

**KENDALL COUNTY PLANNING, BUILDING & ZONING COMMITTEE**

***Kendall County Office Building***

***Rooms 209 and 210***

***111 W. Fox Street, Yorkville, Illinois***

**6:30 p.m.**

**Meeting Minutes of June 13, 2022**

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

**ROLL CALL**

Committee Members Present: Elizabeth Flowers, Scott Gengler (Chairman), Dan Koukol, and Robyn Vickers

Committee Members Absent: Judy Gilmour (Vice-Chairwoman)

Also Present: Matt Asselmeier (Senior Planner), Dan Kramer, Jeremy Dippold, Samantha Dippold, Boyd Ingemunson, Robert Delaney, Jim Martin, Joe Frescura, Pat Frescura, Ramiro Guzman, Sharleen Smith, Anne Vickery, Gerald Gapa, Bob Patula, Kathy Patula, and Blanca Mota

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Member Vickers made a motion, seconded by Chairman Gengler, to approve the agenda with amendment to move the item regarding 19 N. Cherry Road to the first item of under New Business.

With a voice vote of four (4) ayes, the motion carried.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Member Flowers made a motion, seconded by Member Vickers, to approve the minutes of the May 9, 2022, meeting.

With a voice vote of four (4) ayes, the motion carried.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**EXPENDITURE REPORT**

The Committee reviewed the expenditure report from May 2022.

The Committee also reviewed the six (6) month expenditure report and fiscal year-to-date escrow report.

**PETITIONS**

*Petition 21-49 Irma Loya Quezada*

Mr. Asselmeier summarized the request.

The Petitioner is requesting a map amendment rezoning two (2) approximately three point two-four (3.24) acre parcels from A-1 Agricultural District to R-1 One Family Residential District in order to construct one (1) house on each parcel.

The Petitioner plans to use Plat Act exemptions to divide the subject areas proposed for rezoning from the larger parcels.

The agricultural building permits for the parcels were used in 2003 and 2004. The only way houses can be constructed on the subject parcels is by obtaining the requested map amendment.

The application materials, plat of survey and aerial of the property were provided.

On December 4, 2021, five (5) neighbors submitted a written objection to the map amendment. These objections were provided. On January 24, 2022, one (1) additional neighbor submitted an objection. This objection was provided.

On December 7, 2021, the Petitioner's Attorney submitted a request to continue the Petition from the December Kendall County Regional Planning Commission meeting and Kendall County Zoning Board of Appeals hearing. This email was provided.

The properties are on the east side of Brisbin Road across from 14859 and 14975 Brisbin Road.

The current land use is Agricultural.

The future land use is Rural Estate Residential (Max 0.45 Du/Acre).

Brisbin Road is a Township Maintained Major Collector. There are no trails planned in the area.

There were no floodplains or wetlands on the property.

The adjacent land uses were Agricultural, Farmstead, and Hogan's Market.

The adjacent properties and properties within one half (1/2) of a mile were zoned A-1 and A-1 SU.

The Kendall County Future Land Use Map called for the to be Rural Estate Residential. The Plattville Future Land Use Map called for the property to the north of the subject property to be Low Density Residential.

The A-1 special use to the west is for the sale of agricultural products, art, pottery, and home décor not produced on the premises (Hogan's Market).

EcoCat submitted on November 11, 2021, and consultation was terminated.

NRI application submitted on October 18, 2021. The draft LESA Score was 199 indicating a low level of protection.

Seward Township was emailed information on November 16, 2021. The Seward Township Planning Commission reviewed this proposal on December 7, 2021. Discussion occurred regarding the Land Resource Management Plan in relation to Seward Township and protecting farmland. Discussion also occurred regarding drainage and illegal dumping on the property. The Seward Township Planning Commission issued a negative recommendation by a vote of four (4) against the proposal and zero (0) in favor of the proposal with one (1) member absent. The minutes were provided. On December 27, 2021, the Petitioner's Attorney submitted a response to the actions of the Seward Township Planning Commission; this letter was provided. On January 11, 2022, the Seward Township Board voted to submit a formal objection to the

map amendment. On May 10, 2022, prior to submitting the objection to the County, the Seward Township Board voted to rescind the objection. The email to that effect was provided.

The Village of Plattville was emailed information on December 16, 2021. No comments received.

The Lisbon-Seward Fire Protection District was emailed information on November 16, 2021. No comments received.

ZPAC reviewed this proposal at their meeting on December 7, 2021. The Petitioner's Attorney indicated the Petitioner only wanted to build two (2) houses at this time. The Highway Department requested a voluntary right-of-way dedication; the Petitioner's Attorney was agreeable to the request. ZPAC recommended approval of the requested map amendment by a vote of eight (8) in favor and zero (0) in opposition with two (2) members absent. The minutes of the meeting were provided.

The Kendall County Regional Planning Commission did not have a quorum for their meeting on January 26, 2022. The Kendall County Regional Planning Commission reviewed the proposal at their meeting on April 27, 2022. Member Wilson asked why the Petitioners were rezoning only the center portion of the lot and leaving a U-shaped area zoned A-1. The Petitioners, responded that the proposed rezoned portions of the property were the best locations for houses because of drainage, per the engineer, Phil Young, that examined the property. They said the second home would be for their son. They will lease the land to farm and they also plan to have horses on the property. Dan Kramer, Attorney for the Petitioner, explained that the Petitioner still desired to farm a portion of the property. No other business would be run at the property; no landscaping business has been run at the property and no construction or landscaping debris has been placed on the property. The request is consistent with the County's Land Resource Management Plan; Mr. Kramer noted that Seward Township allowed similar rezoning requests recently. He felt that some of the objectors had an implicit bias against the Petitioner. He hoped Seward Township would follow the proper procedures regarding updating a comprehensive plan. Mr. Kramer discussed the LaSalle Factors. He also discussed the *Village of Richton Park v. Sinclair Pipeline* case. He felt the proposed use would be consistent with the neighboring uses because other single-family homes on similar sized lots are located in the area. Donald and Jo Beth Larkin expressed concerns about drainage, potential damage to field tile, and the construction of more homes on smaller parcels in the area. A drain tile survey will be required in order to build a house; the owners have to repair damaged tile by law. Also, a homeowner would not want broken tile on their property because the water would damage their house. Drainage Law is enforced civilly in Illinois. The property is not in a federal designated floodplain. The Larkins were encouraged to work with the Petitioners to maintain the tile; this will be an opportunity to locate and examine the tile. Tim O'Brien, Seward Township Supervisor, explained that the Seward Township Planning Commission was concerned about water issues. The Kendall County Regional Planning Commission recommended approval of the request by a vote of eight (8) in favor and zero (0) in opposition with one (1) member absent. The minutes of the meeting were provided.

