CALL TO ORDER – ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

ROLL CALL for the Zoning Board of Appeals: Randy Mohr (Chair); Scott Cherry, Karen Clementi, Tom LeCuyer, Donna McKay, Dick Thompson and Dick Whitfield

MINUTES: Approval of minutes from the April 29, 2013 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting

PETITIONS:

1. 13-13 Steven & Lori Seeler
   Request Rezoning
   Purpose Rezone 3 acres of property from A-1 to R-1 to build a house
   Location Near Southeast corner of Schlapp and Cherry Road

2. 13-08 ZPAC Definition
   Request Text Amendment
   Purpose Text Amendment to modify the definition of Zoning, Platting & Advisory Committee (ZPAC) in Section 3.02 of the Zoning Ordinance

REVIEW OF PETITIONS THAT WENT TO COUNTY BOARD - None (2 variances last meeting)
Update about fencing

NEW BUSINESS

OLD BUSINESS

PUBLIC COMMENT

ADJOURN ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS - Next meeting on July 1, 2013
KENDALL COUNTY
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING
111 WEST FOX STREET, Room 209 and 210
YORKVILLE, IL 60560
April 29, 2013 – 7:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER
At 7:01 p.m., Chairman Randy Mohr called the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting to order.

ROLL CALL
Members present: Randy Mohr (Chairman), Scott Cherry, Karen Clementi, Tom LeCuyer, Donna McKay and Dick Thompson
Also present was: Senior Planner Angela Zubko
Absent: Dick Whitfield
In the audience: Jeff Muellner, George & Cerise Escobedo, Todd Tesdal and Mark Hansen (Location Manager for Grainco FS Inc.

A quorum was present to conduct business.

MINUTES
Scott Cherry motioned to approve the January 28, 2013 ZBA meeting minutes. Karen Clementi seconded the motion. All were in favor and minutes were approved.

Chairman Randy Mohr wanted to welcome Dick Thompson to the Committee. He is from Big Grove Township.

Chairman Randy Mohr swore all members in the audience and staff in

PETITIONS
#13-10 – Grainco FS Inc. – Variances
Planner Zubko stated the petitioner, Grainco FS is located at the southwest corner of Route 47 and Helmar Road. They are requesting 2 new variances for a new grain bin and a new building and staff has requested the petitioner to clean up the property and to also ask for 2 other variances to existing grain bins on the north side of the property. Also to clarify the east property line is considered a side yard setback since Comed owns property between this property and Route 47. The requested variances are for the new load out building to be located 101’ from the centerline of Helmar Road, a new grain bin to be located 115’ from the centerline of Helmar Road and two existing grain bins to be located 60’ from the centerline of Helmar Road. Planner Zubko wanted to state that the public notice stated another variance for an existing storage shed along Route 47, since then staff has determined that would qualify for a side yard setback which is 10’ from the property line, therefore a variance is not needed. They have already submitted for their building permits.

Karen Clementi asked for the reasons for the variances. Mark Hansen, the location manager, stated it is for the order of operation and in line with an existing conveyor. Donna McKay stated when they came in for the original petition for the variance for the office building she thought she remember they were going to get more property. Mr. Hansen said not that he has known. Tom LeCuyer asked why the grain bins were built in
that location without variances at the time. Planner Zubko stated the setbacks have changed and not sure when the grain bins were built.

With no further testimony, Chairman Mohr closed the testimony and reviewed the Findings of Fact and were approved as follows:

_That the particular physical surroundings, shape, or topographical condition of the specific property involved would result in a particular hardship or practical difficulty upon the owner if the strict letter of the regulations were carried out. 2 of the bins are existing and the 2 new variances need to be in that location for the order of operation._

_That the conditions upon which the requested variation is based would not be applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification. This property has been in existence for at least 20 years and the setbacks have changed._

_That the alleged difficulty or hardship has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property. The placement of the new bin and load out building has to be in those locations to work in the order or operation._

_That the granting of the variation will not materially be detrimental to the public welfare or substantially injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located. The requested variance should not affect any of the neighbors nor be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood._

_That the proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, or substantially increase the congestion in the public streets or increase the danger of fire, or endanger the public safety or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood. The adjacent property to the north is farmland or their own buildings so these variations will not impair an adequate supply of light and air or substantially increase the congestion in the public streets or increase the danger of fire, or endanger the public safety or substantially diminish or impair property values._

With no further suggestions or changes Karen Clementi made a motion, seconded by Tom LeCuyer to approve the variances. With a roll call vote all were in favor and the variances passed.

