

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

CHAMPAIGN COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

**1776 E. Washington Street
Urbana, IL 61801**

DATE:	January 28, 2021	PLACE:	ZOOM MEETING
			Jennifer Putman Meeting Room
			1776 East Washington Street
			Urbana, IL 61802

TIME: 6:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: *Using Zoom in Lyle Shields:* Ryan Elwell, Jim Randol, Larry Wood
Remotely via Zoom: Tom Anderson, Marilyn Lee, Lee Roberts

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: *Using Zoom in Lyle Shields:* Lori Busboom, Susan Burgstrom, John Hall

OTHERS PRESENT: *Remotely via Zoom:* Adam Kimball, Mark Dixon

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:36 p.m.

2. Roll Call and Declaration of Quorum

The roll was called, and a quorum declared present.

Mr. Elwell informed the audience that anyone wishing to testify for any public hearing tonight must sign the witness register for that public hearing. He reminded the audience that when they sign the witness register, they are signing an oath.

3. Correspondence - None

4. Approval of Minutes – None

5. Continued Public Hearings – None

6. New Public Hearings

Cases 995-S-20 & 996-V-20: Petitioners: Adam & Jodi Kimball

Request: Case 995-S-20: Authorize multiple principal structures on the same lot consisting of self-storage warehouses previously authorized in Cases 977-S-20 and 979-V-20 and a sign structure with four off-premises freestanding advertising signs as a Special Use in the B-3 Highway Business Zoning District, subject to approval of the variances requested in related Case 996-V-20. Case 996-V-20: Authorize the following variances for the Special Use Permit requested in related Zoning Case 995-S-20 for proposed off-premises signs in the B-3 Highway Business Zoning District, per Section 7.3.5 of the Zoning Ordinance: Part A: A variance for four off-premises freestanding advertising signs on one sign structure on one frontage that total 1,152 square feet in sign face area in lieu of the maximum allowed one off-premises sign per frontage that totals 300 square feet in sign face area. Part B: A variance for four off-premises freestanding advertising signs on one sign structure

1 with a maximum height of 37 feet in lieu of the maximum allowed 30 feet. Part C: A variance for
 2 four off-premises freestanding advertising signs on one sign structure in addition to an on-premises
 3 sign along the same IL Route 47 frontage, in lieu of the maximum allowed one sign per frontage.
 4 Part D: A variance for four off-premises freestanding advertising signs on one sign structure with
 5 a setback of 64 feet from the street centerline of IL Route 47 and a front yard of 23 feet, in lieu of
 6 the minimum required setback of 85 feet and front yard of 35 feet along a State highway.
 7 Location: A 3.36-acre tract in the South Half of the Northeast Quarter of Section 9, Township 19
 8 North, Range 7 East of the Third Principal Meridian in Scott Township, and commonly known as
 9 the tract just east of the residence with an address of 285 CR 1675N, Seymour.

10
 11 Mr. Elwell informed the audience that anyone wishing to testify for any public hearing tonight must sign
 12 the witness register for that public hearing. He reminded the audience that when they sign the witness
 13 register, they are signing an oath.

14
 15 Mr. Elwell informed the audience that this Case is an Administrative Case and as such, the County allows
 16 anyone the opportunity to cross-examine any witness. He said that at the proper time, he will ask for a
 17 show of hands or a verbal indication from those who would like to cross-examine, and each person will
 18 be called upon. He said that those who desire to cross-examine will be asked to clearly state their name
 19 before asking any questions. He noted that no new testimony is to be given during the cross-examination.
 20 He said that attorneys who have complied with Article 7.6 of the ZBA By-Laws are exempt from cross-
 21 examination. He asked Mr. Kimball to outline the nature of his request.

22
 23 Mr. Kimball, 1103 Farm Lake Dr, Mahomet, said that the Board is familiar with the location from the
 24 previous zoning cases. He said that he has been approached by local businesses about advertising at the
 25 location. He said it is a high traffic area with Interstate 72 and Illinois 47, but yet it is kind of out in the
 26 middle of nowhere. He said that his thought is to help direct folks to local businesses, whether it is banks,
 27 landscapers, Realtors or whatever the business is. He said that looking at the square footage compared to
 28 the requirements, it appears to be a lot more than what is allowed. He said the packet also mentions there
 29 are four sign faces; he just wants to be clear that it is one sign structure with two signs facing north and
 30 two signs facing south. He said the standard billboard you see is 24 feet by 48 feet, and this would be half
 31 that size. He said that it is more than the allowable square footage, but he thinks that with the location and
 32 the long views, that you have being out in the middle of the county there, when you approach the sign,
 33 you are approaching it from a ways away. He said he thinks it is not too big, it is half the size of a normal
 34 billboard, but it does need to be a certain size for the functionality to do its part. He said he thinks it will
 35 be good for the community and local businesses, and from the feedback he received he believes that. He
 36 said that having two sides versus one side, there is a point at which, to be able to put the investment in for
 37 the structure, you do have to have multiple opportunities there. He said he thinks it is important to get the
 38 two sides, or as it is written in the packet, the four sign faces, to give local businesses the opportunity as
 39 well as be able to handle the cost to put the structure in. He said he has had a conversation with the one
 40 neighbor, the Burdettes; he does not see them in the meeting here, but it was a positive conversation. He
 41 said he tried to illustrate what it would look like, and gave them examples of other signs, and Mr. Burdette
 42 seemed to be okay with it and saw it as part of developing the area. He said that he had some visuals, and
 43 offered to share his screen to show the Board the view of what he thinks it would look like coming from
 44 the north and south on IL 47, and he thinks that illustrates the size.

45
 46 Mr. Elwell said yes, he thinks it would be very beneficial to the Board to have a visual of what we are
 47 talking about. He said he was a little disappointed that we did not have it in the packet.

48
 49 Mr. Kimball said that was his fault, and that there is a structure drawing done by a third party in the packet

1 for reference. He displayed a picture from inside a vehicle on IL47 facing south. He said as you get closer,
2 you can begin to process what is on the sign. The next picture is from a vehicle coming off the I-72 bridge
3 heading northbound on IL 47. He said that the temporary sign that he has on the property that says “coming
4 soon” is 12 feet. He said that he knows it is not the best drawing, but he wanted to give the Board an idea
5 of what the sign structure would look like as you are going down the road at that proposed size of 12 feet
6 by 24 feet. He said there is also a variance request on the height, so the maximum height is 30 feet, and
7 he is asking for 37 feet because the engineer structure has it 13 feet off the ground. He said that he could
8 probably reduce that, but would not want to go any more than 10 feet, to take it from 37 feet to 34 feet,
9 but that would again be above the allowable height of 30 feet. He said that the third part of the variance,
10 he is not requesting an additional sign for the storage facility on IL 47. He said that his intention was to
11 communicate to Ms. Burgstrom that the entrance will be off the country road there, but maybe that still
12 counts toward the maximum number of signs. He said that he doesn’t know if variance part C is really
13 required, because the smaller “Mahomet Seymour Storage” sign will be on the road north of the facility.
14