The Kendall County Zoning Board of Appeals started a public hearing on this proposal on December 13, 2021. At the Petitioner's request the hearing was continued to January 31, 2022. The hearing was continued again to February 28, 2022. The minutes of the December 13, 2021, meeting were provided. The minutes of the January 31, 2022, meeting were provided.

On February 14, 2022, the Petitioner's Attorney submitted a request that the hearing be continued to May 2, 2022. This email was provided. The minutes of the February 28, 2022, hearing were provided. At the May 2, 2022 hearing. Mr. Kramer said that his comments regarding implicit bias were directed at the objectors and not anyone associated with Seward Township. He also clarified the type of development that would occur if the rezoning request was approved. The drain tile would be located. Member Vickery provided a history of development in the area and the need for a moratorium on certain zoning actions. The Kendall County Zoning Board of Appeals recommended approval of the request by vote of six (6) in favor and zero (0) in opposition with one (1) member absent. The minutes of the hearing were provided.

The Petitioner desires to rezone the subject property in order to build one (1) house on each of the two (2) new parcels created for a total of two (2) new houses.

Any new homes or accessory structures would be required to meet applicable building codes.

No public or private utilities are onsite.

The property fronts Brisbin Road. Staff has no concerns regarding the ability of Brisbin Road to support the proposed map amendment.

Any new driveways constructed would be for residential purposes. Any new driveways would have to meet applicable regulations and secure proper permits.

No new odors were foreseen.

Any new lighting would be for residential use only.

Any fencing, landscaping, or screening would be for residential purposes.

Any signage would be residential in nature.

No noise was anticipated.

Any new homes would have to be constructed per Kendall County's Stormwater Management Ordinance.

The Findings of Fact were as follows:

Existing uses of property within the general area of the property in question. The surrounding properties are used for agricultural purposes or larger lot single-family residential uses.

The Zoning classification of property within the general area of the property in question. The surrounding properties are zoned A-1 or A-1 SU for the sale of agricultural products, art, pottery, and home décor not produced on the premises.

The suitability of the property in question for the uses permitted under the existing zoning classification. The property is presently zoned A-1. The agricultural housing allocations for the subject property have already been used and no new single-family homes can be constructed on the subject property without a map amendment.

The trend of development, if any, in the general area of the property in question, including changes, if any, which may have taken place since the day the property in question was in its present zoning classification. The Zoning Board of Appeals shall not recommend the adoption of a proposed amendment unless it finds that the adoption of such an amendment is in the

public interest and is not solely for the interest of the applicant. The Zoning Board of Appeals may recommend the adoption of an amendment changing the zoning classification of the property in question to any higher classification than that requested by the applicant. For the purpose of this paragraph the R-1 District shall be considered the highest classification and the M-2 District shall be considered the lowest classification. The trend of development in the area is a mix of agricultural and single-family residential uses found in rural settings.

Consistency with the purpose and objectives of the Land Resource Management Plan and other adopted County or municipal plans and policies. The Future Land Use Map in the Land Resource Management Plan classifies this property as Rural Estate Residential. The R-1 One Family Residential District is consistent with the Rural Estate Residential classification.

Staff recommended approval of the proposed map amendment because the proposal is consistent with the Land Resource Management Plan.

The draft ordinance was provided.

Dan Kramer, Attorney for the Petitioner, discussed the acreage configuration in the area. The owner of the neighboring twenty (20) acres to the north have dumped debris on their property and observers misunderstood which properties were owned by which parties. The Petitioners have not dumped debris on the subject property. The area around the property proposed for rezoning is planted in soybeans.

Member Koukol asked about the landscaper on the west side of the road and if that landscaper was connected to the property on the east of the road. Mr. Kramer did not know the answer to that question. The subject properties have always been vacant.

Discussion occurred regarding the current and projected taxes generated by the subject properties.

Member Koukol made motion, seconded by Member Vickers, to recommend approval of the map amendment.

With a voice vote of four (4) ayes, the motion carried.

Anne Vickery noted the confusion in the area and she pledged to be good neighbors.

The proposal goes to the County Board on June 21, 2022, on the regular agenda.

*Petition 22-10 Mark Fecht on Behalf of Fecht Brothers, Inc. (Property Owner) and Jeremy and Samantha Dippold on Behalf of Best Budget Tree, LLC (Contract Purchaser)*

Mr. Asselmeier summarized the request.

Best Budget Tree, LLC would like to purchase the subject property from Fecht Brothers Inc. in order to operate a tree and landscaping business at the property.

Best Budget Tree, LLC has been in existence for over ten (10) years.

The application materials, site plan, landscaping plan, stormwater plans, and renderings of the proposed building were provided.

The property is on the north side of Route 52 across from 2190 and 2200 Route 52.

The property is approximately forty-eight (48) acres in size.

The property is zoned A-1 Agricultural.

The County's Future Land Use Map calls for the property to be Rural Residential (Max 0.65 Du/Acre). Shorewood's Future Land Use Map calls for the property to be Residential and Commercial.

Route 52 is a State maintained Arterial road.

Joliet has a trail planned along Route 52, but Joliet does not want a right-of-way dedication at this time; an email to that effect was provided.

There are no floodplains on the property. There is a wetland near the northwest corner of the property.

The adjacent land uses are Agricultural and Single-Family Residential.

The adjacent properties are zoned A-1 and R-3.

The County's Future Land Use Map calls for the area to be Commercial, Rural Residential, and Suburban Residential. Joliet's Future Land Use Map calls for the area to be Residential. Shorewood's Future Land Use Map calls for the area to be Residential and Commercial.

The nearby properties are zoned A-1, A-1 SU, and R-1, and R-3.

The A-1 special use permit to the west is for the sale of agricultural products not grown on the premises.

EcoCAT Report was submitted on April 15, 2022, and indicated the following protected resources:

Aux Sable Creek INAI Site

Greater Redhorse (*Moxostoma valenciennesi*)

The Illinois Department of Conservation determined that negative impacts were unlikely and consultation was terminated on April 18, 2022.