**#13-12 – Muellner Construction – Variance**

Planner Zubko stated the property is located on lots 22 and 23 in the Grove Estates Subdivision. The petitioner is requesting a variance to build a fence that will be wrought iron in appearance 5’ (five feet) in height in the front yard. The house is already built on the north lot and they also own the lot to the south so would request to put a fence around their entire property like their neighbors did to the east. Karen Clementi asked if the neighbors to the east received a variance as well. Planner Zubko stated they did not, this was the first home and since a fence permit is not required it is hard to regulate. Donna McKay they have had big issues in the past about the height of fences in the front yard. They have denied people in the past that have requested a fence height variance. Donna McKay suggested maybe amending the section of the Ordinance or they will be getting variances for this all the time. There was also some discussion about the topography and does the fence height follow the topography or one flat height. Planner Zubko stated this is a see-through
fence so do not think this fence is such an issue. Karen Clementi stated what type of president are we setting if they want to match the neighbor’s fence but the neighbor’s fence is not in compliance does it make it right? There was some discussion on covenants and restrictions and how staff does not regulate those so if the subdivision is fine with the fence should the County get involved? For this particular case the HOA did approve this fence and its height. Mr. Muellner brought up the face the fence should match the scale of the property and house. Karen Clementi asked if the fence will be around 5’ or 5’6”, Mr. Muellner stated it will be 5’. Also Ms. Clementi wanted to state they are trying to do the right thing by asking for a variance. No one has an issue with this fence but don’t want to set a precedent so wish the PBZ Committee would take a look at this issue.

After much discussion it was decided to take this issue to the PBZ Committee so see what their thoughts are about maybe permitting fences so this is not such an issue.

With no further testimony, Chairman Mohr closed the testimony and reviewed the Findings of Fact and were approved as follows:

*That the particular physical surroundings, shape, or topographical condition of the specific property involved would result in a particular hardship or practical difficulty upon the owner if the strict letter of the regulations were carried out. Other properties have fenced in their whole lot and as long as the Homeowners Association is fine with the fence height there should not be an issue.*

*That the conditions upon which the requested variation is based would not be applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification. This might be a variation requested throughout the subdivision.*

*That the alleged difficulty or hardship has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property. The owners do not have a hardship but would like a fence around their entire property.*

*That the granting of the variation will not materially be detrimental to the public welfare or substantially injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located. The requested variance should not affect any of the neighbors nor be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood.*

*That the proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, or substantially increase the congestion in the public streets or increase the danger of fire, or endanger the public safety or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood. Adding a fence will not impair any of the above items and will not impact the roadway.*

With no further suggestions or changes Karen Clementi made a motion, seconded by Scott Cherry to approve the variance. With a roll call vote all were in favor and the variance passed. The Committee would request Planner Zubko ask the other neighbor with the 5’-6” fence request a variance and also request the County Board re-look at the regulations and either get rid of the regulations or make people get permits to fences since this was such an issue in the past. The fact we have regulations but no permits does not make sense.

**REVIEW PBZ APPROVALS BY COUNTY BOARD & CHANGES-**
13-01 Kendall County Government Agency and other law enforcement shooting range- Approved by the County Board with no changes after ZBA
13-02 Rezoning and Special use for a Kendall County Government Agency and other law enforcement shooting range- Approved by the County Board with no changes after ZBA
13-03 Other Plat Process (Vacations, Dedication, etc.)- Approved by the County Board with no changes after ZBA
13-04 Micro-batch Distillery- Approved by the County Board with no changes after ZBA

NEW BUSINESS- None

OLD BUSINESS- None

ADJOURNMENT
Scott Cherry made a motion to adjourn the ZBA meeting, Donna McKay seconded the motion. Chairman Randy Mohr adjourned the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting at 7:50 p.m. The next meeting will be on May 28, 2013.