15 Mr. Elwell said that it is his understanding that the billboard structure will not be for his self-storage
16 facility; it would be for advertising. He asked Mr. Kimball if it was correct that he is proposing two signs:
17 one that is off the county road at the entrance, and then the billboard structure.
18

19 Mr. Kimball said yes.
20

21 Mr. Elwell asked if it was correct that the “Mahomet Seymour Storage” sign would be on the country
22 road, and Mr. Kimball would lease the billboard signs out.
23

24 Mr. Kimball said that is correct. He said that the Mahomet Seymour sign is more directional, to let people
25 know where the entrance is, and would be limited in size. He said that the intent of the billboard structure
26 is for people to see and then go into Mahomet or Farmer City or wherever this local business is, and they
27 can go into this restaurant in Farmer City and they now know because they saw this sign.
28

29 Ms. Burgstrom asked Mr. Kimball to zoom in a little more on the second photo to see the billboard drawing
30 better. She said that she has a bit of an issue with this drawing, and she understands that this picture is just
31 trying to give us a representation of what this billboard is. She said that she was out there at the site, and
32 she knows that the existing sign that faces parallel to IL 47 is about 14 feet high. She said that the petition
33 says that the height of the billboard will be 37 feet. She said she knows that the billboard is going to be a
34 bit farther beyond the temporary sign, but she thinks that the way this is represented does not give an
35 accurate picture of what the Board should actually consider. She said that the sign is really going to look
36 about twice as tall as what the temporary sign shows, and the bottom of the bottom billboard sign would
37 be almost as tall as that temporary sign. She said that she also measured the temporary sign at 12 feet
38 wide, so she also thinks that the billboard is going to look wider than what is shown there, maybe not by
39 much, but some.
40

41 Mr. Kimball said that Ms. Burgstrom was correct, and that this drawing was just a quick representation
42 that is not drawn to scale. He said that the billboard is a lot farther back than that temporary sign. He said
43 it could be a little bit bigger than what you see here, but not by a lot. He said that he thinks the conceptual
44 visualization that he was trying to represent is here, but it is not to scale.
45

46 Ms. Burgstrom said that she appreciates Mr. Kimball doing this drawing, because she knows how hard it
47 is to grab a photo and try to gauge a little sketch onto a photo and have it to scale. She said in this case,
48 the Board should know that the pole of the billboard will be a little bit more to the left than what is shown
49 in the photo, because it is supposed to be on the northeast corner of the proposed easternmost self-storage

1 building. She said that nonetheless, it is quite a bit smaller than what she would anticipate seeing in reality.
2
3 Mr. Kimball said that another thing that he thinks we can see from this picture is that the sign is not that
4 far away; he took it after turning off of I-72 onto northbound IL 47, and you cannot read that 12 feet by
5 12 feet temporary sign. He said that as you get closer, you can see it says “now leasing” but he really can’t
6 see it. He said that he thinks that from a functional perspective, there is a certain size that you need to
7 reach for the sign to be functional. He said that if we get too small, he does not think it will be functional.
8 He said it is not a sign that is in town where you are driving at 30 miles per hour; it is 45 miles per hour
9 and you are viewing this from a long distance.
10
11 Mr. Wood asked if 37 feet was taller than the power poles shown.
12
13 Mr. Kimball showed another view from the exit ramp of I-72 onto northbound IL47. He said it is a
14 prominent view where your vehicle is stopped, you are looking right, and you see the sign. He said that
15 compared to the allowable 300 feet in sign face, this does not present well, it is a lot more than that. He
16 said that the point he is trying to make is that there is a certain functionality of the sign, and that is why it
17 was strategically proposed to have 12 feet by 24 feet sign faces; he felt it was the smallest they could go
18 and still be functional. He said the smaller you go, the less cost, so he is motivated to reduce it, versus like
19 a 24 feet by 48 feet sign face, which is kind of a standard size of what you would see off a highway. He
20 said he does not want to go too much smaller because he does not think that it would be readable from
21 these views.
22
23 Mr. Elwell asked Ms. Burgstrom how far back the sign would sit compared to the easternmost building.
24
25 Ms. Burgstrom said that she knows it is supposed to be right on the corner, but she does not know how far
26 off it has to be for installation.
27
28 Mr. Elwell said it seems to him that it will be closer to the intersection of the interstate compared to the
29 county road.
30
31 Mr. Kimball said it would be the country road, at the corner of 1675N.
32
33 Ms. Burgstrom asked how far from that corner it would be.
34
35 Mr. Kimball said he did not have the drawing in front of him, but it would be right at the corner of the
36 building, so maybe 40 feet from the north property line, and maybe 35-37 feet off the east property line.
37 He said the dimensions are noted in the submittal. He said that you take the setbacks that are required for
38 the first building there, and it would be at the northeast corner of that building.
39
40 Mr. Wood said it shows 37 feet from the east property line, and 57 feet from the street centerline of CR
41 1675N.
42
43 Mr. Randol said that the existing sign is located at the beginning of the approach to the interchange.
44
45 Mr. Wood said that those power poles are between 30 and 35 feet, so the sign will be taller than the power
46 poles.
47
48 Mr. Kimball said yes, if they are 35 feet, then the top of the sign would be about the height of the pole or
49 a couple feet above that. He said that the top of the power line is a good reference point.

1 Mr. Elwell asked what process Mr. Kimball would have to go through to get the Board a graphical
2 representation of what the sign would actually look like, or something that is a little bit more realistic or
3 to scale.

4
5 Mr. Kimball asked Mr. Elwell if he had seen the engineered drawing in the packet.

6
7 Mr. Elwell said yes, but being able to take this full page and try to lay it over what he would actually be
8 seeing is kind of hard to see right now.

9
10 Mr. Kimball said yes, and that is why he put these images together.

11
12 Mr. Elwell said that the images are not what he is going to see.

13
14 Mr. Kimball asked Mr. Elwell if he could see the top of the power pole in the sketch, and said that the
15 billboard structure would be roughly the same height. He said that if he had this professionally done, it
16 would show the sign just a tad bit higher than that.

17
18 Mr. Elwell said that is what he is asking for.

19
20 Mr. Kimball referred to another image, from a southbound vehicle approximately at the intersection of IL
21 47 and CR 1675N. He said that the sketch shown is taller than a pole that is farther south from it.

22
23 Mr. Elwell said that the sign sketch is not taller than the two posts that it is in between.

24
25 Mr. Kimball said the third pole shown would be south of the sign, and the two closer ones are north of the
26 sign sketch. He said that he guesses his point is that it is not going to look much different than this sketch,
27 maybe a little bit. He said he put some thought into the program that he used, and tried to do the best he
28 could, and if it were professionally done, it would not look a lot different.

29
30 Mr. Randol said that where Mr. Kimball is proposing to put the sign, IL 47 is already on an incline
31 approaching the overpass, so he thinks that the billboard structure is too close to the interchange to serve
32 as an obstruction and distraction for traffic. He said there is a lot of traffic on CR 1675N. He said he does
33 not know the traffic count currently, but at one point he knows it was hitting pretty close to 700 vehicles
34 per day. He said you have all of that traffic coming on to IL 47, trying to get off of IL 47 to go west on I-
35 72. He said that he thinks having a sign of that magnitude that close to the interchange would be a
36 distraction. He said that he is on the Seymour Fire Department, and he can say that between 1675N and
37 the south side of the IL 47 overpass, they make in a year's time probably 4 to 5 accidents in that stretch
38 and it is because of heavy traffic where people are either trying to go west on CR 1675N or trying to leave
39 the interstate onto IL 47. He said that a sign that close to the interstate is a problem.