The application for NRI was submitted April 21, 2022. The LESA Score was 210 indicating a medium level of protection. The NRI Report was provided.

Petition information was sent to Seward Township on April 25, 2022. The Seward Township Planning Commission reviewed the proposal in May 2022. They expressed concerns about the location of lighting with respect to the adjacent homes. The Seward Township Planning Commission recommended approval of the request. An email to that effect was provided. The Seward Township Board met on May 28, 2022 and recommended denial on a vote of three (3) in favor and one (1) in opposition. The Township Board recommended denial because of concerns related to decreased property values, noise, pollution concerns, the presence of containers for storage, fire issues, the impact of the use on the existing pipelines, and enforcement of conditions by the County. The minutes of the meeting were provided.

Petition information was sent to the Village of Shorewood on April 25, 2022. On May 4, 2022, the Village of Shorewood submitted an email saying they did not want to request a right-of-way dedication for a biking/walking trail. This email was provided.

Petition information was sent to the Minooka Fire Protection District on April 25, 2022. On May 5 and 6, 2022, the Minooka Fire Protection District submitted a letter and email requesting a fire alarm system that meets applicable codes, no smoking signs near the mulch pile, a dry fire hydrant, and signage properly marking the address of the property. The letter and email were provided. The Petitioners were agreeable to this request.

The Kendall County ZPAC reviewed this Petition at their meeting on May 3, 2022. Mr. Klaas asked if the six inch (6") pipe shown on the plans went to Route 52. John Tebrugge, Petitioners' Engineer, said the pipe goes almost to Route 52. The Petitioners had not received final access approval from the Illinois Department of Transportation; they will not get final approval until they (the Dippolds) own the property. The Petitioners understood that any buildings constructed on the property would not be eligible for agricultural building permit exemptions. Based on the information provided, the well would not be a non-community well. The Petitioners were advised to design the septic system for maximum load. The Petitioners were advised to identify on the site plan where lights would be placed. The Petitioners had no plans to use the access off of Arbeiter Road. The land comes with building allocations. ZPAC recommended approval of the proposal by a vote of six (6) in favor and zero (0) in opposition with four (4) members absent. The minutes were provided.

The Kendall County Regional Planning Commission reviewed this Petition at their meeting on May 25, 2022.

Chairman Ashton asked if the Minooka Fire Protection District wanted just an alarm system or if the request was to have the building sprinklered. Mr. Asselmeier responded just an alarm system.

Member Wilson asked how the Petitioners were going to manage the mulch pile and if mulch would be sold. Jeremy Dippold, Petitioner, said the mulch would be installed on off-site locations. They would have several small piles. The maximum height of the mulch piles would be twelve feet (12') because of the company's equipment.

Member Casey asked where the business was currently located. Mr. Dippold responded Renwick Road and Interstate 55. Mr. Dippold said the proposed location would look better than the existing location because no inside storage exists at their current location.

Member Casey asked about possible expansion. Mr. Asselmeier said, if the Petitioners expanded into the farmland beyond the area identified on the site plan, an amendment to the special use permit would be required.

Discussion occurred regarding the access point off of Arbeiter Road. The access would remain to allow a farmer to get their equipment into the field. Based on the plans, it appeared difficult for a farmer to get equipment to north portion of the property using the access off of Route 52. Equipment could be driven through the parking lot. The current owner would continue to farm the property after the Dippolds acquire the property.

Joe Frescura requested that the proposal be denied for the following reasons:

1. The business has no noise control plan; wood chippers would exceed the noise requirements in the proposed special use permit. He provided pictures of the height of mulch piles at the business' current location. The trees proposed on the site plan will not reach full height for ten (10) years and will not provide a full

- noise buffer until that time.
2. The dyed mulch will jeopardize local wells, waterways, and wetlands.
  3. Inclusion of access to Arbeiter Road; he would like to see the access point removed. He also discussed burning at other landscaping businesses.
  4. There are several containers at the Petitioners' current operating location. He was concerned about the placement of the containers turning the area into an industrial park and causing a decrease in property values in the area.
  5. He noted that five (5) landscaping business have special use permits in Seward Township. These existing special uses are not located near homes like the proposed special use.
  6. He expressed concerns regarding the soils to support a septic system.
  7. He expressed concerns regarding burning on the property and the possible intermingling of onsite and offsite generated materials in a burn pile.
  8. He noted that the LESA Score was 210. He argued the property should be retained for farming.

Mr. Dippold said chippers would not be used onsite; they would be at customers' homes. He explained the mulch dyeing process; the dyed mulch is not hazardous. He did not want burning on the property. He has three (3) containers which are used for storage; the containers would be replaced with the building. He was agreeable to a condition not allowing shipping containers on the property. He did not anticipate operating at the site until July 2023. He has no interest in using Arbeiter Road to access the property for the business.

Anne Vickery noted this proposal would be the sixth (6<sup>th</sup>) landscaping special use in Seward Township. She asked if anyone on the Board would like to live next to this type of use. She also noted that the property was planned to be residential. She asked who would enforce the regulations; she noted burning at another landscaping business.

Robert Delaney said the area was a residential area and should remain a residential area. He questioned the need to have a large amount of acreage used for the proposed use.

Pat Frescura said that she has lived in the area for over fifty (50) years. She noted the time, investment, and pride in her property. She was against having the proposed use near her property. She wanted to keep the land as farmland. She said that she was unaware of the Seward Township Planning Commission's meeting.

Jim Martin, Seward Township Trustee, said the Seward Township Planning Commission did not forward a recommendation to the Township Board. The Township Board did not vote on this proposal.

Tim O'Brien, Seward Township Supervisor, said the Seward Township Planning Commission did not forward a recommendation to the Township Board.

It was noted that the proposal would preserve agricultural uses on the majority of the property.

Dave Shively asked what A-1 meant. A-1 means agricultural. He discussed the repaving of Arbeiter Road. He asked about enforcement of burning regulations. Mr. Asselmeier explained that burning items brought onto the property was against State law. Mr. Shively favored keeping the property in farming. He favored a housing development instead of the proposed use.

Member Wilson favored having the proposal over houses.



Tony Guzman said that he bought his property because it was a residential area. He would like to see the property become a park. He likes the wildlife in the area. He felt the use was an industrial use.

Mr. Dippold asked if his proposal was any different than a farmer building grain bins with related noise and odors. He also noted that he was pursuing the zoning on the property the correct way.