Respectfully Submitted,
Angela L. Zubko
Senior Planner & Recording Secretary
13-13
STEVEN & LORI SEELEER
MAP AMENDMENT - A-1 TO R-1

SITE INFORMATION
PETITIONER Steven & Lori Seeler

LOCATION At the southeast corner of Cherry Road and Schlapp Road.
About 0.15 miles east of Schlapp Road

TOWNSHIP NaAuSay

PARCEL # 06-03-300-007 & 06-03-300-010 (11.6 Acres)

SIZE The location of rezoning will be 3 acres of the 11.6 acre
property.

EXISTING LAND USE Farmland/Trees

ZONING A-1 Agricultural

LRMP Land | County: Rural Residential (Max. Density: 0.65)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>du/acre; Village of Oswego: Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Cherry Road is designated as a major collector roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FUTURE LAND USE PLANS**
The requested zoning change to R-1 is consistent with the County's Land Resource Management Plan and the Village of Oswego's Future Land Use Plan.

**REQUESTED ACTION**
The Petitioner is requesting approval of a Map Amendment to rezone 3 acres of an 11.6 acre parcel from A-1 (Agricultural) to R-1 (One-Family Residence District) to build a home on their property.

**APPLICABLE REGULATIONS**
§ 8.02 of the Zoning Ordinance (Residential District)
§ 13.07 of the Zoning Ordinance (Amendments)

**SURROUNDING LAND USE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Adjacent Land Use</th>
<th>Adjacent Zoning</th>
<th>LRMP</th>
<th>Zoning within ½ Mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>Rural Res.</td>
<td>A-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>Rural Res.</td>
<td>A-1; A-1 SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>Rural Res.</td>
<td>A-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Single Family Home</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>Rural Res.</td>
<td>A-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PHYSICAL DATA**

- **Endangered Species Report**
The Illinois Natural Heritage Database contains no record of State-listed threatened or endangered species, Illinois Natural Area Inventory sites, dedicated Illinois Nature Preserves, or registered Land and Water Reserves in the vicinity of the project location.

- **Natural Resources Inventory**
The NRI report indicates that 100% of the soils on this site are soils that are classified as being prime farmland and the most agronomically productive. 77.6% of the soils are very limited dwellings with basements, 75.9% are very limited for dwellings without basements, lawns/landscaping and conventional septic systems.

  - Land Evaluation: 98
  - Site Assessment: 81
  - TOTAL: 179
  - Level of Protection: Low

**ACTION SUMMARY**

- **Township (NaAuSay)**
  They received a unanimous approval at the April 29th Plan Commission Meeting and at the May 20th Board Meeting they also recommended approval.

- **Municipal (Oswego)**
  Have not heard from yet (e mailed to Rod Zenner on 4.12.13)
There was no issue with the rezoning. Fran asked if 35’ of ROW could be dedicated, since then Mr. Kramer stated he would talk to his client but did not see an issue with dedicating ROW. ZPAC recommended approval.

The Plan Commission recommended approval.

The petitioners have indicated they intend to construct a single-family dwelling unit on the 3 acre parcel if the map amendment request is approved.

The County’s Zoning Ordinance states that the R-1 District may be appropriate in any area suggested for residential use on the County’s LRMP with a minimum square footage of 130,000 square feet (2.995 Acres). The requested 3 acres to be rezoned meets the minimum requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

§ 13.07.F of the Zoning Ordinance outlines findings that the Zoning Board of Appeals must make in order to grant a map amendment. Staff has answered as follows:

Existing uses of property within the general area of the property in question. The current existing uses to the west are residential with lots ranging from 1 to 8 acres. The rezoning will be consistent with the general area and will not alter the overall principal uses of the property.

The Zoning classification of property within the general area of the property in question. The zoning classifications within the general area are currently R-1, R-2 and A-1.

The suitability of the property in question for the uses permitted under the existing zoning classification. The petitioners would like to rezone part of their property to R-1 in order to build a house. The property must be rezoned to build a home. A lot of this property is wooded.

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 that area is agricultural with residential houses. The rezoning to R-1 should have little impact on further development with the area as it would be consistent with surrounding area.