40
41 Mr. Kimball said he would echo what Jim said; there is heavy traffic in that area and he thinks that is one
42 of the reasons he is getting so many contacts from local businesses, to be able to direct them to Seymour,
43 Mahomet, Farmer City or wherever it might be. He says he thinks that is kind of a good reason to locate
44 a billboard because of the outreach it could have. He said that the location is kind of a crossroads to the
45 small towns in the area. He said that if he is taking a certain route every day in his commute, maybe he is
46 not aware of a small business in Mahomet.

47
48 Mr. Randol said that if you are running that route as an everyday commute, you already know the
49 businesses that are in Mahomet. He said that he does not see that as being a plus for the area.

1 Mr. Wood noted that the variance being requested is four times the size of what is allowed, which is pretty
2 exorbitant.

3
4 Mr. Kimball said yes, he agrees. He said that Ms. Burgstrom mentioned that to him, and it does not present
5 itself very well, but it does need to be a certain size to be functional. He said he doesn't want Mr. Randol
6 to think he is not respecting what he is saying, he does, but he has had multiple local businesses approach
7 him. He said that he thinks that small businesses see a benefit to it. He said he does appreciate Mr. Randol
8 saying that the locals know where businesses are at.

9
10 Ms. Burgstrom asked Mr. Kimball if this sign structure would move forward financially for him if it were
11 reduced to two faces, one in each direction, and would therefore have a reduced height that would not
12 need that height variance.

13
14 Mr. Kimball said he does not see working with two faces. He said that he thinks if the actual size itself
15 was a problem, maybe reduce the sizes of the faces. He said he prepared a matrix that shows different
16 sizes. He said the current proposal is around 1,100 square feet in sign face area, and that is a lot when
17 compared to the 300 square feet allowed. He asked what it would do to reduce it to 1,000, 900 or less, and
18 said that he put together the matrix to share that if they would like. He said that if reducing the size is the
19 solution here, but he thinks doing the four sign faces is very important, because that is the opportunity for
20 the local businesses.

21
22 Mr. Randol asked Mr. Kimball if he had considered this sign when he approached the Board about the
23 self-storage warehouses to start with.

24
25 Mr. Kimball said no, he had not. He said that he put up the temporary sign to do some market analysis on
26 what type of storage people are looking for. He said that he was getting calls from local businesses that
27 were interested in being on that temporary sign. He said it was kind of something that came through with
28 market research.

29
30 Mr. Wood asked what the benefit would be to Mr. Kimball.

31
32 Mr. Kimball said that the benefit to him is twofold. He said for one, the return on investment on a long-
33 term real estate investment, and also, he thinks it is good for the community and the local businesses. He
34 said that he says that because of his personal interaction with these businesses and their desire. He said
35 that like any real estate venture, it is a long-term return on investment; you invest money into it, and
36 eventually you will break even.

37
38 Mr. Anderson said that he was at the site yesterday, and looked at the handout, which said it had a variance
39 for four off-premises freestanding advertisement signs. He said that he assumed they were completely off
40 the premises, somewhere else. He asked if that was correct.

41
42 Ms. Burgstrom said that when we refer to an off-premises sign, we mean that it will be on the subject
43 property, but will refer to businesses or whatever that are not on the subject property. She said an on-
44 premises sign would be advertising for the business or entity that is on the subject property.

45
46 Mr. Anderson asked where the four signs would be on the premises.

47
48 Mr. Kimball said that the four signs would be on one structure on one pole, and there would be two 12
49 feet by 24 feet sign faces on two sides facing north and south.

1 Mr. Anderson said that Mr. Elwell's suggestion of a diagram would help.
2
3 Mr. Kimball asked Mr. Anderson if he had the packet.
4
5 Mr. Anderson said yes.
6
7 Mr. Kimball said that there is a dimensioned engineered cut sheet product data of the sign from the
8 manufacturer in there.
9
10 Ms. Burgstrom said that is Attachment C of the packet. She said that basically shows that if you were
11 driving northbound on IL 47, you would see the pole on the left and two of the four faces.
12
13 Mr. Elwell asked if the sign structure would be lit.
14
15 Mr. Kimball said yes. He apologized for not having Attachment C in front of him, and asked if the diagram
16 showed a light on the structure. He said that it would have a light, and it would be engineered to shine on
17 the face of the sign. He said you would not be able to see it driving, and the Burdettes (the neighbor to the
18 west) would not see a light; it would be shielded so that the light would shine only on the sign.
19
20 Ms. Burgstrom said that with a Special Use Permit, there are lighting requirements in Section 6.1.2. of the
21 Zoning Ordinance. She said that lighting has to be dark sky friendly, so if lighting is facing upward, she
22 is not sure if that particular style of billboard lighting is able to be dark sky friendly. She said she does not
23 know the answer to that.
24
25 Ms. Lee said that variance part A has a total sign area of 1,152 square feet, and asked if that was for the
26 sign itself. She said that if you had something that was 1,200 square feet, that would be 30 feet by 40 feet,
27 which is a lot of area.
28
29 Mr. Kimball said it is four 12 feet by 24 feet faces, which is 288 square feet.
30
31 Ms. Lee said that if it was 40 feet by 30 feet, that is like 1,200 square feet, so 1,152 is very close to 40 feet
32 by 30 feet.
33
34 Mr. Wood said that he thinks that the whole point here is that with four signs, you increase your income.
35
36 Mr. Kimball said there is a certain point where you need to recoup your investment.
37
38 Ms. Burgstrom said that what she is hearing is that smaller sign faces are possible, that Mr. Kimball is
39 willing to put together a matrix to show people what would be feasible in terms of both legibility and how
40 that relates to his financial feasibility for the billboard. She said that she is also hearing Board members
41 asking for a better visualization of how this sign structure would really look onsite.
42
43 Mr. Randol said he agreed with Ms. Burgstrom.
44
45 Mr. Kimball said that he can share the matrix tonight if the Board would like to.
46
47 Mr. Elwell said that for him, he wants to tell Mr. Kimball yes; he has a background in real estate and
48 understands what he is saying. He said that sitting on this Board, he needs to see what he is approving,
49 and he thinks that doing a little bit more due diligence, not allowing the Board to have any imagination

1 on this, he feels like Mr. Kimball really needs to show them what he is talking about. He said that he
2 understands that there will be some capital investment on his side of things for this, but he really believes
3 that Mr. Kimball would have a much stronger case if he had the exhibits to show the Board. He said that
4 he is visualizing a telephone pole right now, and the sign is potentially going to be two or three feet taller
5 than that pole. He said that he cannot see how close the setbacks are going to be from the northeast corner
6 of the easternmost building. He said that there is nothing showing him where it is going to be. He said that
7 even putting a dot on this exhibit would have helped.

