

MINUTES OF THE LIVINGSTON COUNTY
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
HELD ON DECEMBER 2, 2019, STARTING AT 7:00 PM
IN THE LIVINGSTON COUNTY HISTORIC COURTHOUSE
112 W. MADISON ST. PONTIAC, ILLINOIS

Roll call was taken.

Those present were: Jerry Gaspardo, Mike Haberkom, Rudy Piskule, Eddie Hoemer, Verne Taylor, Keith Bahler, Dee Woodbum, Shane Long, Scott Cranford and John Slagel.

Those absent were: Dean Wahls and Scott Sand.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

The agenda to this meeting was mentioned by the chairman. With no recommendations for additions or amendments to the agenda for this December 2, 2019 meeting, Verne Taylor moved, seconded by John Slagel that the agenda for this meeting be approved as presented. This motion was unanimously approved by voice vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Minutes of the July 29, 2019 meeting were mentioned by the chairman, with no comments being made the chairman stated that the minutes stand approved as written.

BUSINESS:

Livingston County Zoning Cases SF-2-19 and V-7-19 and SU-2-19 – Slagel

These zoning cases are in regard to a proposal by James Slagel for a new two lot subdivision of 3.87 acres of land parcel of land, with this property being located in the Northwest Quarter of Section 10 of Belle Prairie Township in the rural Fairbury area. A variance to provide for a lot to have a width of 40 feet instead of 150 feet is also being requested because of the manner in which the subject property is proposed to be configured. A special use for a contractor's storage yard is also part of this review as the long time businesses of Slagel Monuments and Slagel Insulation need to be formally recognized. Notice of this hearing was published and area property owners have been notified regarding this proposed subdivision, variance and special use. The zoning administrator reviewed his report in regard to these zoning cases, with this report including aerial photos of the subject property and surrounding area, along with a plat of the proposed two lot subdivision. One lot would have the existing residence located on it and the business related businesses are proposed to be located on the second lot. Mr. Slagel was present at this meeting.

Discussion took place between the applicant and the planning commission members in regard to the proposed flag lot size and as to if a new drive is proposed to be placed on the proposed 40 foot wide frontage area. The applicant explained that a new lane would be placed in this area, which will allow for delivery trucks to pull onto the property off of the road, making it safer to unload the trucks. Delivery trucks are now unloaded off of the road. The current well and septic will continue to serve both the house and business buildings. Room for new buildings has been provided on the business building lot.

John Slagel then moved, seconded by Dee Woodburn, that the Livingston County Regional Planning Commission recommend the approval of Livingston County Zoning Cases SF-2-19, V-4-10 and SU-2-19 that would allow for the subject property to be divided into a two lot subdivision with a lot variance width to allow one of the lots to have a lot width of 40 feet, and to acknowledge the Slagel Monuments and Slagel Insulation businesses being located on the property.

Livingston County Zoning Case SU-3-19 – Pontiac Flying LLC

This zoning case is in regard to a review of a special use for a proposed private use airport and for commercial liquefied fertilizer storage and distribution. This proposed special use is to be located in Section 16 of Saunemin Township. A detailed application explanation had been provided to the planning commission members, and a standards of special uses sheet was provided to the planning commission members. Notice of this hearing was published and area property owners have been notified regarding this proposed special use. Kris and Scott Peterson were present at this meeting representing the applicant in this zoning case. The Peterson's distributed a printed handout packet of information regarding this special use. The Peterson's remarked about the information provided in this handout, including the reasoning for their proposal to relocate from the Pontiac Municipal Airport. A half mile rectangle traffic pattern was commented about. The peak season during July and August was mentioned, and about 100 to 120 flights a day could take place per day during this peak season, with operations taking place from sun rise to sun down. When water supply was discussed during the applicant's presentation, the applicant's remarked that no test wells had been drilled. And though they may have marker lights they do not plan on runway lights at this time.

The meeting was then open to comments from others present. Ed and Jane Wiebers, the closest residents to the runway commented about this proposed private airport. The Wiebers showed their property and house site on an aerial photograph that was part of the application explanation. Mr. Wiebers related that the proposed airport would be 814 feet from his back door. Mr. Wiebers then commented about the family history of his property and his residence. Mr. Wiebers pondered as to why the Pontiac Airport, the current site for Pontiac Flying, is still not the better location for this business. Mr. Wiebers expressed his concerns about the noise the proposed airport will generate, and he expressed his concerns as to how his well water supply could be adversely affected by the proposed airport. Mr. Wiebers questioned as to if his property values would be affected and as to if his wife's health would be affected with her having a suppressed immune system. Mr. Wiebers wondered as to if the airport could expand operations in the future.