Consistency with the purpose and objectives of the Land Resource Management Plan and other adopted County or municipal plans and policies. The Land Resource Management Plan calls for this property to be Rural Residential which would be consistent with an R-1 zoning designation and the Village of Oswego also calls for this property to be residential.
Recommendation: Staff would recommend approval of the requested Map Amendment to rezone 3 acres of an 11.6 acre parcel from A-1 (Agricultural) to R-1 (One-Family Residence District) to build a home on their property.

Attachments:
1. Plat of Survey
2. ZPAC Meeting minutes on 5.6.13
3. RPC Meeting minutes on 5.22.13
Angela Zubko called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

Present:
Megan Andrews – Soil & Water Conservation District
Fran Klaas – County Highway Department
Phil Smith – Sheriff’s Office
Judy Gilmour – PBZ Member
Angela Zubko – PBZ Senior Planner

Absent:
Greg Chismark – Wills Burke Kelsey
Jason Petit – Forest Preserve
Aaron Rybski – Health Department

AGENDA

A motion was made by Fran Klaas to approve the agenda, Megan Andrews seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion carried.

MINUTES

Phil Smith made a motion, seconded by Fran Klaas, to approve the January 7, 2013 meeting minutes. All were in favor and the motion carried.

PETITIONS

#13-13 Steven & Lori Seeler
Planner Zubko stated the property is located at the southeast corner of Cherry Road and Schlapp Road, about 0.15 miles east of Schlapp Road. The petitioner is looking to rezone about 3 acres of an 11.6 acre property. It is consistent with the Village of Oswego’s and our future land use plan, there are no trails shown on Cherry Road and the reason for rezoning is to build a home on the property. The NaAuSay Township Plan Commission did recommend approval and it will go to the Township Board on May 20th. The reason for the weird shape to rezone is because they are just rezoning where they want their house to be built, they would like to use the rest of the land for agricultural uses and there are also a lot of existing trees on the property. Ms. Andrews asked if an existing curb cut will be used, Planner Zubko stated she thought they would use one of the two curb cuts.

Mr. Klaas stated he knew we could not put conditions on the rezoning but would request a 35’ right-of-way dedication on Cherry Road. Judy Gilmour and Phil Smith did not have any comments at this time. Megan Andrews stated they are working on a NRI and writing up an expanded executive summary which will include soil septic suitability and building suitability, etc. As soon as the report is ready a copy will be forwarded to the petitioner and PBZ Department.

With no further suggestions or changes Fran Klaas made a motion, seconded by Phil Smith to forward the petition onto the Plan Commission. All were in favor.

#13-08 ZPAC Definition
Planner Zubko stated this text change is to allow any member of the PBZ Committee attending the meeting instead of just the PEZ Chair. Ms. Andrews asked the composition of the PBZ Committee and Planner Zubko went through the members and stated it consists of all County Board members.

With no further questions or changes Fran Klaas made a motion, seconded by Megan Andrews to forward the petition onto the Plan Commission. All were in favor.
Chairman Bill Ashton called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

ROLL CALL
Members Present: Chair Bill Ashton, Tom Casey, Bill Lavine, Larry Nelson, Vern Poppen, Claire Wilson, Budd Wormley and 1 vacancy (Big Grove)
Others present: Senior Planner Angela Zubko
Members Absent: Tim Sidles and Walter Werderich
In the Audience: Attorney Daniel Kramer, John and Dianne Vann

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Larry Nelson made a motion to approve the agenda as written. Tom Casey seconded the motion. All were in favor and the agenda was approved.

APPROVAL OF BILLS- No Bills

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Bill Lavine made a motion to approve the minutes from February 27, 2013 as amended. Larry Nelson seconded the motion. All were in favor and the minutes were approved.

Welcome Vern Poppen- Mr. Poppen introduced himself and told us a little about himself.