8
9 Mr. Kimball said there is a dimension of the sign location; it is a dot where the pole is on the aerial layout
10 of the buildings, with a dimension off the north and east sides of that pole.

11
12 Ms. Burgstrom said that she thinks what Mr. Elwell is saying is that yes, we can look at this from a bird's
13 eye view like in Attachment B, but what it seems the Board is asking for is almost a 3D representation of
14 the proposed building, the pole, and the height.

15
16 Mr. Kimball asked if they wanted just a to-scale version of the photos he showed the Board.

17
18 Mr. Randol said that he thinks they need a better view of what the sign is actually going to be like so that
19 they can put it in perspective with the building, the interstate, and Route 47. He said that the way he looks
20 at it, this current information tells him that the sign is too much for that location that close to the
21 interchange.

22
23 Mr. Kimball said that he does not think that a new drawing will change Mr. Randol's view of that.

24
25 Mr. Elwell said that the Board is saying that it would be to your advantage to have something to present
26 to the Board. He said that he thinks Mr. Kimball was very close with the pictures he took from this pickup,
27 but when he tried to gauge the size, it was not clear. He said that to him, what they have seen is not
28 accurate. He said that he understands that it is difficult to draw to scale, but that is something that he needs
29 to see. He said that he is not to the point where he could give an affirmative vote without something more
30 conclusive.

31
32 Mr. Randol said that if he were to approve the drawing of the billboard on the northbound photo, it appears
33 that his sign is extending to the east off of the property, out over the State right-of-way. He said that is the
34 image he is getting.

35
36 Mr. Wood said that the other issue we have here is that this proposal is really pushing the zoning
37 regulations that we are supposed to be run by. He said it goes way beyond that, and he does not really see
38 pushing the zoning rules that much just to generate an additional income stream.

39
40 Ms. Burgstrom said she wanted Mr. Kimball to note that as these Board members talk about how they
41 need more visual information to move toward a vote on this, she wanted to say also that there is no
42 guarantee of approval just because he brings in a visualization. She said that he needed to weigh the matter
43 of if it is worth the expense to get a visualization done that would be adequate for the Board to be able to
44 consider your case, while also knowing that there is no guarantee of approval.

45
46 Mr. Kimball said yes. He asked if the Board would like to look at the different sign sizes on the matrix.

47
48 Mr. Elwell asked if Mr. Kimball had another exhibit.

49

1 Mr. Kimball shared his screen. He referred to the current proposal with sign faces totaling 1,152 square
2 feet, that consists of four 12 feet by 24 feet sign faces, or 288 square feet each. He said that a standard
3 highway billboard face is 24 feet by 48 feet, so each sign face is half of that. He said it was strategically
4 placed at that size for functionality. He said that he tried to reduce the size, reduce the costs, reduce the
5 amount of steel and the height, while still being able to function well for the local businesses that are
6 advertising on it. He referred to the next rows of the matrix, that reduced the sign face to 10 feet by 22
7 feet, or 220 square feet each, for a total of 880 square feet. He referred to the next rows, which reduced
8 each sign face to 10 feet by 20 feet, for a total of 800 square feet. He showed reductions to 10 feet by 18
9 feet and 10 feet by 16 feet. He said this was his attempt at trying to reduce it as a compromise here, but he
10 thinks if they go much less than a 10 feet by 20 feet sign face, he thinks that the functionality really gets
11 reduced.

12
13 Ms. Burgstrom said that she appreciated the matrix showing the different sizes, but what is the minimum
14 size that can be done that is still legible.

15
16 Mr. Kimball said that he thinks the 10 feet by 20 feet sign face is the minimum.

17
18 Ms. Burgstrom said that the Board has to make a finding about whether the proposed variance is the
19 minimum possible variance. She said that by showing these different sizes, Mr. Kimball is showing us
20 that the minimum required variance is not for 1,152 square feet, it is something closer to 800 square feet,
21 or even less, we don't know.

22
23 Mr. Kimball said that he and Ms. Burgstrom had discussed this briefly in preparing for this meeting. He
24 said they discussed what if this size is too big to get behind, what would be an acceptable size. He said
25 that for him, the lowest he can get it to and still be functional is 10 feet by 20 feet. He said that the size of
26 the temporary sign out there is 12 feet, and it was barely visible from the stop sign at the interchange exit
27 ramp.

28
29 Mr. Elwell asked how the Board feels about moving forward without having a more in-depth visual
30 exhibit.

31
32 Mr. Randol said that for his part, he thinks the Board needs to see a more in-depth visual, and what is
33 being proposed is just way too big. He said that we have to remember that what we set that Mr. Kimball
34 can do, somebody else is going to come back and say "hey, you've done this on IL 47, and this is what I
35 want done for my sign also."

36
37 Mr. Elwell said that he does not know if there is going to be that much difference, but what he is concerned
38 about with this is that he does not know what he is agreeing to. He said that Mr. Kimball could very well
39 win him over with the larger sign, but he cannot move forward today. He said that he cannot speak for the
40 entire Board, but it seems to him that there needs to be some more homework. He said that the Board
41 understands that there will be more investment to be incurred and they are sensitive to that, but he needs
42 to have more, or he is not able to give an affirmative vote.

43
44 Mr. Randol asked Mr. Kimball if he is on any kind of timeframe to get this done.

45
46 Mr. Kimball said he was looking at April to erect the sign. He said it was a three-month lead time, so he
47 was hoping to get it ordered in January.

48
49 Mr. Randol asked if he was not under a committed timeframe to get it done.

1 Mr. Kimball said he has verbal agreements, but nothing in writing that he has to provide someone a sign
2 for, so technically no.

3
4 Mr. Randol said that is probably good. He asked Mr. Hall when the next time would be that the Board
5 could meet to discuss this case.

6
7 Mr. Wood said February 25th.

8
9 Mr. Hall said that the next meeting would depend on whether the Board cancels the February 25th hearing.
10 He said we have some schedule issues that we will discuss on the docket. He said that in his opinion, the
11 kind of high-quality visual representation the Board is wanting he believes would take longer than
12 February 25th.

13
14 Mr. Randol agreed and said he is like Mr. Elwell; he wants to see what he is approving.

15
16 Mr. Hall said that technology-wise, it is certainly easy enough to do that, but Mr. Kimball is going to have
17 to find someone that has time to do it, they will have to work through the details and the intricacies. He
18 said that he thinks they would want to go at least two months.

19
20 Mr. Elwell said that he googled “proposal for a billboard diagram” and there were several options.

21
22 Mr. Kimball said if that is what the Board needs, he can put it together.

23
24 Mr. Anderson said that Mr. Kimball could find other places where someone else has advertised right off
25 the interstate and approximate what size he wants, and take a picture of that sign or give the Board the
26 address and they can take a look at it. He said that he thinks that Mr. Kimball is going to have to convince
27 the Board that his expense is not going to harm anyone, anyone’s property, or anyone’s feelings, and they
28 will have to see that.

29
30 Mr. Kimball told Mr. Anderson that sounds good. He said he would get the Board some locations and
31 they could drive by. He said that is a good idea.

