it would be a good fit or not, she mentioned to the Department of Planning and Zoning staff that they would like Mr. Parkhill to come to them to talk about rezoning upon annexation and about things they could do to work together; Mr. Parkhill indicated to the Department of Planning and Zoning staff that he wasn't interested, so she has not had direct communication with Mr. Parkhill related to this project. She said she would also like to point out that as part of their Land Resource Management Plan goals; there are many policies in here that talk about incorporated municipalities and development in general that is within the Extraterritorial Jurisdiction or adjacent in consistency with development standards. She said she is a little confused why this isn't considered new development, she realizes they are using an existing structure, but they are completely changing how it is being used, so she would like to point to those policies and point out that there are many in here that she doesn't believe this project helps achieve those, but she will be happy to answer any questions that they have.

43 44 45

Mr. Andersen asked if there were any questions from the Board.

46 47

Mr. Roberts said lots, but he doesn't know how to put it all together right now.

Mr. Anderson asked if there were any comments from Staff. Seeing none, he told Ms. Heckman that there were no questions, and they were going to call the next witness to testify – Becky Kesler.

Becky Kesler, 407 South Lake of the Woods Road, Mahomet, stated she is the property north of this property and has a common property line on her south border and their north border. She said her concern is that this property is covered with trees and plants, and the gentleman that owned it and sold it was one of the people at Lake of the Woods, so he worked with all the gardens and had a lot of this type of material there. She said the house has been empty about a year, and her concern is that the property is zoned residential for a single-family, and it was zoned that way when Mr. Parkhill purchased it, and he knew what it was, so now he is trying to change the zoning, which will affect her greatly, so that is what she is concerned about. She said she doesn't particularly want a construction company right next to her house and that is what this would be. She said he has already said that the construction company is going to be leaving equipment and trucks around that area, and she would think they would have to be cutting down all the trees, because they have a huge number of trees, she means, it is Lake of the Woods Road. She said she just wanted the Board to hear that from her and asked if the Board had any questions.

Mr. Andersen asked if there were any questions from the Board or Staff.

19 Mr. Hall asked her if she was the small lot that is next to this property or the next lot to the north.

Ms. Kelser said the small lot.

Mr. Hall said okay, and asked her if she was familiar with the special condition that they have proposed about having an augmented 30-foot-deep vegetative buffer between this property and their property.

Ms. Kesler said she doesn't know about the depth, but she knew they have mentioned some type of space there, and another thing that is unusual is that these lots were developed before there were any rules and they were County, so her property line is very unusual looking. She said his property comes right up to her driveway, so when she says she would have a construction company in her living room, it is almost that way. She said she is worried about that even being enough depth between the two properties, she means, they are talking about a construction company with lots of vehicles and different things going on, and how about people who would be parking coming into this business, then would there be extra vehicles parked there. She said she thinks there is a lot of questions, and she doesn't understand, because he bought the property knowing it was zoned for a single-family and now he wants to change it.

 Mr. Hall said as an adjacent property owner, they have seen the Village of Mahomet lodge a formal protest, but as an adjacent property owner that shares the property line with this property, she also has a right to make a formal protest, but her protest won't have as much of an effect as the Village of Mahomet's protest. He said if she would like to make that protest, then she can give them a call at the office, they recommend that be in place before the County Board votes on this, but that is something she might want to consider.

Ms. Kesler said the next gentleman would probably be interested as well, so she will talk to him.

44 Mr. Hall said okay.

Ms. Kesler said so there are two of them that have a common property line.

Mr. Hall said okay, and he doesn't know if this Board would be interested, but he would be interested to know if 30 feet isn't enough, then is there any buffer that would be adequate to ease their concerns.

Ms. Kesler said she doesn't know because this is her retirement home, and somebody comes in and says they are going to put a construction company next to her house, and because of the odd shapes of the property, she would say that his property line is within 10 feet of her garage. She said she knows they can't build that way now, but they used to do that stuff, so those are her concerns.

Mr. Hall said that is all he has and thanked her.

Ms. Kesler said okay.

Mr. Andersen asked if there were any other questions from the Board. Seeing none, he thanked Ms. Kesler and asked if anyone else would like to testify. Seeing no one, he entertained a motion to close the Witness Register for Case 129-AM-24.

Mr. Flesner moved, seconded by Mr. Bates, to close the Witness Register for Case 129-AM-24. The motion carried by voice vote.