PETITIONS

#13-13 Steven & Lori Seeler
Planner Zubko stated the property is located at the southeast corner of Cherry Road and Schlapp Road, about 0.15 miles east of Schlapp Road. The petitioner is looking to rezone about 3 acres of an 11.6 acre property. It is consistent with the Village of Oswego's and our future land use plan, there are no trails shown on Cherry Road and the reason for rezoning is to build a home on the property. The NaAuSay Township Plan Commission did recommend approval and it was also approved by the Township Board on May 20th. The reason for the weird shape to rezone is because they are just rezoning where they want their house to be built, they would like to use the rest of the land for agricultural uses and there are also a lot of existing trees on the property. Mr. Klaas knew we could not put conditions on the rezoning but would request a 35' right-of-
way dedication on Cherry Road. The NRI report was received today and the LE score
was 98 and the total LESA score was 179.

Mr. Attorney Kramer introduced himself and explained why they are requesting rezoning
and not an A-1 building permit. They would like to have some horses which is why a
proposed barn is shown on the zoning plat. Mr. Kramer said they wanted to be mindful
of the close neighbor and put the barn at least 100' from the neighbor.

The Vann's, a neighbor, were in the audience and didn't have any concerns but wanted
to hear the plan for this property.

With no further suggestions or changes Larry Nelson made a motion, seconded by
Budd Wormley to recommend approval and forward the petition onto the Zoning Board
of Appeals. All were in favor.

#13-08 ZPAC Definition
Planner Zubko stated this text change is to allow any member of the PBZ Committee
attending the meeting instead of just the PBZ Chair. The ZPAC (Zoning, Platting and
Advisory Committee) consists of all staff. Mr. Nelson suggested added language to
include 1 vote out of the 5 PBZ members.

With no further suggestions or changes Larry Nelson made a motion, seconded by Bill
Lavine to recommend approval and forward the petition onto the Zoning Board of
Appeals. All were in favor.

REVIEW OF PETITIONS THAT WENT TO COUNTY BOARD
Still have not heard from 609 Wheeler Road- stopped contact after Plan
Commission

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD- No audience members spoke

NEW BUSINESS
Review of Draft Bike Plan- Planner Zubko stated that in the packet is the draft bike
plan and it is still being reviewing it with the municipalities but would request the
Commission to look it over and contact Planner Zubko with any questions or comments.
Mr. Ashton asked if any of the bike paths are on the roadway, Planner Zubko stated this
has not been discussed to date as being on the roadway. Mr. Wormley feels like this as
a taking and to make sure to have plenty of time for the public hearing. Mr. Nelson
requested to add some trails in Plano to Abe street and connecting to the regional trail
on Frazier Road. Ms. Wilson asked if that enters the Ellis property. Planner Zubko will
check if not add it. Also the same thing for Sa-nee-kee park. She brought up multi-use
trails instead of just bike trails and the bias.

OLD BUSINESS
Spreadsheet of Septic Complaints- Planner Zubko stated at the last meeting the Plan
To: ZBA  
From: Angela L. Zubko, Senior Planner  
Date: May 23, 2013  
Re: Text Amendment – Modify the definition of the ZPAC Committee (Petition 13-08)

The proposed changes are to allow anyone from the Planning, Building and Zoning Committee (PBZ) to attend the ZPAC meeting and not just the PBZ Chair.

Section 3.02:

ZONING, PLATTING & ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ZPAC). An informal, strictly advisory committee and not a County Board committee comprised primarily of County staff and advisors. Membership includes, but is not limited to, representatives from the County Planning, Building and Zoning Department, the Highway Department, the Health Department, the Sheriff’s Department, Forest Preserve District, Soil and Water Conservation District, and the County Engineer or consultants. The PBZ Chair Any member of the Planning, Building and Zoning (PBZ) Committee of the County Board shall also serve on ZPAC but only 1 vote out of the 5 PBZ members will be permitted.

The ZPAC discussed the text amendment and had no comments but recommended approval. The RPC wanted one change to verity only 1 PBZ member has a vote at the ZPAC meeting.

Attachments:
1. ZPAC meeting minutes on 5.6.13
2. RPC meeting minutes on 5.22.13
Angela Zubko called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

Present:
Megan Andrews – Soil & Water Conservation District
Fran Klaas - County Highway Department
Phil Smith – Sheriff’s Office
Judy Gilmour – PBZ Member
Angela Zubko – PBZ Senior Planner

Absent:
Greg Chismark – Wills Burke Kelsey
Jason Petit- Forest Preserve
Aaron Rybski – Health Department

AGENDA

A motion was made by Fran Klaas to approve the agenda, Megan Andrews seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion carried.