32
33 Mr. Wood said he would remind Mr. Kimball of what Mr. Randol brought up a little earlier, and that is
34 establishing a precedent for something that isn’t really needed and doesn’t have anything to do with the
35 business itself there.

36
37 Mr. Kimball said he thinks it would be beneficial to the community and local businesses.

38
39 Mr. Wood said that is very magnanimous, but unfortunately, the zoning rules do not allow that.

40
41 Mr. Elwell asked if there were any other questions from the Board or staff.

42
43 **Mr. Randol moved that the hearing be postponed until Mr. Kimball has the information the Board**
44 **has asked for, and has presented it to staff so that they can then schedule the meeting, rather than**
45 **trying to put a timeframe on getting this done.**

46
47 Mr. Hall said that we have to continue to a date certain, however. He said the Board could continue to a
48 date certain, and then check back to see if the work is done, and if not, continue it again. He said it could
49 be continued to include enough time to where you think the work will be done.

1 Mr. Wood said that 60 days from now would be close to March 25th.

2
3 Mr. Elwell asked if Mr. Randol could also be a bit more precise on the exhibits he needs to bring with the
4 motion.

5
6 **Mr. Randol revised his motion, seconded by Mr. Roberts, to continue the hearing until March 25,**
7 **2021, and Mr. Kimball would get a more detailed drawing to the Board so they can tell exactly what**
8 **they are being asked to vote on, and more detail on the smaller sign rather than the size proposed,**
9 **with a 3D visualization of that size to make it look right.**

10
11 Mr. Kimball asked if there was any way to have the meeting on February 25th.

12
13 Mr. Elwell asked Mr. Kimball if he thought he could get the requested items by February 25th.

14
15 Mr. Kimball said yes.

16
17 Ms. Burgstrom said that due to concerns with short staffing coming up that we are going to talk about
18 later, cancellation of the February 25th meeting is going to be discussed. She said that March 11 is probably
19 the better date to go for.

20
21 Mr. Elwell asked Mr. Randol if he would like to amend his motion to March 11th.

22
23 Mr. Randol declined to amend his motion, which gives everybody time to adjust for whatever needs to be
24 done.

25
26 Mr. Elwell said that it sounds like time is of the essence for Mr. Kimball, and asked Ms. Burgstrom if
27 there would be a way to move the date back if the opportunity arises.

28
29 Mr. Randol said that Ms. Burgstrom said we already need to discuss scheduling issues later tonight, so
30 not to put pressure on the office, he suggests staying with March 25th.

31
32 Mr. Elwell said there is a motion and second for continuing the hearing to March 25, 2021. He requested
33 a roll call vote.

34
35 The vote was called as follows:

36	Anderson – yes	Elwell - no	Randol – yes
37	Roberts – yes	Wood - yes	Lee - yes

38
39 **The motion carried.**

40
41 Mr. Elwell told Mr. Kimball that Ms. Burgstrom would be in touch with future communications. He
42 requested a motion to recess for 7 minutes.

43
44 Mr. Randol moved, seconded by Ms. Lee, to take a 7-minute recess.

45 The vote was called as follows:

46	Anderson – yes	Elwell - yes	Randol – yes
47	Roberts – yes	Wood - stepped out	Lee - yes

48
49 **The motion carried.**

1 Mr. Elwell said they would reconvene at 7:50.

2

3 Mr. Elwell reconvened the meeting at 7:57, and called case 997-S-21.

4

5 **Case 997-S-21: Petitioners: TAG Warehouse LLC – Series Atkins 150 Warehouse, owned by T.A.G.,**
6 **LLC, which is owned by the Northern Trust Company and Susan A. Atkins as Trustees of Marital**
7 **Trust A under the Clinton C. Atkins Marital Trusts dated the 23rd day of December, 2014, with**
8 **officers Spencer Atkins, CEO; Mark Dixon, President; Rick Klopffleisch, CFO; Jane Solon, Vice-**
9 **President; and John Martinie, Vice President; via agent Mark Dixon**

10 Request: **Authorize multiple principal structures consisting of two existing warehouses and an**
11 **existing railroad siding and terminal in the I-1 Light Industry Zoning District.**

12 Location: **A 62.16-acre parcel of land located in part of the East Half of the Northwest Quarter and**
13 **the West Half of the Northeast Quarter of Section 3, Township 19 North, Range 8 East of the Third**
14 **Principal Meridian in Champaign Township, and commonly known as Atkins 150 Warehouse with**
15 **an address of 2309 W Bloomington Rd, Champaign.**

16

17 Mr. Elwell informed the audience that anyone wishing to testify for any public hearing tonight must sign
18 the witness register for that public hearing. He reminded the audience that when they sign the witness
19 register, they are signing an oath.

20

21 Mr. Elwell informed the audience that this Case is an Administrative Case and as such, the County allows
22 anyone the opportunity to cross-examine any witness. He said that at the proper time, he will ask for a
23 show of hands or a verbal indication from those who would like to cross-examine, and each person will
24 be called upon. He said that those who desire to cross-examine will be asked to clearly state their name
25 before asking any questions. He noted that no new testimony is to be given during the cross-examination.
26 He said that attorneys who have complied with Article 7.6 of the ZBA By-Laws are exempt from cross-
27 examination. He asked Mr. Dixon to outline the nature of his request.

28

29 Mr. Mark Dixon, 2805 South Boulder Dr, Urbana, said that Atkins Group has owned this building since
30 1994. He said it is a very large industrial building, and because of the sheer size of it, it requires more than
31 one occupant to be a viable piece of property. He said that they are requesting the ability to have multiple
32 structures as well as a railroad siding on that particular property.

33

34 Mr. Elwell asked if there were any questions from the Board.

35

36 Mr. Wood asked the current use for the building.

37

38 Mr. Dixon said that there currently are 12 tenants; the largest is Plastipak in the main warehouse. He said
39 he thinks there are 6 other tenants in the main warehouse and 3 tenants in the vehicle maintenance building
40 as well as the tenant in the railyard.

41

42 Mr. Wood asked if it is correct that the vehicle maintenance building is what this case is for.

43

44 Mr. Dixon said that is correct; there is a particular tenant that they think is a natural fit, it is an auto body
45 shop. He said that the building was basically built for vehicle maintenance when Southland originally built
46 it, and they think that would be compatible with the other users at the site.

47

48 Mr. Wood asked Mr. Dixon if he expected the use to change. He said that the Special Use Permit is so
49 they could lease it out as a principal building as opposed to an accessory structure.

1 Ms. Burgstrom said that the Special Use Permit is to allow two principal structures on the same lot. She
2 said there are a whole bunch of different uses, including an auto repair shop, that would be allowed by-
3 right as long as they can have multiple principal structures.

4
5 Mr. Elwell asked how the proposed tenant would differ from the existing tenants.
6

7 Mr. Dixon said that the proposed tenant would be very similar, because the neighbor tenant takes care of
8 the Plastipak truck fleet, so it is already an auto repair shop that does a combination of engine, muffler,
9 tire replacement and other repairs. He said that the building has 37,000 square feet, and that is what it was
10 designed for; it has clear height, steel walls, oil separation, drains in the floor, and overhead doors.