Kim Larkin said that she did not want to look at this use in her backyard. She said that mulch has an odor. Discussion occurred regarding the smell of mulch. She expressed concerns about diminished property values.

Steve Papaeliou expressed his opposition to the containers on the property.

Mr. O'Brien requested the proposal be tabled and sent back to Seward Township. Member Wilson wanted to know the opinion of the Township Board. Member Nelson noted the Petitioners followed the proper procedures to get to this point. Mr. Dippold opposed tabling the proposal because Mr. Fecht wants to close on the property quickly.

Member Nelson did not see much of a difference between the proposal and farming uses.

Member Wormley noted that a subdivision could be placed on the property at some point in the future, even if the special use permit was approved. He thought the proposal was a good proposal compared to other uses that could go on the property.

The Kendall Regional Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the proposal with an additional condition stating that no storage containers would be allowed on the subject property by a vote of seven (7) in favor and one (1) in opposition with one (1) member absent. The minutes of the meeting were provided.

The Kendall County Zoning Board of Appeals held a public hearing on May 31, 2022. It was noted that the powered equipment exemption applies to equipment used to maintain the property and not to equipment related to the landscaping business. The business would have to follow the hours of operation and employee number requirements in the special use permit and could move snow, if they followed the hours of operation requirement. The Petitioners had not indicated that they would move snow. The Zoning Ordinance set the number of parking spaces required. An amendment to the special use permit would be required, if the business expanded onsite. Discussion occurred regarding Joliet's and Shorewood's Future Land Use Maps in this area.

Boyd Ingemunson, Attorney for the Petitioners, said the Petitioners have gone above and beyond what is required of them in terms of planning and preparing for the proposal. He said the business is a tree processing company. Chipping occurs offsite. Onsite, they make mulch and cut firewood for customers. No chipping occurs onsite. There are no by-products. No storage of landscaping materials like rock or grass clippings, will occur. He noted that the conditions were more restrictive than other special uses in the A-1 District. The Petitioners agreed to the conditions. He noted the buffer space and screening with trees. Member Vickery asked if chipping would occur onsite. Mr. Ingemunson said chipping occurs offsite. Mr. Ingemunson noted the safety guide for the mulch dyeing. He said table salt is more toxic than mulch dyeing. Mr. Ingemunson said wood splitting would occur onsite with a hydraulic splitter.

Member Vickery asked about containers. Jeremy Dippold, Petitioner, said the reason for the building was to store equipment. No cargo containers would be needed if the building was constructed. He was agreeable to a condition not to have semi-trailers on the premises.

Chairman Mohr asked how long the business had been in existence on Renwick Road. Mr. Dippold responded 2012. Chairman Mohr asked about the distance to existing residences at the business' current site. Mr. Dippold responded the current site was thirty-two (32) acres and across the entire frontage there is about a dozen homes. He has not received any complaints. Chairman Mohr asked if the business will change because of the increased acreage. Mr. Dippold responded that he wanted additional room and have more organization. Chairman Mohr asked if any employees self-report to sites. Mr. Dippold responded employees come to the business and take work vehicles to sites. Mr. Dippold explained that he always overdoes in terms of room and space. He noted it was better to have multiple small piles of mulch.

Discussion occurred regarding moving the perimeter trees, with berms and more mature trees, along the boundary of the landscape business area instead of around the perimeter of the entire site. Mr. Dippold described tree growth and that trees root better on flat pieces of land.

Joe Frescura discussed the impact of the proposed use on property values. He said that no noise plan was provided. He discussed the removal of tree waste from the site. He discussed the wheel loader used by the Petitioners. This piece of equipment generates about 125 decibels. He said people purchased property in the area for the peace and quiet. Agricultural equipment is used episodically and not continually on the subject property. The proposed use is different than residential maintenance. He stated that the proposed use is close to residential houses, which is different than other intense agricultural and landscaping uses. Noise would decrease property values. It was noted that no noise study existed for the proposed use. The noise ordinance does not apply to agricultural uses. Mr. Asselmeier explained the enforcement of noise regulations. Mr. Frescura requested a noise study. He also noted that the amount of chemicals impact toxicity. He questioned how much water would be used to dilute chemicals. Loss of water would also negatively impact property values.

Pat Frescura said the property is zoned residential and agricultural and has been used for farming. She had a Realtor look at her property and said that her property would decrease in value by fifteen percent (15%) if the proposed use moved into the area. She said no one would benefit from this use, except the Petitioners. She noted the odors from the mulch, dust from truck traffic, noise, and burning would negatively impact the area. She said that complaints of burning against TZ Landscaping have been made and no enforcement occurs. She did not see a gain to the public from the proposed use. She noted that none of the existing landscaping businesses were close to existing homes. She noted that the Seward Township Board voted against the proposal. She noted the LESA Score was 210 making the land desirable for farming; lower score land should be used for business uses.

Discussion occurred regarding other landscaping businesses located near residences.

Ramiro Guzman said that he was also in the landscaping business, but did not operate out of his house. He loves the agriculture around his property. He did not think a business would locate in the area. He is opposed to the proposal. He discussed the making of chips and mulch. He would like to know the power load of the grinder. The use will create a pile of dead branches; he questioned the height of piles of brush and logs. He was also concerned about the safety of local children because of the pond. He was also concerned about mulch fires. Mr.

Dippold described his grinder; he said it makes minimal noise. He said his pond is no different than retention ponds in subdivision. He was not opposed to moving the screen of trees to around the landscaping business area only.

Sheila Trost questioned the public need for the proposed use. Chairman Mohr said there was not a public need and special use permits do not need to meet all of the LaSalle Factors, like zoning changes.

Kim Larkin felt the proposal did not meet the requirements of the LaSalle Factors. The business will not be open to the public and will not bring anything to the community or provide income to the County or Township. She said Kendall County does not come out when complaints are filed; she provided an example involving Animal Control and a dog in the area.

Mr. Frescura asked about buildings not being considered agricultural. Mr. Asselmeier explained that the conditions related to agricultural exempt buildings and agricultural exempt equipment were placed in special use permits to qualify that the use is not agricultural and needs to secure appropriate permits and follow rules for non-agricultural equipment. Mr. Frescura argued that the use is a manufacturing use and not an agricultural use.

Tim O'Brien, Seward Township Supervisor, noted that the Seward Township Board voted this proposal down by a three (3) to one (1) vote.