Mr. Andersen asked the Board what they were thinking about this potential business and is there something they need to see differently about this development.

Mr. Flesner said after hearing testimony from Ms. Heckman from the Village of Mahomet, they have to figure out a way to get commercial vehicles in and out first of all, but if this is just a residential driveway, and in one of the pictures in the packet, it looks like it is a rock road, which he is not certain if that is exactly what it is or not. He said he doesn't know the size of the roofing company or anything, but if they are moving semis in and out, they are going to have to make sure the culvert is big enough in general and that it would be rocked from South Lake of the Woods Road to even pull in there and that there is enough of an area to pull trucks in to even get to this back building since Mr. Parkhill that they are going to use all three buildings.

Mr. Parkhill said they have a big entrance, they have semis in the back of that industrial site that drop off motors and cars.

Mr. Flesner said he can see that, but he doesn't see any place on the property inside this black box that shows his property can get a semi in there.

36 Mr. Parkhill said they wouldn't be bringing a semi up that close to the house.

Mr. Andersen said okay hold on here, he needs to come up to the testimony microphone—give them just a minute and they will give him a chance.

41 Mr. Parkhill asked if they would like him to come back up to the testimony microphone.

Ms. Burgstrom said yes come on up.

Mr. Andersen said he can come up, but just give them a minute here, they are still discussing.

- Ms. Burgstrom said that her and Charlie went out to visit the site and that is where those pictures came from, and one thing they were wondering about is access to that rear yard, because there is a guy-wire that
- is in between the let her look at the proper location.

Mr. Parkhill said the buffer is going to be a lot more than 30 feet.

Mr. Andersen said if he doesn't mind to please give them a minute for his comments.

Mr. Parkhill said okay.

Mr. Flesner told Ms. Burgstrom that it was the very bottom picture on the first page, he sees the guy-wire there.

 Ms. Burgstrom said she didn't measure when they were out there, but if she had to guess it is maybe ten to 12 feet between the guidewire and the corner of the garage, so it would be a question for the potential tenant on how they exactly plan on getting in and out of there, if they need to have an entrance on South Lake of the Woods Road or what is the plan in her opinion.

Mr. Bates asked Mr. Hall that since it was stated that it is going to be an apartment and a business, then does that change what the requirements would need to be for the septic, and their mention of parking, then would the Americans with Disabilities Act be required.

Mr. Hall said Americans with Disabilities Act would be Required if they are adding parking, but they haven't seen a site plan yet and don't usually ask for much of a site plan for rezoning, because if this is rezoned, then any site plan that they see today can be out the window the next day. He said how he understands it is that the dwelling will be occupied by the owner of the company, and he can't imagine that a roofing company has septic loading but that depends on how many employees they would have on site. He said in the Zoning Ordinance this is not something that they would require any documentation about septic system capacity or anything like that. He said as the Board, they can ask questions like that, that is why they are the Board, if they have that concern, then they should ask that question. He said long term, if the septic system does fail, then his recollection is that they would have to connect to a sewer system that is within 200 feet.

Mr. Bates said his question is more about rezoning from residential to B-4 and asked if that changed anything with the septic.

Mr. Hall said the septic is based more on the use, in fact, it is based only on the use, so if the use is, in fact, a resident apartment with a contractor's facility, he is not aware that the Champaign County Health Department would even require anything when there is only a change of use like this, but he could be wrong, but he has never heard of that, they can check into that if the Board would like.

Mr. Bates said he was trying to get the questioned answered from what was presented from Ms. Heckman with the Village of Mahomet, that she couldn't ask directly, so he was trying to ask for the group.

Mr. Hall told him that he could ask the petitioner, for example, has the septic tank been cleaned out recently, because septic tanks should be cleaned out once every three to five years to continue working properly. He said the property has been vacant for a year, so that would be the place to start with how good of a septic system do they have in total, but this septic system is so old that he doubts there are any records, because it was from a time when the State of Illinois would have done any permitting, but permitting at that time was pretty sketchy and was more uncommon than common.

Mr. Flesner said with the home being built in 1973, in all honesty, it is probably less than a 1,000-gallon

tank, because now the code is 1,500-gallon per dwelling. He said Mr. Parkhill did mention that they were going to have to have a showroom on the first floor and an apartment on the second floor, so he doesn't know what Mr. Parkhill is considering a showroom and asked if it was just going to be roofing and siding or is it going to be tile flooring, or is this going to be like a TSI where they are going to have 1,500 people in there a day.