11
12 Mr. Elwell asked Ms. Burgstrom why the case is necessary if there are already similar tenants in nature.
13

14 Ms. Burgstrom said that when the building was originally allowed, there was the huge building that was
15 the principal use, and they were using the small building as an accessory as a fleet maintenance facility.
16 She said we now have a potential tenant who does not have a place in the big building, so it needs to be
17 its own principal use separate from anything related to the current setup.

18
19 Mr. Dixon said that one asterisk on that explanation is that the proposed tenant would be doing the repairs
20 for all the existing Amazon fleet located on the property, which has about 220 vehicles. He said that the
21 proposed tenant has an exclusive agreement to do repairs for that fleet.
22

23 Ms. Burgstrom said that is great. She said that nonetheless, the proposed tenant would still need to be a
24 principal use because they are separate from Amazon, whereas before it was Plastipak with the accessory
25 Plastipak fleet maintenance.
26

27 Mr. Wood said that it is only because they are not tenants of the principal building, and it adds a little
28 more flexibility.
29

30 Mr. Elwell asked if this would go into perpetuity.
31

32 Ms. Burgstrom said yes. She said a change of use permit would be required as part of this, so if they get
33 different uses in the building, like if the tenants change out over time, ideally either the tenant or the owner
34 would come in and apply for a change of use permit as things change.
35

36 Ms. Lee said that there are more than one tenants in the accessory building now, and asked if there would
37 just be one in that building now, or will there still be several tenants.
38

39 Mr. Dixon said there are three there now, and this would be the fourth.
40

41 Mr. Randol asked if other potential tenants would have to come to ZBA once this Special Use Permit is
42 approved.
43

44 Ms. Burgstrom said if they are a by-right use for the I-1 Light Industry Zoning District, the only thing
45 they might need is a change of use permit if it differs from auto repair. But if they are a use that requires
46 a Special Use Permit, then that entity would have to come in and apply for a Special Use Permit.
47

48 Mr. Elwell asked Ms. Burgstrom to explain the railroad siding and how that ties into this as well.
49

1 Ms. Burgstrom said that the rail spur is something that has a permit to be there, but it is really a principal
2 use on its own, so it is just something we are bringing into compliance along with everything else.

3
4 Mr. Elwell asked if there were special conditions for the case.

5
6 Ms. Burgstrom said yes.

7
8 Mr. Elwell asked the Board how it would like to proceed.

9
10 **Mr. Randol moved, seconded by Mr. Roberts, to accept the Summary of Evidence and Documents**
11 **of Record, and proceed to the Findings of Fact.**

12
13 Mr. Hall asked if the Board wanted to review those special conditions.

14
15 Ms. Burgstrom said she would like to clarify that recently, they have kind of strayed from reviewing the
16 special conditions as part of the Summary of Evidence without having to make a motion. She said that
17 once the Board has accepted or agreed upon the special conditions with the petitioner in the Summary of
18 Evidence, that is when you can move to approve the Summary of Evidence with the special conditions
19 and proceed to the Findings of Fact if the Board would like.

20
21 Mr. Randol withdrew his motion and asked to look at the special conditions.

22
23 Mr. Elwell referred to the special conditions in the packet and told Mr. Dixon that he would read the
24 conditions and ask Mr. Dixon if he agreed to each one.

25
26 **A. A Change of Use Permit shall be applied for within 30 days of the approval of Case**
27 **997-S-21.**

28
29 The special condition stated above is required to ensure the following:

30 **The establishment of the proposed uses shall be properly documented as**
31 **required by the Zoning Ordinance.**

32
33 Mr. Elwell asked Mr. Dixon if he agreed with condition A.

34
35 Mr. Dixon said yes.

36
37 **B. The Zoning Administrator shall not authorize a Zoning Compliance Certificate until**
38 **the petitioner has demonstrated that any new or proposed exterior lighting on the**
39 **subject property will comply with the lighting requirements of Section 6.1.2.**

40
41 The special condition stated above is required to ensure the following:

42 **That any proposed exterior lighting is in compliance with the Zoning**
43 **Ordinance.**

44
45 Mr. Elwell asked Mr. Dixon if he agreed with condition B.

46
47 Mr. Dixon said yes.

48
49 **C. Any future sale of the subject property may be subject to the Illinois Plat Act (765**

1 **ILCS 205/0.01 et seq.) or the Champaign County Subdivision Regulations; or the**
2 **subdivision regulations of a municipality that has jurisdiction within one and one-half**
3 **miles of the corporate limits.**

4
5 The special condition stated above is required to ensure the following:
6 **That the subject property complies with the Zoning Ordinance.**

7
8 Mr. Elwell asked Mr. Dixon if he agreed with condition C.

9
10 Mr. Dixon said yes.

11
12 Mr. Randol moved, seconded by Mr. Wood, to accept the Summary of Evidence, Documents of Record,
13 and special conditions, and proceed to the Findings of Fact.

14
15 Mr. Elwell requested a roll call vote.

16
17 The vote was called as follows:

18 Anderson – yes	Elwell - yes	Randol – yes
19 Roberts – yes	Wood - yes	Lee - yes

20
21 **The motion carried.**

22
23 **FINDINGS OF FACT FOR CASE 997-S-21:**

24
25 From the documents of record and the testimony and exhibits received at the public hearing for zoning
26 case **997-S-21** held on **January 28, 2021**, the Zoning Board of Appeals of Champaign County finds that:

27
28 **1. The requested Special Use Permit IS necessary for the public convenience at this location.**

29
30 Mr. Wood said that the requested Special Use Permit IS necessary for the public convenience at this
31 location because: the subject property has been in industrial use since the 1970s, and this Special Use
32 Permit will add some flexibility to the current status; and the subject property is adjacent to US Route 150
33 (W Bloomington Rd) and is located about 1.6 road miles west of the I-74 interchange at Prospect Avenue,
34 2 road miles from the entrance to I-72 off Country Fair Drive, and 1.9 road miles to the I-57 interchange
35 at Olympian Drive, so it is in a good location.

36
37 **2. The requested Special Use Permit, SUBJECT TO THE SPECIAL CONDITIONS**
38 **IMPOSED HEREIN, is so designed, located, and proposed to be operated so that it WILL**
39 **NOT be injurious to the district in which it shall be located or otherwise detrimental to the**
40 **public health, safety, and welfare because:**

41
42 **a. The street has ADEQUATE traffic capacity and the entrance location has**
43 **ADEQUATE visibility.**

44
45 Mr. Randol said that the street has ADEQUATE traffic capacity and the entrance location has
46 ADEQUATE visibility because: traffic volumes along US 150/Bloomington Road are below capacity,
47 and the entrance location has been in place with a dedicated left turn lane for many years.

48
49 Mr. Elwell asked if we are talking about the tenant with the Amazon account, how many vehicles did Mr.