Mark Fecht, Property Owner and Petitioner, said the wetland is a farmed wetland. He said the soil is not the greatest soil; leaching was not likely. He discussed his hog operations and the property would be ideal for pig space. He felt operating a hog farm would more negatively impact property values than the proposed use. He felt that he might be able to get two thousand four hundred (2,400) hogs on the property. The property was not set up for irrigation.

Discussion occurred regarding the location of the pipelines. The pipelines are near the southern part of the property and are not near the proposed use area.

Member Vickery left the meeting prior to the votes on the conditions and recommendation.

The Kendall County Zoning Board of Appeals voted four (4) in favor and zero (0) in opposition with three (3) absent to amend condition 25 to not allow semi-trailers to be parked on subject the property.

The consensus of the Kendall County Zoning Board of Appeals was not to change the site plan, landscaping plan, and tree counts to have the trees placed along the landscape business area only instead of the perimeter of the property.

The Kendall County Zoning Board of Appeals voted three (3) in favor and (1) in opposition to the request with three (3) members absent. State law requires the concurrent vote of four (4) members to recommend approval. Therefore, the recommendation was denial. Chairman Mohr voted no because of the concerns raised by the neighbors related to the view of area. He was also concerned about loss of property values. He believed the subject property would eventually be houses. The minutes of the hearing were provided.

The Petitioners called after the hearing and said they would like to amend condition 25 to set a date for removal of the storage containers. The Petitioners also would like to allow semi-trailers on the property both in relation to the business allowed by the special use permit and in relation

to farming activities. The Petitioners also submitted a plat showing the distance to property lines from their operations. This plat was provided.

Per Section 7:01.D.30 of the Kendall County Zoning Ordinance, landscaping businesses can be special uses on A-1 zoned property subject to the following conditions:

1. All vehicles, equipment and materials associated with a landscaping business shall be stored entirely within an enclosed structure, unless otherwise permitted under the terms of this Special Use Permit.
2. The business shall be located on, and have direct access to, a State, County or Collector Highway as identified in the County's LRMP, having an all-weather surface, designed to accommodate loads of at least seventy-three thousand, two hundred eighty pounds (73,280 lbs.), unless otherwise approved in writing by the agency having jurisdiction over said Highway. Such approvals shall establish limitations as to the number of employees and types of vehicles coming to and from the site that are engaged in the operation of the use (including delivery vehicles). These restrictions shall be included as controlling conditions of the Special Use.
3. No landscape waste generated off the property can be burned on this site.

If the County Board approves the outdoor storage of materials, the above conditions have been met.

According to the business plan, the business currently operates two (2) four (4) employee crews in April through October and one (1) four (4) employee crew in November through March. The Petitioners plan to hire four (4) additional employees, if business increases. Employees arrive at the property at approximately 7:30 a.m., go to work sites, and return to the property between 3:30 p.m. and 4:00 p.m. Employees unload equipment and materials and leave between 4:30 p.m. and 5:00 p.m. The business operates on Monday through Fridays with an occasional Saturday.

Business equipment presently consists of two (2) bucket trucks, two (2) wood chippers, two (2) one (1) ton pickup trucks, two (2) utility trailers, two (2) spare pick-up trucks, and one (1) wheel leader tractor. When not in operation, the Petitioners plan to house vehicles and equipment inside the proposed approximately nine thousand six hundred (9,600) square foot building. Mulch and firewood piles would be placed on the gravel area as shown on the site plan and landscaping plan and would be piled a maximum twelve feet (12') in height. The Petitioners do not plan to store stone, brick, or rock at the property. Per the site plan, the gravel area is approximately ten point five (10.5) acres in size. If there is a motor vehicle or equipment related leak, the impacted gravel will be removed and replaced with clean gravel.

No retail services will be available at the property and retail customers will not be invited onto the property.

If approved, the Petitioners plan to start operations as quickly as possible.

One (1) approximately nine thousand six hundred (9,600) square foot building is proposed for the site in the location depicted on the site plan and landscaping plan. The building will look substantially like the provided rendering. The walls will be approximately sixteen feet (16') feet

tall and the doors will be fourteen feet (14') in height. The peak of the building will be a maximum twenty-four feet (24').

Any structures related to the landscaping business would be required to obtain applicable building permits.

No well or septic system presently exists on the property. No other utilities are located on the property.

One (1) ten foot by ten foot (10' X 10') dumpster enclosure was shown on the site plan and landscaping plan east of the vehicle parking area.

The property drains to the south.

There is one (1) wetland located near the northwest corner of the property.

The site plan and landscaping plan show a proposed seventy-three thousand, nine hundred eighty-four (73,984) square foot wet bottom pond. At the deepest point, the pond will be sixteen feet (16') deep. The stormwater plan information was provided.

WBK Engineering submitted comments on the proposal. This letter was provided. These comments will have to be addressed prior to the issuance of a stormwater management permit.

Per the site plan and landscaping plan, the Petitioners plan to install one (1) thirty foot (30') wide gravel driveway. The driveway will be approximately forty-eight feet (48') from the western property line.

According to site plan and landscaping plan, the Petitioners plan to install two (2) parking areas. One (1) parking area is planned south of the building and the other parking area is planned west of the building. The total number of parking spaces is twenty-one (21) including one (1) handicapped accessible parking space.

Three (3) pipeline easements exist on the property.

No existing lighting is located on the property.

At the time of the ZPAC meeting and Seward Township Planning Commission meeting, the Petitioners had not submitted a lighting plan. The lighting plan shows one (1) free standing light near the south parking lot and six (6) lights on the building. Based on the photometrics provided, no light would cross the property lines. The lighting plan was provided.

Per Section 11:02.F.12.e, of the Kendall County Zoning Ordinance, the maximum height for the freestanding light is twenty feet (20').

According to the site plan and landscaping plan, one (1) non-illuminated sign is proposed between the gravel driveway and the western property line. No information was provided regarding sign dimensions or height. Per Section 12:08.A. of the Kendall County Zoning Ordinance, the total maximum allowable signage is thirty-two (32) square feet of gross surface area.

No security information was provided.

The landscaping plan shows one hundred fifty (150) white pines along the perimeter of the property. The white pines will be three (3') feet at the time of planting and will grow to between fifty feet (50') and eighty feet (80'). Ten (10) deciduous trees are planned along the perimeter of the pond. The trees will be one and one half inches (1.5") at the time of planting. The landscaping plan also calls for a seed mix of Kentucky blue grass and turf type perennial grass around the pond and along the gravel driveway. Vegetation will be installed after the gravel and pond are installed.