5 6 7

8

9

10

1

2

3

4

Mr. Parkhill said it would be their show cards, which are made out of cardboard with the siding colors on it, shingles, and stuff like that, but it would be more offices on the first floor, then there is a garage attached to the side of the house on the west, then that is where the little showroom will be. He said the two-car garage parallel with East McDougal Road, that is going to get taken down, because it is in a bad spot and then the parking is going to be on that concrete pad.

11 12

Ms. Burgstrom said she could speak a little bit to the Accessibility Code; any change in parking or landscaping for parking will trigger the need for accessible parking, so it can't just be a concrete pad, it has to have signs, be striped, and all that stuff.

16

17 Mr. Parkhill said okay.

18

Mr. Hall said the Board can ask the petitioner for a better site plan of how they would plan to redevelop this for the proposed use, but again, that site plan might be interesting, but it is nothing that they can hold him to.

22

Mr. Roberts said he would be interested in seeing how they are going to access that other building on the west side.

25

26 Mr. Parkhill said that one in the very back.

27

28 Mr. Bates said yes.

29

30 Mr. Flesner said himself as well.

30 31

Mr. Parkhill said they are going to have a driveway off East McDougal Road that comes in back behind there to access it.

34

Mr. Roberts asked if they were going to remove all the trees, shrubs, and stuff back there.

35 36

Mr. Parkhill said they are going to save as much of it as they can, but some of that stuff has got to go, he was big into flowers and trees, that was his deal, but they are going to try and keep as much of it as they can, and especially over towards the north going up South Lake of the Woods Road, that is all going to stay the same.

41

42 Mr. Andersen said something he would like to see is where exactly the septic system is located, so they 43 can make sure that the septic system isn't going to be driven over in any way trying to access that garage 44 back there to the west.

45

Mr. Parkhill said no, the septic system is in front of the house on the south side between the asphalt parkinglot that Roger put in and the house.

48

Mr. Flesner said that might be where the septic tank is, but where is the leach field, because there is no

1 way that there is a leach field on the south side of that house.

Mr. Roberts agreed.

Mr. Parkhill said correct, he said their guess is as good as his where the leech field is at, that thing was put in back in 1957 when the house was built.

Mr. Flesner said it couldn't have been put in back in 1957 if the house was built in 1973.

10 Mr. Parkhill said what now.

Mr. Flesner said oh, it says pre 1973 that the house was built and apologized to him.

Mr. Flesner said when he purchased the property; most of the time when someone purchases a rural home like this and there is a septic tank, they have to have a septic tank inspection and asked him if he had a septic tank inspection.

Mr. Parkhill said they just located it, he had no idea where the septic tank was until a couple weeks ago,they haven had any inspection done yet.

21 Mr. Flesner asked him where the well was on this property.

Mr. Parkhill told him the well is back to the west in front of that metal shed. He said see this little white dot, that is another shed with the pressure tank and everything inside of it and the well is next to that.

Mr. Flesner said he would definitely recommend that they have a septic inspection done or something along those lines to at least know where the leach field is located in accordance with the well, because he has to be 100 feet no matter which direction anyways now.

Mr. Hall said one problem with old leach fields is even the Champaign County Health Department doesn't recommend probing, because probing for it can damage the system and with an old system once any part of it is damaged, then the whole system will probably have to be replaced. He said it might be that having someone pump the septic tank, they might be able to make an educated guess as to where the leach field might be located, but that is always a challenge on these old systems is knowing what they consist of without damaging them in the process.

Mr. Bates said at this point he doesn't feel like they have enough information to make a decision to move forward tonight, he guesses the recommendations he has is to come back with a septic inspection, a plan of the layout and use with at least the intent of where he is going, so they have an idea of how it is going to look. He said he would strongly encourage to meet with the Village of Mahomet's Board and discuss any other options with them, because with the protest it does make it very difficult with the County Board the way it is currently made up.

Mr. Parkhill said they are patiently waiting for the sewer to come up to them.

Ms. Heckman asked if she could say something really quick.

48 Ms. Burgstrom said Ms. Heckman can respond to that particular comment.

1 Mr. Andersen asked Ms. Heckman if she would like to comment.

Ms. Heckman said she can and let me go over here.

Ms. Burgstrom said they would have to reopen the Witness Register for Case 129-AM-24.

Mr. Andersen entertained a motion to reopen the Witness Register for Case 129-AM-24.

