

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES  
October 27, 2010**

The Planning and Zoning Committee of the DeKalb County Board met on October 27, 2010 at 7:00 p.m. in the “Gathertorium” located in the DeKalb County Legislative Building. In attendance were Committee Members Ken Andersen, Larry Anderson, Marlene Allen, Michael Haines, John Hulseberg, and Ruth Anne Tobias. Also in attendance were Dean Johnson, Scott Pumroy, Roger Craigmile, and staff members, Gary Hanson, Paul Miller, and Rebecca Von Drasek.

Ken Andersen, Planning and Zoning Committee Chair, called the meeting to order and noted that Pat Vary and Stephen Walt were absent.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

*Ms. Tobias moved to approve the agenda, seconded by Mr. Hulseberg, and the motion carried unanimously.*

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Hulseberg noted on page two and three of the minutes of the September meeting of the Planning and Zoning Committee that he requested Vulcan provide information about other quarries should the company file a future application. Mr. Hulseberg specified that he was requesting that it provide information about Vulcan’s quarry operations only.

*Ms. Tobias moved to approve the minutes of the September 22, 2010 meeting of the Planning and Zoning Committee as amended, seconded by Ms. Allen, and the motion carried unanimously.*

**DISCUSSION ITEM - FY’11 Draft County Budget Appeals re: Soil and Water Conservation District**

Mr. Hanson explained that the original draft budget requested a contribution of \$19,000 to the Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) which would be a reduction of 5% (\$1,000) from the FY’10 contribution. This reduction is the same as was required of County departments. Mr. Hanson noted that two appeals to the draft budget regarding this line item had been filed, (1) from Mr. Todd, requesting a further reduction to \$17,100, and (2) from Mr. Hulseberg, requesting an increase to the FY’10 level of \$20,000.

Mr. Hulseberg noted that he had requested that this item be tabled from the September meeting because he wanted to know how the Law and Justice Committee would decide on his larger appeal that the State’s Attorney Office reduce its budget by the same 5% as was required of the other County departments. Mr. Hulseberg explained that he withdrew his appeal at the Law and Justice Committee at their October meeting after hearing from the State’s Attorney regarding the consequences of such a reduction in that Department’s budget. However, he stated that his appeal regarding funding of the SWCD remains the same.

Dean Johnson, from the SWCD, made a brief presentation and provided the Committee with a handout which outlined the responsibilities and activities of the SWCD. He emphasized that the SWCD works with various entities to provide a resource for questions regarding water and soil. He explained that the SWCD, along with the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS), bring in approximately \$16 million dollars into the County with the US Department of Agriculture's Conservation Reserve Program (CRP). Finally, Mr. Johnson acknowledged that the SWCD was prepared to get by on the reduced contribution of \$19,000.

Mr. Anderson asked about the SWCD user fees. Mr. Johnson noted that the user fees were recently raised, and with larger scale projects the fees can be substantial. He estimated that the Lee-DeKalb wind farm cost the applicant approximately \$20,000.

Ms. Allen also asked about other service fees in addition to user fees. Mr. Johnson replied that some fees are generated with the sale of maps and photographs, however he added that the revenues generated from fees do not differ all the costs of operations.

Mr. Andersen asked if the SWCD had other revenue sources. Mr. Johnson noted that the IEPA contracts with the SWCD for \$6,000 a year to perform IEPA inspections.

Mr. Hulseberg asked what would happen if the SWCD lost its funding and closed. Mr. Miller responded that he was not sure what entity would provide the Natural Resource Inventory reports required by the County's Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Haines asked if how a hypothetical closing this would effect the CRP. Mr. Johnson hypothesized that a neighboring SWCD would incorporate DeKalb County under its authority. He also noted that local services would be lost.

Mr. Ken Andersen inquired is the SWCD had taxing authority. Mr. Johnson answered that although the SWCD was a unit of government it does not have taxing authority. Mr. Andersen also asked if the Drainage Districts provide any funding to the SWCD. Mr. Johnson stated that they do not.

Ms. Tobias asked how many SWCD are in Illinois. Mr. Johnson reported that there were 98 offices and noted that the offices were combined in Kane/DuPage and in other collar counties to the East.

*Mr. Haines moved to deny Mr. Todd's appeal to reduce the contribution to \$17,100, seconded by Ms. Tobias, and the motion carried with four in favor (Haines, Hulseberg, Tobias, L. Anderson), one opposed (Allen), and one abstention (K. Andersen).*

Mr. Hulseberg observed that \$1,000 reduction for a small entity such as the SWCD would be a big decrease. He noted that his appeal would re-instate the FY'10 contribution level by adding \$1,000.

*Mr. Hulseberg moved to approve his appeal to increase the contribution to \$20,000, seconded by Mr. Haines, and the motion failed with two in favor (Hulseberg, Haines), three opposed (Tobias, Allen, L. Anderson), and one abstention (K. Andersen).*

### **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

*At 7:23 p.m. Mr. Larry Anderson moved to enter Executive Session to discuss Personnel and Collective Bargaining, seconded by Ms. Allen, and the motion carried unanimously.*

Executive Session ended at 7:49 p.m.