The portion of the property not used for storage, building, driveway, or the pond will remain farmed. Most of the property will be farmed in 2022, which will delay the installation of the landscaping until 2023.

No information was provided regarding noise control.

No new odors are foreseen by the proposed use.

If approved, this would be the nineteenth (19<sup>th</sup>) special use permit for a landscaping business in unincorporated Kendall County.

The Findings of Fact were as follows:

That the establishment, maintenance, or operation of the special use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort, or general welfare. Provided the site is developed in accordance with the submitted site plan and landscaping plan, the operation of the special use will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, morals, comfort, or general welfare. Conditions may be placed in the special use permit ordinance to address hours of operation. **Member Vickery dissented with this Finding.**

That the special use will not be substantially injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood. The Zoning classification of property within the general area of the property in question shall be considered in determining consistency with this standard. The proposed use shall make adequate provisions for appropriate buffers, landscaping, fencing, lighting, building materials, open space and other improvements necessary to insure that the proposed use does not adversely impact adjacent uses and is compatible with the surrounding area and/or the County as a whole. Appropriate restrictions may be placed in the special use permit to regulate the number of employees, hours of operation, site landscaping, lighting, and noise. Therefore, the neighboring property owners should not suffer loss in property values and the use will not negatively impact the adjacent land uses. **Chairman Mohr and Member Vickery dissented with this Finding.**

That adequate utilities, access roads and points of ingress and egress, drainage, and/or other necessary facilities have been or are being provided. If a stormwater management permit is issued based on the submitted materials, drainage should not be an issue. If the Illinois Department of Transportation approves the access, ingress and egress should not be an issue. Utilities will need to be extended and/or installed on the property. **Member Vickery dissented with this Finding.**

That the special use shall in all other respects conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located, except as such regulations may in each instance be modified by

the County Board pursuant to the recommendation of the Zoning Board of Appeals. This is true. No variances are required. **Member Vickery dissented with this Finding.**

That the special use is consistent with the purpose and objectives of the Land Resource Management Plan and other adopted County or municipal plans and policies. True, the proposed use is consistent with an objective found on Page 9-21 of the Kendall County Land Resource Management Plan which calls for “a strong base of agricultural, commercial and industrial uses that provide a broad range of job opportunities, a healthy tax base, and improved quality of services to County residents”. Also, the Kendall County Future Land Use Map and the Village of Shorewood’s Future Land Use Map call for commercial uses near the intersection of Route 52 and Arbeiter Road. **Chairman Mohr and Member Vickery dissented with this Finding.**

Staff recommended approval of the special use permit for a landscaping business subject to the following conditions and restrictions:

1. The site shall be developed substantially in accordance with the submitted site plan, landscaping plan, and lighting plan **(amended after ZPAC)**.
2. The gravel area shown on the submitted site plan and landscaping plan shall not exceed ten point five (10.5) acres in size. The owners of the business allowed by this special use permit may reduce the amount of acreage covered by gravel.
3. The owners of the businesses allowed by this special use permit shall diligently monitor the property for leaks from equipment and vehicles parked and stored and items stored on the subject property and shall promptly clean up the site if leaks occur.
4. One (1) approximately nine thousand six hundred (9,600) square foot building may be installed on the subject property in substantially the location shown on the site plan. The building shall look substantially like the building depicted in the submitted rendering. The maximum height of the building shall be twenty-four feet (24’).
5. Any new structures constructed or installed related to the business allowed by this special use permit on the property shall not be considered for agricultural purposes and must secure applicable building permits.
6. No business operations may commence at the subject property until an occupancy permit is issued for the building shown on the submitted site plan. No business operations may commence at the subject property until the parking stalls, dumpster enclosure, and wet bottom pond shown on the submitted site plan are installed. Business operations may commence at the subject property prior to the installation of vegetation shown on the submitted landscaping plan.
7. Equipment and vehicles related to the business allowed by the special use permit may be stored outdoors at the subject property during the hours the business is open and shall be stored indoors during non-business hours.
8. None of the vehicles or equipment parked or stored on the subject property related to the business allowed by the special use permit shall be considered agricultural vehicles or agricultural equipment.
9. All of the vehicles and equipment stored on the subject property related to the business allowed by the special use permit shall be maintained in good condition with no deflated tires and shall be licensed if required by law.

10. All landscape related materials shall be stored indoors or on the gravel area depicted on the site plan. The maximum height of the piles of landscaping related material shall be twelve feet (12') in height, unless otherwise restricted by a stormwater management permit. Stone, brick, and rock shall not be stored outdoors.
11. The size and depth of the wet bottom pond shall be governed by the stormwater management permit issued for the subject property.
12. One (1) two (2) sided non-illuminated sign may be installed on the location depicted on the submitted site plan.
13. At least two (2) no smoking signs shall be installed near the piles of landscaping related materials. **(added after ZPAC)**
14. One hundred fifty (150) white pines shall be installed in substantially the locations shown on the submitted landscaping plan. The white pines shall be a minimum of three feet (3') in height at the time of planting. The white pines shall be installed by June 30, 2023. Damaged or dead white pines shall be replaced on a timeframe approved by the Kendall County Planning, Building and Zoning Department. The Kendall County Planning, Building and Zoning Committee may grant an extension to the deadline to install the white pines.
15. Ten (10) deciduous trees shall be installed in substantially the locations shown on the submitted landscaping plan. The deciduous trees shall be a minimum one point five inches (1.5") in diameter at the time of planting. The deciduous trees shall be installed by June 30, 2023. Damaged or dead deciduous trees shall be replaced on a timeframe approved by the Kendall County Planning, Building and Zoning Department. The Kendall County Planning, Building and Zoning Committee may grant an extension to the deadline to install the deciduous trees.
16. The seed mix called for in the submitted landscaping plan shall be installed by June 30, 2023. The Kendall County Planning, Building and Zoning Committee may grant an extension to the deadline to install the seed mix.
17. No landscape waste generated off the property can be burned on the subject property.
18. A maximum of twenty (20) employees of the business allowed by this special use permit, including the owners of the business allowed by this special use permit, may report to this site for work. No employees shall engage in the sale of landscaping related materials on the property.
19. No retail customers of the business allowed by this special use permit shall be invited onto the property by anyone associated with the use allowed by this special use permit.
20. The hours of operation of the business allowed by this special use permit shall be Monday through Saturday from 7:30 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. The owners of the business allowed by this special use permit may reduce these hours of operation.
21. The noise regulations are as follows:



Day Hours: No person shall cause or allow the emission of sound during daytime hours (7:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M.) from any noise source to any receiving residential land which exceeds sixty-five (65) dBA when measured at any point within such receiving residential land, provided; however, that point of measurement shall be on the property line of the complainant.