Mr. Bates moved, seconded Mr. Flesner, to reopen the Witness Register for Case 129-AM-24. The motion carried by voice vote.

Abby Heckman, Village of Mahomet Planner, said to respond to that and Mr. Hall's statement about 200 feet. She said the Village of Mahomet's ordinances say 300 feet, but maybe 200 feet is what the County's rule says. She said there is water running adjacent along East McDougal Road, so it is available; the sanitary sewer, the woman that testified before, her home is currently served by sanitary sewer. She said right now it uses a private lift station that takes it across the street to Windwood Lane where there is a lift station there that gets it into the gravity system. She said they have a planned utility project that is going for bid by the summer, that will extend gravity sewer from the corner of South Lake of the Woods Road and Illinois Route 150/ East Oak Street north along the frontage of this property to eliminate the private lift station for the home of the woman that testified previously, and to be available to serve other folks as septic systems fail in that area, because they are all very old on very wooded lots, and they are anticipating that will happen naturally over time, so hopefully that clarifies.

Ms. Burgstrom asked Mr. Andersen if she could ask a question.

Mr. Andersen said she could go ahead.

Ms. Burgstrom asked Ms. Heckman if the extension of the sewer line along this property triggers the requirement that they would have to annex, or can they go ahead and stick with their septic field until they want to connect to sewer.

 Ms. Heckman told her that the Village of Mahomet's ordinances don't apply to people outside of the Village of Mahomet, she assumes the Champaign County Health Department would notify them when someone requests a permit or to work on their septic systems, and then at that time they would be required to annex into the Village of Mahomet to receive water and sanitary sewer services.

Mr. Bates said so he is clear on understanding, if they hook up, then they will be annexed into the Village of Mahomet.

Ms. Heckman said correct.

Mr. Andersen asked Ms. Heckman if she had anything else.

44 Ms. Heckman said no.

- Mr. Andersen asked if there were any questions from the Board or Staff. Seeing none, he thanked Ms.
- Heckman and entertained a motion to reclose the Witness Register for Case 129-AM-24.

49 Mr. Flesner moved, seconded by Mr. Bates, to reclose the Witness Register for Case 129-AM-24.

The motion carried by voice vote.

Mr. Andersen said one comment he had on this was that it seems like there is potential there for maybe the cart before the horse a little bit with rezoning and this property could potentially end up in the Village of Mahomet anyways. He would hope that they could get some of the Village of Mahomet's concerns addressed on what Mr. Hall was saying about meeting with the Village of Mahomet to go over the septic system, because it being so old not knowing where it is, he would like to know where it is and a better plan even if they can't hold them to it, so they have a better understanding. He would feel a lot more comfortable if he knew the potential that it is going to be in the Village of Mahomet anyway.

Mr. Flesner said he would agree too with that, because if the septic tank is where Mr. Parkhill says it is on the south side of that house, and lets just say the leach field runs straight to the west, which he is sorry he put that picture away, but they are going to have to dig a culvert somewhere in there for trucks and everything to get back into that back west shed. He said they could essentially be driving over their leech field, they might have to have it scoped, it is something for Mr. Parkhill to look into, so he doesn't end up hurting himself in the long run with this property, because to even have a backhoe drive over his leech field, then it would be gone.

Mr. Andersen said he wants to make sure that they are clear to Mr. Parkhill what the Board is needing from him. He said they are needing a clear total overview of it, but they want to know the septic location and potentially a good educated guess on where the leech field is from the guy servicing it. He said that is what they are asking Mr. Parkhill, if they are going to have him continue it and asked them if there was anything else.

Mr. Bates said he would like to see a report that it is functioning not just a location.

Mr. Andersen said okay.

Mr. Bates asked if that would make made sense.

Mr. Hall said he doesn't know if you can do report like that, the only way to determine if it is functioning is they put in a load and see if it's treated the way it is supposed to be; he doesn't know how to do that in a septic system.

Mr. Andersen asked if Mr. Flesner could speak on that.

Mr. Flesner said all septic tanks have water already in them as long as it is not above the leech field area, they should theoretically be good, but if they know where the leech field is and can see it in their yard where the grass grows a lot taller than the rest, then typically they have a problem. He said right now it is too early to tell, but once the grass greens up, then they could actually go out there and walk it, and go hey, they know the leech field is right here, especially if it is as old as what he thinks it possibly is. He asked if Mr. Parkhill would agree.