MINUTES

Phil Smith made a motion, seconded by Fran Klaas, to approve the January 7, 2013 meeting minutes. All were in favor and the motion carried.

PETITIONS

#13-13 Steven & Lori Seeler
Planner Zubko stated the property is located at the southeast corner of Cherry Road and Schlapp Road, about 0.15 miles east of Schlapp Road. The petitioner is looking to rezone about 3 acres of an 11.6 acre property. It is consistent with the Village of Oswego’s and our future land use plan, there are no trails shown on Cherry Road and the reason for rezoning is to build a home on the property. The NaAuSay Township Plan Commission did recommend approval and it will go to the Township Board on May 20th. The reason for the weird shape to rezone is because they are just rezoning where they want their house to be built, they would like to use the rest of the land for agricultural uses and there are also a lot of existing trees on the property. Ms. Andrews asked if an existing curb cut will be used, Planner Zubko stated she thought they would use one of the two curb cuts.

Mr. Klaas stated he knew we could not put conditions on the rezoning but would request a 35’ right-of-way dedication on Cherry Road. Judy Gilmour and Phil Smith did not have any comments at this time. Megan Andrews stated they are working on a NRI and writing up an expanded executive summary which will include soil septic suitability and building suitability, etc. As soon as the report is ready a copy will be forwarded to the petitioner and PBZ Department.

With no further suggestions or changes Fran Klaas made a motion, seconded by Phil Smith to forward the petition onto the Plan Commission. All were in favor.

#13-08 ZPAC Definition
Planner Zubko stated this text change is to allow any member of the PBZ Committee attending the meeting instead of just the PBZ Chair. Ms. Andrews asked the composition of the PBZ Committee and Planner Zubko went through the members and stated it consists of all County Board members.

With no further questions or changes Fran Klaas made a motion, seconded by Megan Andrews to forward the petition onto the Plan Commission. All were in favor.
way dedication on Cherry Road. The NRI report was received today and the LE score was 98 and the total LESA score was 179.

Mr. Attorneys Kramer introduced himself and explained why they are requesting rezoning and not an A-1 building permit. They would like to have some horses which is why a proposed barn is shown on the zoning plat. Mr. Kramer said they wanted to be mindful of the close neighbor and put the barn at least 100’ from the neighbor.

The Vann’s, a neighbor, were in the audience and didn’t have any concerns but wanted to hear the plan for this property.

With no further suggestions or changes Larry Nelson made a motion, seconded by Budd Wormley to recommend approval and forward the petition onto the Zoning Board of Appeals. All were in favor.

**#13-08 ZPAC Definition**

Planner Zubko stated this text change is to allow any member of the PBZ Committee attending the meeting instead of just the PBZ Chair. The ZPAC (Zoning, Platting and Advisory Committee) consists of all staff. Mr. Nelson suggested added language to include 1 vote out of the 5 PBZ members.

With no further suggestions or changes Larry Nelson made a motion, seconded by Bill Lavine to recommend approval and forward the petition onto the Zoning Board of Appeals. All were in favor.

**REVIEW OF PETITIONS THAT WENT TO COUNTY BOARD**

Still have not heard from 609 Wheeler Road- stopped contact after Plan Commission

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD** - No audience members spoke

**NEW BUSINESS**

Review of Draft Bike Plan- Planner Zubko stated that in the packet is the draft bike plan and it is still being reviewing it with the municipalities but would request the Commission to look it over and contact Planner Zubko with any questions or comments. Mr. Ashton asked if any of the bike paths are on the roadway, Planner Zubko stated this has not been discussed to date as being on the roadway. Mr. Wormley feels like this as a taking and to make sure to have plenty of time for the public hearing. Mr. Nelson requested to add some trails in Plano to Abe street and connecting to the regional trail on Frazier Road. Ms. Wilson asked if that enters the Ellis property. Planner Zubko will check if not add it. Also the same thing for Sa-wee-kee park. She brought up multi-use trails instead of just bike trails and the bias.

**OLD BUSINESS**

Spreadsheet of Septic Complaints- Planner Zubko stated at the last meeting the Plan