Night Hours: No person shall cause or allow the emission of sound during nighttime hours (10:00 P.M. to 7:00 A.M.) from any noise source to any receiving residential land which exceeds fifty-five (55) dBA when measured at any point within such receiving residential land provided; however, that point of measurement shall be on the property line of the complainant.

EXEMPTION: Powered Equipment: Powered equipment, such as lawn mowers, small lawn and garden tools, riding tractors, and snow removal equipment which is necessary for the maintenance of property is exempted from the noise regulations between the hours of seven o'clock (7:00) A.M. and ten o'clock (10:00) P.M.

22. At least one (1) functioning fire extinguisher and one (1) first aid kit shall be on the subject property. Applicable signage stating the location of the fire extinguisher and first aid kit shall be placed on the subject property.
23. One (1) dry hydrant shall be placed on the property **(added after ZPAC)**.
24. The maximum height of the light pole shown in the lighting plan shall be twenty feet (20') **(added after ZPAC)**.
25. No storage/shipping containers are allowed on the subject property and no semi-trailers may be parked on the subject property **(added by the RPC and amended at ZBA)**.
26. The owners of the business allowed by this special use permit acknowledge and agree to follow Kendall County's Right to Farm Clause.
27. The property owner and operator of the business allowed by this special use permit shall follow all applicable Federal, State, and Local laws related to the operation of this type of business.
28. Failure to comply with one or more of the above conditions or restrictions could result in the amendment or revocation of the special use permit.
29. If one or more of the above conditions is declared invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining conditions shall remain valid.
30. This special use permit shall be treated as a covenant running with the land and is binding on the successors, heirs, and assigns as to the same special use conducted on the property.

The draft ordinance was provided.

Member Koukol asked about the handicapped parking space. Mr. Asselmeier said that parking space was required per the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Member Koukol asked about grinding offsite and the dyeing process. Boyd Ingemunson, Attorney for the Petitioners, said wood chipping occurs offsite and they roto-chop onsite (making the mulch onsite).

Mr. Ingemunson explained that the equipment would not exceed the noise requirements. He also explained the need for the business in the area; the business is a specialized tree and landscaping business. He explained the proposed screening and said the Petitioners were agreeable with planting trees along the perimeter of the property as shown on the landscaping plan.

Mr. Ingemunson requested that condition 25 be amended to have semi-trailers on the property, but not used for storage. The semi-trailers would be stored inside the building during non-business hours.

Mr. Dippold explained the dyeing process. The dyeing machine is not used every day. Dyeing does not occur in the winter because the water freezes. No burning would occur onsite. He also discussed back-up beepers that only go off if something is behind the equipment.

Member Flowers asked about fire prevention. The site will have a pond and dry hydrant.

Member Koukol asked if the restrictions would impact the business and if the Petitioners have discussed the proposal with neighbors. Mr. Dippold said that he has containers to store equipment at his existing site. Those containers will not be used at the subject property. The existing containers on the subject property will be removed, if the special use permit is approved.

Member Koukol noted the concerns of the neighbors.

Discussion occurred regarding the proposed gravel driveway and keeping access on Arbeiter Road for farming purposes.

Discussion occurred about installing berms. The belief was that trees would do better on flat ground compared to installing trees in berms. Mr. Dippold explained the tree selection in the landscaping plan.

The building would be installed over the winter 2022-2023 with excavating in fall 2022. Mr. Dippold would like to plant the trees in the fall.

Robert Delaney questioned if the Petitioners were in the landscaping business. He said the Petitioners were a manufacturing facility. Mr. Ingemunson said the Petitioners are not manufactures and the use does not fit in the M-1 District. The use is landscaping. Mr. Ingemunson said forestry is a permitted use in the A-1.

Joe Frescura discussed concerns about a lack of a noise abatement plan. He requested that the proposal not be voted on or denied until a noise abatement plan was provided. He has driven by the Petitioners current location.

Anne Vickery discussed the Findings of the Fact. She felt the use would be detrimental to the area. She said the use would not be consistent with the Kendall County Land Resource Management Plan because no taxes would be generated at the subject property. She said that the Petitioners could do their business at their home outside Newark. She asked when the

people living in the unincorporated area count.

Pat Frescura said that her neighbor, Mr. Carusi, was elderly and also against the proposal.

Ramiro Guzman said that he was in the landscaping business. He explained the mulch making process. He said that it would take at least twelve (12) months to make mulch. He was concerned about traffic, dust, and noise.

Member Vickers discussed the possibility of hogs going on the property. Discussion occurred hog farmers paying neighbors because of the smell.

Member Koukol suggest finding a compromise between the Petitioners and the neighbors.

Discussion occurred regarding the dyeing process. The wood absorbs the dye while inside the machine.

Mr. Dippold said that his residential property is wooded. He was open to installing berms on the property.

Chairman Gengler suggested that Mr. Dippold invite neighbors to the business' current location.

Sharleen Smith, Seward Township Trustee, discussed the conflicts when considering the proposal. She noted that Seward Township has had issues with other businesses and the Township has been burned in those cases. As a Board, the Township would like to see that everyone's needs are met. She said the Township Board voted with the people. She said people were concerned about noise, dye, and fire.

Member Koukol suggested tabling the proposal in order to give his neighbors an opportunity to visit the business' current operations. He also favored having a berm on the property. He would like to find some middle ground.

Mr. Ingemunson discussed the rule of law as it relates to zoning and private property rights. He discussed the possibility that the court could issue the special use permit without any conditions.

Chairman Gengler suggested visiting the business' current location.

Discussion occurred regarding the dates of the July Committee of the Whole, Planning, Building and Zoning Committee, and County Board meetings. Mr. Ingemunson noted that the property is under contract with extensions.

Jim Martin, Seward Township Trustee, said the property owner has had the property for sale for some time. He urged Committee members to visit other mulch operations to see if they are located in residential areas. He believes the quality of life for the residents would be diminished.