 Mr. Parkhill said he doesn't think they are going to find the leech field because it is pretty rough back in there as they can see with all the trees, under growth, and everything. He said he found it two weeks ago, so they are going to go over and take the dirt off the top of it, but most of it is already gone, it looks like he had been doing something with it when they previously had it pumped. He said they will get Berg Tanks and they'll have it pumped, and check it out, but yes it is old and has been there forever.

1 Mr. Hall said Berg Tanks could possibly make a report about the level of water when they open the tank 2 and what that might indicate about how well it functions.

3 4

Mr. Parkhill said oh yea, if you have a bad leech field that stuff is going to be bubbling out of that tank, and it's going to be a wet, soggy, and smelly mess.

5 6 7

8

9

Mr. Flesner said if Berg Tanks can pump it for him, but the only people around here that he knows that actually does septic tank inspections is Gulliford Septic and Sewer. He said when he bought his house and he is in the plumbing and pipefitting trade, so he can vouch that Gulliford Septic and Sewer does septic inspections.

10 11

Mr. Andersen said to be clear, they are looking for some kind of septic inspection from somebody like that as well with the other things, so they have a better idea.

14

Mr. Flesner said in the interest of everybody involved with Mr. Parkhill included, if his leech field heads to the west and he covers it with concrete or whatever, then he is dooming himself.

17

18 Mr. Parkhill said he understands.

19

Mr. Hall said to clarify, the Board also wants to see a proposed site plan for how the roofing company is going to use the property, so they have a clear idea of that including the shed removal, new parking, and how they are planning to get access for deliveries and if that is going to require a new driveway entrance. He thinks the Board would want to know that he can get a new driveway entrance.

24

25 Mr. Bates said he thinks that is important because they are not going to be issuing that permit, correct.

26

27 Mr. Hall correct.

28

Mr. Bates said they could go through all of this and actually not have the access granted for what they are trying to use it for; he thinks it is important that he works with the County and the Village of Mahomet to get some further answers before they can make a decision on rezoning.

31 32

33

34

Mr. Andersen said he is in agreement with that, and they need to look at the calendar here to see when to continue this case. He said April 25, 2024 is the soonest they can hear him again and asked if he thought he would be able to come up with those answers they requested from him by that time.

35 36

37 Mr. Parkhill said sure, they can work on it and asked if he said April 25, 2024.

38

39 Mr. Andersen said yes that is there first available date.

40

Mr. Hall said they would like to have anything he can provide at least a week and half before, that way they can have it packaged up and send it out to the Board members, so they get a chance to spend the whole weekend soaking it in before they come back for the meeting.

44

45 Mr. Andersen entertained a motion to continued Case 129-AM-24 to April 25, 2024 meeting.

46

47 Mr. Roberts moved, seconded by Mr. Bates, to continued Case 129-AM-24 to April 25, 2024 48 meeting. The motion carried by voice vote.

8.	Staff Report
----	--------------

Mr. Hall said there is no staff report, but he wanted to remind them that they have Ms. Burgstrom for one more public hearing and then Mr. Campo will be taking over for her, so their goal is to have things keep moving smoothly.

Ms. Bates thanked Ms. Burgstrom and told Mr. Campo good luck.

Mr. Andersen thanked her.

### 9. Other Business

A. Review of Docket

Mr. Andersen asked if there were going to be any upcoming absences and there were none.

 Mr. Roberts told Mr. Hall that a few weeks ago they had a young man come in from Wilbur Heights about the building, parking lot, and he was going to turn it into an auto repair shop or something, and he had to move a lot of vehicles and make room, so it wouldn't be so cluttered. He goes by there frequently because it is on the way to the recycle place and it doesn't look like he has done anything except add more cars to it.

Mr. Hall said they would take a look at that, and he hasn't done anything on it himself recently, but they will follow up on that.

Mr. Roberts said he was just wondering if he had changed plans or had contact them or what, but it seems like that whole Wilbur Heights area seems to be growing and growing.

Mr. Hall said one of his neighbors has already been through court and had a decision against them, and they haven't changed how they operate, and they are working with the State's Attorney on that. He said Mr. Malik has been much more cooperative and had taken care of things during the time when the court case was going on, but it sounds like they need to go back and pay another visit.

### 10. Adjournment

Mr. Andersen entertained a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Bates moved, seconded by Mr. Roberts, to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried by voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 8:21p.m.

42 Respectfully Submitted,

Secretary of the Zoning Board of Appeals