

**Members Present**

Mr. Olthoff, Mr. Tripp, Mr. Bertrand, Ms. Hertzberger, Mr. Washington, Mr. Scholl, Mr. Whitten, and Mr. Hess

**Members Absent**

Mr. Stauffenberg, Mr. James, Mr. Martin, and Mr. Marcotte

**In Attendance**

Mr. McLaren, Mr. Bossert, Eric Sadler, Delbert Miller, Michelle Sadler, Donna Shehane, Sarah Billadeau, Mike Lammey, Mike Van Mill, Kaylee Gamble, Greg Deck, Erik Rayman, Keith Wojnowski, Craig Gaus, Rich Howell, Don Pallissard, and Creighton Coxey

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call**

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Mr. Olthoff, at 9:00 a.m.  
Quorum Present.

**2. Public Comment**

Greg Deck spoke regarding ZBA Case #06-06.

**3. Approval of Minutes- July 12, 2006 & July 25, 2006**

A motion to approve the minutes from July 12, 2006 and July 25, 2006 was made by Mr. Scholl and seconded by Mr. Whitten. Motion carried.

Mr. Whitten asked about the propane tank on Rt. 45.

Mr. Van Mill stated that this item will be discussed at the next PZA meeting.

**4. Zoning**

• **ZBA Case #06-06**

Mr. Van Mill stated that this is a request to rezone property from A-1 Agriculture to RE-Rural Estate on a parcel that is situated in the southeast quarter of Section 33 of Norton Township. The property is owned by Craig and Renee Gaus and the petitioners for the rezoning are Creighton and Carolyn Coxey. The Coxeyes wish to construct a single family home on a one acre parcel. There was no public comments and no objectors present at the hearing.

A motion to concur with the ZBA was made by Mr. Scholl and seconded by Mr. Bertrand. Motion carried.

Mr. Scholl stated that there was a corn crib on this property at one point, so the petitioners would not be taking prime agriculture land out of use.

**Note: These transcribed minutes are a synopsis of information derived from the meeting. If you need verbatim information, please contact the County Clerk about obtaining a recorded tape.**

- **ZBA Case #06-07**

Mr. Van Mill stated that this a request to rezone property from A-1 Agriculture to RE- Rural Estate on a parcel situated in Section 14 of Essex Township. The property is owned by Nathan Sharper and the petitioners for this request are Jason and Rachel Grace. They wish to purchase the property which contains an existing single family residence. The property was divided in 1972 and has been in existence since that time. In order for the Graces to purchase the property they wish to bring it into compliance. The public hearing on this matter was held on July 26<sup>th</sup> and the Zoning Board of Appeals recommended approval of this rezoning by a vote of 4 ayes to 1 nay. The Zoning Board of Appeals also recommended the approval of the variances by a vote of 5 ayes to 0 nays. There were no public comments and there were no objectors present at the hearing.

A motion to approve was made by Mr. Scholl and seconded by Mr. Tripp. Motion carried.

Mr. Martin asked if the existing house is going to be rehabed.

Mr. Van Mill stated that the petitioners plan on rehabbing the existing home.

## 5. Subdivision

- **Subdivision Development Policies**

Mr. Van Mill stated he wanted to bring to the committee's attention to some issues that he would like to discuss and bring some amendments to the committee as the committee proceeds with a number of subdivision cases. For consideration at a future date there are three primary issues that could be amendments to the subdivision regulations. They are:

1. Technical Review and Follow-up Inspection: Have engineering reviews of the plans and follow-up inspections of the plans in the field to ensure that construction of the subdivision is done according to the building plans that were approved. To date no applications have been received for the engineer position. In the meantime, it is important that a plan b be put into place. A short term or internal policy should be put in place for a third party review. Mr. Van Mill would like to have consideration of wording at the next PZA meeting and then be sent forward to the County Board in September.
2. Change the Subdivision Design Approval Process: This committee currently only sees the construction drawings which is in the middle of the whole process. Mr. Van Mill would like to see a process in which

**Note: These transcribed minutes are a synopsis of information derived from the meeting. If you need verbatim information, please contact the County Clerk about obtaining a recorded tape.**

the County Board and this committee see the overall design and give approval on the overall development plan.

3. Final Plats and the approval of construction on lots: For a number of years the County Board has approved Final Plats before the improvements to the subdivisions are complete. The big issue here is that when Final Plats are approved then the developer can start selling lots, until that time the developer has to proceed with the development of the subdivision but he cannot sell the lots. The County has in some cases gotten to the point where the Final Plats are approved and single lot residential developments are allowed to occur and then some governmental entities that are responsible for taking over improvements don't because of the things that are going on in the subdivision without their knowledge or approval. It might be best if the County tightens its policies on approval of Final Plats.