Area resident Roger Gerdes provided the history of his family farm, questioning why this private airport is being proposed at this location. Mr. Gerdes is concerned about the number of potential flights during the busy season for this proposed business. Barbara Frantz questioned why the flight path could not be moved east away from their property. Mr. Gerdes commented about how much benefit the proposed airport would really have to the area, including how much the tax revenue to the school would really increase. Area resident Philip Corban commented about this area being a nice quiet community and that he does not want the proposed airport developed near him. The peak time and slow times of the year for flights were discussed. Bryan Frantz expressed his concerns about the proposed airport. Potential water use and supply was further discussed. Training of the Saunemin Fire Department and area emergency responders was commented in regards to a scenario of an accident at the airport or in the area. Barbara Frantz commented about the proposed flight path, property value concerns, well water and the drainage of surface water. Comments about the potential continued use of the Pontiac Airport by Pontiac Flying Services were made. Chris Peterson related that maintenance work on planes would take place during their down flying months, and that they can work with the Saunemin Fire Department to inform them of dangers related to the proposed business, and that they can address farm surface drainage with culverts. Emergency scenarios and prepared responses were further discussed. Taxing issues were discussed, in part with property value discussions. The

potential of another rural site to be used for the proposed private airport was discussed, with an area being less populated being better. The area property owners expressed why they do not want it in their area. Water concerns were then further discussed. Regional Planning Commission Comments regarding the Livingston County Comprehensive Plan Analysis for Proposed Land Use Changes.

The planning commission members that reviewed comprehensive plan checklist analysis for proposed land use changes with Comments pertaining to Livingston County Zoning Case SU-3-19 – Pontiac Flying LLC

Does the land use change fulfill a significant need in the area?

The use is agriculture related, but questionable as to if it is significantly needed in the area.

--Will the land use change be beneficial to the general welfare, safety, and health of the residents of the immediate area and the general population of Livingston County?

No.

--Will the land use change constitute a precedent of an incompatible use and be a detriment to adjacent property?

Yes, to homes in the area, but not to the farm land in the area.

--Will the land use change create an isolation of the specific land use?

No.

--Will the land use change adversely influence living conditions due to the creation of a new pollution source?

More noise pollution would be generated.

--Will the land use change adversely influence adjacent property values?

Unknown.

--Will the land use change contribute to unsafe traffic patterns or undue congestion?

More traffic would be created if water would need to be hauled to the site, along Route 116 and Route 47.

--Will the land use change alter the population density pattern and increase the load on public facilities?

No, not necessarily.

--Will the land use change adversely affect a valuable natural resource of the County?

Possibly water.

--Will the land use change conflict with exiting commitments of planned public improvements?

No.

--Will the land use change create additional environmental problems due to soils, vegetation, slope or floodplain?

Not if developed properly.

--Is the land use change consistent with municipal plans (if applicable)?

Not applicable.

--Will the land use change result in private investment, which would be beneficial to the redevelopment of a deteriorated area?

No.

--Is the land use change located where the needed infrastructure services have been or can be provided?

The availability of water is unknown, which could create a need to use other water source areas, of which can be considered an infrastructure service area.

-- Is the subject property physically suitable for the purpose of the land use change?

Yes.

--Will the relief of a hardship for an individual property owner create a detriment to the public welfare?

Potentially yes to the area residents.

--

Eddie Hoerner moved, seconded by Rudy Piskule that the Livingston County Regional Planning Commission pass on their review and comments in regard to Livingston County Zoning Case SU-3-19 to the Livingston County Zoning Board of Appeals. This motion was approved by voice vote.

Livingston County Zoning Case ZT-1-19

This zoning case pertains to a text amendment to add zoning regulations related to cannabis businesses. Notice of public hearing was made pertaining to this zoning case. The zoning administrator referenced his report and the proposed zoning regulations text amendments be proposed because of the new state statutes regarding cannabis.

It is proposed that any cannabis business be reviewed as a special use in the districts outlined in the proposed text amendments. It was the consensus of the planning commission members to have the review process of these proposed text amendments move forward with further hearings before the zoning board of appeals, recognizing that new zoning regulation text language is needed to address the newer state statutes regarding cannabis businesses.

OTHER BUSINESS: None

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

INFORMATIONAL UPDATE:

The planning commission members present were informed that their next meeting is scheduled for Monday January 6, 2020 at 7:00 pm. A schedule for the 2020 regular meeting dates for the Livingston County Regional Planning Commission members were provided to the planning commission members present.

ADJOURNMENT:

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

This meeting was then adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles T. Schopp, Secretary
Livingston County Regional
Planning Commission