1 Dixon say the fleet has.

2
3 Mr. Dixon said they have 220 vehicles, but at one time this location had over 1,000 vehicles. He said it
4 has substantially fewer vehicles than the original construction.
5

6 **b. Emergency services availability is ADEQUATE.**

7
8 Mr. Randol said that emergency services availability is ADEQUATE because: the subject property is
9 located approximately 3.4 road miles from the Eastern Prairie Fire Protection District, and no comments
10 have been received from the Fire Protection District.
11

12 Mr. Elwell asked if it is true that they are contracted with the Eastern Prairie Fire Protection District.
13

14 Ms. Burgstrom said yes, and that she was surprised by that because the City of Champaign has a station
15 right down the street.
16

17 Mr. Randol said that it is, and for a structure that size, there is a county-wide mutual aid agreement, and
18 if need be, anyone in the county can come in to help Eastern Prairie with that.
19

20 **c. The Special Use WILL be compatible with adjacent uses.**

21
22 Mr. Wood said that the Special Use WILL be compatible with adjacent uses because: no construction is
23 proposed, and the property is surrounded by vacant land, agricultural land, a post office, and Parkland
24 College, all of which have existed for many years.
25

26 **d. Surface and subsurface drainage will be ADEQUATE.**

27
28 Mr. Wood said that surface and subsurface drainage will be ADEQUATE because: no new construction
29 is proposed.
30

31 **e. Public safety will be ADEQUATE.**

32
33 Mr. Randol said that public safety will be ADEQUATE because: there are no residential properties
34 adjacent to the subject property. The Township Highway Commissioner, IDOT, and Eastern Prairie Fire
35 Protection District have been notified of this case, and no comments have been received.
36

37 **f. The provisions for parking will be ADEQUATE.**

38
39 Mr. Wood said that the provisions for parking will be ADEQUATE because: there are hundreds of
40 concrete parking spaces available onsite, and a surplus of spaces has been shown over time. There are
41 more than enough loading berths than the minimum required. No screening is required for parking.
42

43 Mr. Randol stated that the requested Special Use Permit, SUBJECT TO THE SPECIAL CONDITIONS
44 IMPOSED HEREIN, is so designed, located, and proposed to be operated so that it WILL NOT be
45 injurious to the district in which it shall be located or otherwise detrimental to the public health, safety,
46 and welfare.
47

48 **3a. The requested Special Use Permit, SUBJECT TO THE SPECIAL CONDITIONS**
49 **IMPOSED HEREIN, DOES conform to the applicable regulations and standards of the**

DISTRICT in which it is located.

Mr. Wood said that the requested Special Use Permit, SUBJECT TO THE SPECIAL CONDITIONS IMPOSED HEREIN, DOES conform to the applicable regulations and standards of the DISTRICT in which it is located.

3b. The requested Special Use Permit, SUBJECT TO THE SPECIAL CONDITIONS IMPOSED HEREIN, DOES preserve the essential character of the DISTRICT in which it is located because:

a. The Special Use will be designed to CONFORM to all relevant County ordinances and codes.

Mr. Randol stated that the Special Use will be designed to CONFORM to all relevant County ordinances and codes.

b. The Special Use WILL be compatible with adjacent uses.

Mr. Wood stated that the Special Use WILL be compatible with adjacent uses.

c. Public safety will be ADEQUATE.

Mr. Randol stated that public safety will be ADEQUATE.

Mr. Randol stated that the requested Special Use Permit, SUBJECT TO THE SPECIAL CONDITIONS IMPOSED HEREIN, DOES preserve the essential character of the DISTRICT in which it is located.

4. The requested Special Use Permit, SUBJECT TO THE SPECIAL CONDITIONS IMPOSED HEREIN, IS in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Ordinance because:

a. The Special Use is authorized in the District.

Mr. Elwell stated that the Special Use is authorized in the District.

b. The requested Special Use Permit IS necessary for the public convenience at this location.

Mr. Wood stated that the requested Special Use Permit IS necessary for the public convenience at this location.

c. The requested Special Use Permit, SUBJECT TO THE SPECIAL CONDITIONS IMPOSED HEREIN, is so designed, located, and proposed to be operated so that it WILL NOT be injurious to the district in which it shall be located or otherwise detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare.

Mr. Wood stated that the requested Special Use Permit, SUBJECT TO THE SPECIAL CONDITIONS IMPOSED HEREIN, is so designed, located, and proposed to be operated so that it WILL NOT be injurious to the district in which it shall be located or otherwise detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare.

- d. **The requested Special Use Permit, SUBJECT TO THE SPECIAL CONDITIONS IMPOSED HEREIN, DOES preserve the essential character of the DISTRICT in which it is located.**

Mr. Wood stated that the requested Special Use Permit, SUBJECT TO THE SPECIAL CONDITIONS IMPOSED HEREIN, DOES preserve the essential character of the DISTRICT in which it is located.

Mr. Wood stated that the requested Special Use Permit, SUBJECT TO THE SPECIAL CONDITIONS IMPOSED HEREIN, IS in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Ordinance.

5. The requested Special Use **IS NOT** an existing nonconforming use.

6. THE SPECIAL CONDITIONS IMPOSED HEREIN ARE REQUIRED FOR THE PARTICULAR PURPOSES DESCRIBED BELOW:

- A. **A Change of Use Permit shall be applied for within 30 days of the approval of Case 997-S-21.**

The special condition stated above is required to ensure the following:

The establishment of the proposed uses shall be properly documented as required by the Zoning Ordinance.

- B. **The Zoning Administrator shall not authorize a Zoning Compliance Certificate until the petitioner has demonstrated that any new or proposed exterior lighting on the subject property will comply with the lighting requirements of Section 6.1.2.**

The special condition stated above is required to ensure the following:

That any proposed exterior lighting is in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance.

- C. **Any future sale of the subject property may be subject to the Illinois Plat Act (765 ILCS 205/0.01 et seq.) or the Champaign County Subdivision Regulations; or the subdivision regulations of a municipality that has jurisdiction within one and one-half miles of the corporate limits.**

The special condition stated above is required to ensure the following:

That the subject property complies with the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Elwell entertained a motion to adopt the Summary of Evidence, Documents of Record, and Findings of Fact, as amended for Case 997-S-21.

Mr. Wood moved, seconded by Mr. Roberts, to adopt the Summary of Evidence, Documents of Record, and Findings of Fact, as amended.

The vote was called as follows:

Anderson – yes	Elwell - yes	Randol – yes
Roberts – yes	Wood - yes	Lee - yes

The motion carried.

1 Mr. Elwell entertained a motion to move to the Final Determination for Case 997-S-21.

2
3 Ms. Lee moved, seconded by Mr. Roberts, to move to the Final Determination for Case 997-S-21.

4
5 The vote was called as follows:

6	Anderson – yes	Elwell - yes	Randol – yes
7	Roberts – yes	Wood - yes	Lee - yes

8
9 The motion carried.

