Chairman Mike Haberkorn called the meeting to order and roll call was taken.

Those present were: Mike Haberkorn, Jerry Gaspardo, Rudy Piskule, Eddie Hoerner, Verne Taylor, Keith Bahler, Dee Woodburn, Shane Long and Scott Cranford.

Those absent were: Dean Wahls, Scott Sand and Luke Bartlett.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

With no recommendations for additions or amendments to the agenda for this meeting, Jerry Gaspardo moved, seconded by Dee Woodburn, that the agenda for this meeting be approved as presented. This motion was unanimously approved by voice vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Minutes of the June 27, 2016 meeting were mentioned by Chair Haberkorn. Then Shane Long moved, seconded by Eddie Hoerner, that these minutes be approved as presented. This motion was unanimously approved by voice vote.

BUSINESS:

Case SU-1-17; Pertains to a request by Bob Cissell – Dollar General, for a zoning district map amendment for the purpose of amending the zoning classification on the subject property from an R2, Low Density Multiple Family Residence, District to a C1, Local Business, District. The subject property in this zoning case is part of Lots 4, 6,8,10 and 12 of Block 13 Village of Vermillion City, and Lots 30 and 31 as part of a plat in the South Bloomington St. Addition as part of the East Half of the Northeast Quarter of Section 2 of Reading Township, as part of unincorporated South Streator, at 110 E. Livingston Rd., Streator, IL. Public notice regarding this zoning case was published on January 25, 2017. The county zoning administrator presented his report relating to this zoning case.

Dean Holten of Arc Design Resourced Inc., representing the applicant in this zoning case presented testimony relating to this zoning case. Mr. Holten made some general comments about this proposed property rezoning. Mr. Holten then commented about the drainage on the property. Mr. Holten remarked that some initial soil testing has been done on this property that is being used in assessing the property drainage. Mr. Holten was not aware that the subject property ground had been disturbed until today, though he does not believe that would affect their overall drainage plans.
Mr. Holten commented about plans for dry wells in the proposed parking lot. How drainage on the adjacent property may be affected was then questioned. Mr. Holten mentioned contact with IDOT in which they will not directly accept drainage water off of the subject property, into their storm water drainage system on nearby Route 23. Mr. Holten then related that their initial soil tests reflect a sand depth of 6 to 8 feet in depth on the subject property, which they are planning on working on drainage above this level. Mr. Holten remarked about the drainage basin planned for the north end of the subject property, and about how overflow from the basin would go south towards Livingston Rd. through swales on the east and west sides of the property. Their drainage is being designed to accept more water than what is currently going on to the property. Mr. Holten presented a new Dollar General site plan to the planning commission members, to assist in his explanation of the proposed property development. This site plan showed the planned store location, parking lot area, a water drainage basin area and the green area on the sides of the property.

Potential fencing on the subject property was then discussed, specifically on the east side of the property, were fencing could cut down on the glare of car lights on the adjoining residents to the east. Mr. Holten remarked that fencing in this area is an option to be reviewed. Proposed lighting on the property was then discussed. Mr. Holten mentioned plans for one light in the parking lot area and some lights on the building. How the lighting design could be looked at to cut down on the glare to the residential part of this neighborhood was mentioned. The discussion then returned to drainage issues including the planned use of dry wells. In regards to the use of the property, Mr. Holten noted that the property would be leased, by Dollar General. Multiple commercial uses in the proposed district were then commented about.

Area property owner James Reihl commented about how he may be concerned about other commercial uses of the subject property. With the current gun shop in the area and how the subject property had the excess dirt on it at one time, he is concerned about how the area property is becoming more commercial, in what he prefers as his residential area. Drainage was further discussed. Mr. Reihl then expressed his opposition to this proposal. Mr. Reihl’s property location on Franklin St., south of the subject property was then confirmed. Mr. Reihl’s opposition is based on concerns about increased noise, traffic, lighting and drainage. Options on the proposed lighting on the subject property was then discussed, and traffic on Livingston Rd, near Rt. 23, and how it is busy during shift changes at the Vector plant east of the subject property. County Board member John Slagel mentioned that needs to be looked at as a zoning map amendment as a whole. Comments were made about how the resident property owner east of the subject property was not available for this meeting but may attend the zoning board of appeals meeting on Thursday, of which he may have more questions. The planning commission remembers then conversed about this case, starting with the area of the R2 district in the area, and existing area property development. The planning members still had remaining issues on the drainage, lighting, fencing, neighbor to the easts potential comments and the potential commercial uses, in the proposed C1 district. The planning commission members discussed the option to table this zoning case for more testimony, yet while knowing this is a zoning map proposal, they would prefer more detailed answers.
At the conclusion of this dialogue regarding this zoning case, Keith Bahler moved, seconded by Eddie Hoerner, that the planning commission forward this zoning case to the Livingston County Zoning Board of Appeals requesting that the issues of drainage, lighting, noise and fencing be more completely addressed by the applicant at the zoning board of appeals meeting. The planning commission members believe that these issues should be addressed to the zoning board of appeals satisfaction, or that this zoning case be tabled until these issues are adequately addressed. Planning commission members also commented that if the closest adjoining resident to the east of the subject property is present at the zoning board of appeals meeting, that the zoning board of appeals should consider his questions and comments as it relates to this zoning case. This adjacent property owner had a conflict and did not attend the reginal planning commission meeting. However, the planning commission members believe a dialogue with this adjacent property owner may provide more insight into this proposed zoning map amendment proposal. This motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

INFORMATIONAL UPDATE:

The planning commission members present were informed that their next meeting is scheduled for Monday March 6th, at 7:00 pm.

ADJOURNMENT:

Shane Long moved, seconded by Rudy Piskule, that the meeting be adjourned. This motion was unanimously approved.

This meeting was then adjourned at 8:34 p.m.