Chairman Gengler made motion, seconded by Member Vickers, to issue a neutral recommendation and the proposal go to the Committee of the Whole on June 16, 2022.

The proposal may get tabled at the Committee of the Whole to allow County Board members to visit the business' current location.

With a voice vote of four (4) ayes, the motion carried.

The proposal goes to the Committee of the Whole on June 16, 2022.

Robert Delaney discussed the pipelines that run through the property and if the pipeline owner would want anything over the pipes to protect the pipes.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

#### **Request for Guidance Regarding a Junk and Debris Issue and Container without a Permit at 19 N. Cherry Drive, Oswego**

Mr. Asselmeier summarized the issue and provided pictures of the property showing the container.

Gerald Gapa, property owner, explained the container was placed in the property to hold household items after a fire at the property. Within the next six (6) months, they plan to sell and move to Michigan. The debris in the yard was created by the fire and related demolition work.

Mr. Gapa owns the container.

Member Koukol suggested putting the items back in the house.

The container does not leak.

Member Vickers asked if Mr. Gapa needed assistance with moving. He did not assistance taking care of the landscaping debris in the backyard.

Member Koukol asked if the Mr. Gapa could find another location for the container. Mr. Gapa was unsure if he could find an offsite location.

Mr. Gapa requested three (3) months to remove the container.

Bob and Kathy Patula said the property has continued to decline for the last twenty-six (26) years. They felt the building should be condemned. Mr. Asselmeier said that the County does not have property maintenance code in the unincorporated area. Discussion occurred about the tax reduction at the property and loss of property value.

The consensus of the Committee was to set a deadline of September 1, 2022, to remove the container.

#### **Approval of a Recommendation to Change the Address of 27 Knollwood Drive, Montgomery to 35 Woodcliff Drive Montgomery; Committee Could Request the State's Attorney's Office Assist with Drafting/Reviewing the Address Change Ordinance**

Mr. Asselmeier summarized the issue.

GIS received a complaint from the resident of 27 Woodcliff Road. Due to a public safety concern of emergency responders possibly going to the wrong address KenCom agreed the address should be changed from 27 Knollwood Drive to 35 Woodcliff Road. This issue was voted on by the KenCom Operations Board and the minutes were provided. A picture of the area was provided.

It was noted that the owners of 27 Knollwood Drive opposed the address change.

Blanca Mota, property owner, explained her reasons for opposing the change. She was not aware the issue existed. She was willing to erect clearer signage on the property. She was provided KenCom's information regarding signage placement suggestions.

It was noted that this property was not the only property with this issue in Boulder Hill.

#### Review of Annual NPDES Survey

Mr. Asselmeier summarized the issue.

Every year at the end of June or beginning of July, Kendall County sends an NPDES survey to the townships.

WBK reviewed the survey and suggested adding question one under Good Housekeeping. WBK also suggested that question two under Good Housekeeping be changed from:

"Do you feel the County provides adequate training to staff members to keep them informed on stormwater pollution prevention practices?"

to

"Do you feel you have adequate resources for training of your staff members to keep them informed on stormwater pollution prevention practices?"

The revised survey incorporating WBK's suggestions was provided.

The Committee had no objections to the survey as presented.

#### **OLD BUSINESS**

##### Approval of a Contract for Plumbing Inspections Between Kendall County and Mayer Construction, LLC D.B.A. Mayer Plumbing, LLC

Mr. Asselmeier summarized the request.

The Planning, Building and Zoning Department has been informed that Randy Erickson was no longer available to do plumbing inspections.

Brian Holdiman researched possible replacements and recommended Anthony Mayer of Mayer Construction, LLC, D.B.A. Mayer Plumbing, LLC.

The proposed contract was provided.

Pete Ratos from the United City of Yorkville is presently doing plumbing inspections for the County under the terms of the existing intergovernmental agreement between the County and Yorkville.

Member Koukol made motion, seconded by Member Flowers, to recommend approval of the contract.

With a voice vote of four (4) ayes, the motion carried.

The proposal goes to the County Board on June 21, 2022, on the consent agenda.

Certified Local Government Grant Items

Approval to Issue an Invitation to Bids to Conduct an Historic Structure Survey in Unincorporated Kendall and Bristol Townships

Mr. Asselmeier presented the invitation to bid.

Approval to Request that the State's Attorney's Office Review the Contract of the Lowest Responsible Bidder

Member Flowers made motion, seconded by Member Koukol, to issue the invitation to bids and request that the State's Attorney's Office review the contract of the lowest responsible bidder.

With a voice vote of four (4) ayes, the motion carried.

**NEW BUSINESS**

Approval to Schedule a Second Planning, Building and Zoning Committee Meeting During the Month of June 2022

The consensus of the Committee was to have a special meeting on June 29, 2022, at 5:30 p.m.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

None

**COMMENTS FROM THE PRESS**

None

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

None

The following items were moved to the June 29, 2022, meeting agenda:

Request for Guidance Regarding a Banquet Facility at 1126 Simons

Recommendation of a Proposal from Teska Associates, Inc. to Update the Kendall County Land Resource Management Plan in Its Entirety

Approval of an Intergovernmental Agreement between the Village of Millbrook and the County of Kendall to Administer the County's Ordinances for Zoning, Building Code, Subdivision Control, Comprehensive Plan, and Stormwater Management within the Jurisdiction of the Village of Millbrook for a Term of One (1) Year in the Amount of \$1.00 Plus Associated Costs Paid by the Village of Millbrook to the County of Kendall

**ADJOURNMENT**

Member Flowers made a motion, seconded by Member Vickers, to adjourn. With a voice vote of four (4) ayes, the motion carried.

Chairman Gengler adjourned the meeting at 8:51 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Matthew H. Asselmeier, AICP, CFM Senior Planner

Enc.



**KENDALL COUNTY  
PLANNING, BUILDING, & ZONING COMMITTEE  
JUNE 13, 2022**

IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO BE CONTACTED ON FUTURE MEETINGS REGARDING THIS TOPIC, PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR ADDRESS OR EMAIL ADDRESS

NAME	ADDRESS (OPTIONAL)	EMAIL ADDRESS (OPTIONAL)
Dan Keam		
Boyd Engemann		
Joe FRESCUA		
Anne Keelley		
Jim Martin		
Bob Powell		
Kathy Patula		
Blanca Mota		