10
11 **FINAL DETERMINATION FOR CASE 997-S-21:**

12
13 Mr. Wood moved, seconded by Ms. Lee, that the Champaign County Zoning Board of Appeals finds that, based upon the application, testimony, and other evidence received in this case, the requirements of Section 9.1.11B. for approval HAVE been met, and pursuant to the authority granted by Section 9.1.6 B. of the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance, determines that:

17
18 The Special Use requested in Case 997-S-21 is hereby GRANTED WITH SPECIAL
19 CONDITIONS to the applicants, TAG Warehouse LLC – Series Atkins 150 Warehouse, owned
20 by T.A.G., LLC, which is owned by the Northern Trust Company and Susan A. Atkins as
21 Trustees of Marital Trust A under the Clinton C. Atkins Marital Trusts dated the 23rd day of
22 December, 2014, with officers Spencer Atkins, CEO; Mark Dixon, President; Rick Klopffleisch,
23 CFO; Jane Solon, Vice-President; and John Martinie, Vice President; via agent Mark Dixon, to
24 authorize the following as a Special Use on land in the I-1 Light Industry Zoning District:

25
26 Authorize multiple principal structures consisting of two existing warehouses and an
27 existing railroad siding and terminal in the I-1 Light Industry Zoning District.

28
29 SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

- 30
31 A. A Change of Use Permit shall be applied for within 30 days of the approval of Case
32 997-S-21.
- 33
34 B. The Zoning Administrator shall not authorize a Zoning Compliance Certificate
35 until the petitioner has demonstrated that any new or proposed exterior lighting on
36 the subject property will comply with the lighting requirements of Section 6.1.2.
- 37
38 C. Any future sale of the subject property may be subject to the Illinois Plat Act (765
39 ILCS 205/0.01 et seq.) or the Champaign County Subdivision Regulations; or the
40 subdivision regulations of a municipality that has jurisdiction within one and one-
41 half miles of the corporate limits.

42
43 Mr. Elwell requested a roll call vote.

44
45 The vote was called as follows:

46	Anderson – yes	Elwell - yes	Randol – yes
47	Roberts – yes	Wood - yes	Lee - yes

48
49 The motion carried.

1 Mr. Elwell told Mr. Dixon that the Special Use Permit has been approved.

2

3 Mr. Dixon thanked everyone for their time.

4

5 Mr. Elwell asked staff what kind of exhibits they might advise a petitioner to provide who wants to install
6 a sign. He asked them to explain some of the communication behind the scenes.

7

8 Ms. Burgstrom said that they don't get that many sign variance requests. She said that for the ones they
9 have received in the time she has been here, they wanted to see the plan drawings with dimensions of the
10 billboard or sign. She said they would like to see not only the birds-eye view of the layout but at least a
11 cross-section, and even better a 3D visualization, so that everybody can get a really good idea of what we
12 are looking at and how its dimensions gauge to the surroundings. She said other than that, if they have
13 something official from the sign company that has additional materials, then it can't hurt.

14

15 Mr. Randol said that Mr. Kimball might do well to look at the sign that is at the site we just discussed (the
16 Atkins property). He said that sign is not huge, everything is visible on two sides, and is very legible. He
17 said it doesn't have to be 40 feet in the air.

18

19 Ms. Burgstrom said that she could make suggestions of potential locations, including that one, for him to
20 take a look at.

21

22 Mr. Wood asked how tall the buildings are that Mr. Kimball wants to construct.

23

24 Ms. Burgstrom said that she is not sure she has that information.

25

26 Mr. Wood said that he was wondering if they need to get the signs above the roof so that people can see
27 them. He said that the ones facing north-south are in front of the building, and if you are coming from the
28 other direction, if it is not high enough, you are not going to see the bottom sign.

29

30 Ms. Burgstrom said that the bottom of the sign is 13 feet from the ground, and the building should not be
31 able to obstruct anything, unless you are heading eastbound on CR 1675N. She said that we are getting to
32 the point of discussing the case when we have already closed and continued that hearing, so we will have
33 to move on from that topic. She said if she could find the height of the buildings she would get back with
34 the Board.

35

36 **7. Staff Report - None**

37

38 **8. Other Business**

39

40 **A. Review of Docket**

41

42 Mr. Hall said that starting with the February 25th ZBA meeting, our senior planner will be on a planned
43 sick leave that will include March 11th and March 25th. He said she would hopefully be back on April 15th,
44 but she might be working from home. He said that the event that causes this sick leave will occur between
45 February 11th and February 25th. He said we also have other staff out right now; the Board may recall that
46 we have two staff members who we have not replaced, so we are literally limping along. He said he would
47 really appreciate it if the Board could cancel the February 25th meeting. He said that he thinks he and the
48 senior planner working from home can get the March 11th and March 25th meetings handled, but he would
49 like to see the February 25th meeting cancelled.

1 Mr. Wood said that other than the Kimbells, it looks like there isn't anything else scheduled for those
2 meetings.

3
4 Mr. Hall said that is correct.

5
6 Ms. Burgstrom said we are expecting a fee payment any minute for what will be a Map Amendment and
7 Special Use Permit. She said that if the Board cancelled the February 25th meeting, those cases would be
8 for March 11th.

9
10 Mr. Randol asked if it would help to move the Kimball cases into April. He said he could not see this sign
11 being a big pressure deal for Mr. Kimball. He said it could take some of the pressure off of what we will
12 be facing here.

13
14 Mr. Hall said that everybody's case is an important case, and everybody's case is urgent.

15
16 Mr. Randol said that his case is not stopping him from doing any construction or moving forward with his
17 actual process with the warehouses. He said the only thing that would do is give him more money in his
18 pocket sooner. He said there is no saying the Board will even approve it then.

19
20 Mr. Hall said he understood. He said that from a staff position, it would be easier to deal with a continued
21 case on March 25th than start a new case, although we're prepared to start a new case also. He said we
22 may do both on March 25th.

23
24 Mr. Elwell asked if he understood correctly that this would put our first scheduled meeting on the 11th.

25
26 Mr. Hall said the next scheduled meeting would be on the 11th.

27
28 Ms. Burgstrom said we have the February 11th meeting that does have cases on it, so the docket would
29 skip February 25th and go to March 11th.

30
31 Mr. Hall said that he is okay with keeping February 25th until the Board sees what happens on February
32 11th. He said if any of those cases need to be continued to February 25th, that would be fine. He said we
33 don't really need to cancel tonight, and in fact we really should have it as an agenda item on the February
34 11th agenda.

35
36 Mr. Elwell said he would prefer to have this vote at the end of February 11th.

37
38 Mr. Hall said that you can see that we are already bumping up against the deadline for that February 25th
39 meeting for any new case, and their plan is to book any new case starting on March 11th and proceed from
40 there.

41
42 Ms. Burgstrom said staff would put the topic on the next agenda.

43
44 **9. Audience participation with respect to matters other than cases pending before the Board**

45
46 None

47
48 **10. Adjournment**

49

1 Mr. Elwell entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting.

2

3 **Ms. Lee moved, seconded by Mr. Roberts, to adjourn the meeting.**

4

5 Mr. Elwell requested a roll call vote.

6

7 The vote was called as follows:

8 **Anderson – yes**

Elwell - no

Randol – yes

9 **Roberts – yes**

Wood - yes

Lee - yes

10

11 **The motion carried.**

12

13 The meeting adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

14

15 Respectfully submitted

16

17

18

19 Secretary of Zoning Board of Appeals

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49