### **COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

Mr. Miller explained that the Planning and Zoning Committee had received a draft of an update to the text of the DeKalb County Unified Comprehensive Plan for its September 22, 2010 meeting. He noted that it was agreed at the September meeting that Committee members would review the draft and be prepared to ask questions and make suggested changes at the October 27, 2010 meeting. Staff also suggested that emphasis be given to the goals and objectives, as these translate into policies, regulations and projects. Mr. Miller presented the Committee with the revised Future Land Use Map and Future Transportation Plan. He detailed the next steps to the Comprehensive Plan review process, noting that staff will provide a draft copy to various shareholders within the County and then post the amended draft on the County's web site and hold three open houses before holding a public hearing on the updated Plan. Following the hearing, the draft Plan would return to the Committee and County Board for adoption.

Mr. Ken Andersen then opened up the discussion to the Committee.

Mr. Hulseberg asked about the Transportation Plan, noting that some of the proposed routes were still in discussion within the DeKalb Sycamore Area Transportation Study (DSATS) group. Mr. Miller observed that many of the routes are long term and are included to assist entities such as DSATS.

Ms. Tobias noted that the rail line extension through Genoa should be included within the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Allen asked that if all the municipalities are on board with the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Miller noted the addition of Maple Park and indicated that every municipality submitted their respective Future Land Use maps for inclusion on the County's. He added that none of the municipalities were updating their plans to coincide with the County's update.

The Committee then briefly discussed the term "buffer" zone that was included within an objective for the goal to develop policies which protect standard farm operations. Mr. Miller noted that this term had been associated with an intergovernmental boundary agreement between the Cities of Genoa and Sycamore. Mr. Miller expressed to the Committee that the intent was to both maintain distinct municipal boundaries and to protect agricultural uses from residential pressures. Mr. Haines noted that if municipalities agreed with a property owner that residential development was desirable then they could enter into an annexation or even pre-annexation

agreements. Mr. Larry Anderson expressed concern for the property owners who may not see property values increase if development is discouraged. Mr. Miller pointed out that there is no given right to develop a property; many assume that there is, but in fact development has always been dependent on approval by a zoning authority.

Mr. Miller then shared with the Committee a replacement for page 38 of the draft which incorporated up-to-date numbers on the population potential of the proposed Future Land Use Map. The upshot of this point was that more than adequate room for growth and development is depicted on the Future Land Use Plan to take place around the municipalities such that there is no need for any land designated to remain in Agricultural use to be converted to Residential.

Mr. Andersen inquired if the term “limited recreational use” was appropriate for the goal to protect floodplain. Mr. Miller asked if the term “passive recreational use” would be acceptable, noting that these types of uses would be more like a walking trails and not game fields. Mr. Miller observed removing all recreation uses would also require a significant revision to the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Andersen then asked the Committee how they felt about discouraging “nonagricultural” uses. He observed that there may be some uses should be permitted by right in the agricultural district without requiring a Special Use Permit. Ms. Tobias responded that the application process allows the County Board to screen the types of uses. Mr. Miller echoed Ms. Tobias, observing that each application can be judged on its own merits rather than having to fit into a specific definition of a use.

Mr. Andersen asked if there were any active “conservation” easements. Mr. Miller responded that there were some, but not many.

Ms. Tobias asked that the Goals be numbered within the plan.

Mr. Andersen asked about the goal regarding the expansion of the landfill. After a brief discussion, Ms. Tobias suggested that the staff include within the objective direction to implement the goals of the Solid Waste Plan rather than endorse a specific waste management technique, and the Committee agreed.

Mr. Andersen asked that the objectives two and three for the goal related to the landfill be combined. Mr. Miller agreed to do so in a new draft.

Mr. Haines asked if there were ways to restrict the spreading of municipal waste water sludge on the farm fields. Mr. Miller noted that agricultural activities are often exempt from County regulation. Mr. Anderson added that there are State standards which farmers are required to follow.

Mr. Andersen asked the Committee for its opinion of the 40 acre requirement to build a residence in the A-1, Agricultural District. Mr. Miller noted that this issue was very controversial when revisions to minimum lot size have been proposed in the past. After a brief discussion the Committee determined that the regulation should not be changed.

Mr. Andersen also asked about the recommendation to discourage commercial development on the outskirts of towns. Mr. Miller explained that the recommendation specifically relates to the kinds of commercial uses which directly compete with pedestrian-oriented, speciality retail that is the feature of central business district uses. The Committee briefly discussed the examples of developments on the outskirts of towns which have detracted from the existing businesses within downtowns. Mr. Miller also offered that if a commercial developer approaches the County they are encouraged to contact the municipality and consider annexation.

Mr. Andersen asked that “all-weather” include a hyphen and he noted that the “trail system” should be defined. Mr. Miller noted that trail system was defined in the Transportation portion of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Miller informed the Committee that he would make the revisions as directed and encouraged members to submit any additional revisions via e-mail. He noted that staff would begin preparations for the open houses in January.

#### **MONTHLY REPORT**

No comments were made.

#### **DISCUSSION ITEM**

The Committee briefly discussed the next Committee meeting date. Following the suggestion to meet on December 8, 2010, Mr. Hanson noted that the Committee Caucus was scheduled for December 6, 2010. The Committee agreed to meet next on December 8, 2010.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Planning and Zoning Committee is next scheduled to meet December 8, 2010 at 7:00 p.m. in the Conference Room East.

*Mr. Larry Anderson moved to adjourn, seconded by Ms. Allen, and the motion carried unanimously.*

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Kenneth Andersen**  
**Planning and Zoning Committee Chairman**