Mr. Van Mill stated that he would like to be able to discuss those amendments to the Subdivision Regulations and bring the wording back to the committee at its next meeting.

### **Solid Waste**

- **United Recycling Industries Proposal**

Ms. Shehane stated that last week she visited United Recycling Industries and they presented to her an idea on how to assist the County in recycling its electronics. She showed the committee a brief video from United Recycling Industries on what their company does in terms of recycling electronics.

Ms. Shehane stated that United Recycling Industries is trying to be proactive on the issue of electronics recycling. States are beginning to ban these types of products from landfills, Illinois has not banned them yet but she imagines it will happen in the future. Illinois is leaning towards charging the consumer at the point of purchase for electronics recycling, similar to what Illinois does with tire purchases. Retailers are not wild about this idea of more legislation because it makes for a lot more paperwork and administrative issues. United Recycling is trying the idea of where the County would provide a drop off location for citizens one day a month to drop off their electronics for a fee. There is also a proposal to get the retailers to become partners with the County and United Recycling in that they would provide a coupon to the consumer for either equal to what they paid for the fee or double the amount of the fee (i.e. if a person pays \$20.00 to drop off the electronic they would receive a \$40.00 off

**Note: These transcribed minutes are a synopsis of information derived from the meeting. If you need verbatim information, please contact the County Clerk about obtaining a recorded tape.**

coupon to spend at the retailer). The County does not have anything to lose, if this is not working out the program can be stopped.

Mr. Martin stated that this is a really good idea. He asked if there are other companies out there in this particular business in order to get a cost comparison.

Ms. Shehane stated that there is another company located in Chicago Heights that she is going to visit.

Mr. Whitten asked what is currently happening.

Ms. Shehane stated that there is currently no law on the disposal of these items in the landfill but that is expected to change.

Mr. McLaren asked what other counties have a program like this.

Ms. Shehane stated that Kendall County has been doing this for a year without the coupon incentive. She would suggest doing this program with the coupon incentive in place.

Mr. Scholl asked if local municipalities have been informed of this. He would like to see if they are willing to participate in the program.

Ms. Shehane stated that she has been contacted by the Village of Bradley.

Mr. Martin stated that some of the suggestions that have been made are really good. He would like to see some information from the competitors. Could a price cut be given if the County did away with the profit it would earn from this program?

Ms. Shehane stated that idea has crossed her mind and she is going to have to consult with United Recycling Industries.

## **6. Planning**

None

## **7. Old/New Business**

Mr. Whitten asked if there is a full ZBA Board now.

Mr. Olthoff stated that there are still two openings. There is going to have to be an interview process in order to determine who will be on the board. A date will

**Note: These transcribed minutes are a synopsis of information derived from the meeting. If you need verbatim information, please contact the County Clerk about obtaining a recorded tape.**

have to be decided upon to have a special meeting during the week of August 28th.

Mr. Scholl asked what is going on with River Bend Subdivision drainage situation.

Mr. Van Mill stated that a letter was sent to the developer after the last meeting. The developer did not have an IEPA permit at the time of the letter; however, by the time the developer responded to the letter they did have that permit from the IEPA. The developer indicated that the Stormwater Erosion Control was part of the improvement plans. The Planning Department has done an inspection but has not put together the final conclusions on that. He has spoke with the developer and they are requesting final plat approval and along with that they are doing an ~~as~~ built+survey to show where everything is to make sure that it was done correctly.

Mr. Olthoff stated that he will see if a report can be given at the next PZA meeting.

Mr. Tripp asked for an update on the house being built on Rt. 102 and for an update on the Bridalwood Pond.

Mr. Van Mill stated that in regards to the house on Rt. 102 he has received a phone call from Steve Liehr. The foundation on that house is in and nothing else has occurred since then. He is going to contact the landowner to see where he is in the process. In regards to the Bridalwood Pond the County Board rejected a proposal by the property owner to allow for the pond to remain on the property. This item has been taken to Court. Judge Wenzelman heard arguments and came back with a request for both parties to submit a ~~report~~. There is a question as to the legality of the case.

## **8. Executive Session**

There was no executive session at today's meeting.

## **9. Adjournment**

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Hess and seconded by Mr. Bertrand at 9:57 a.m. Motion carried.

William Olthoff, Chairman

Stephanie Jackson, Executive Coordinator

**Note: These transcribed minutes are a synopsis of information derived from the meeting. If you need verbatim information, please contact the County Clerk about obtaining a recorded tape.**