Chairman Bill Ashton called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm.

ROLL CALL
Members Present: Chair Bill Ashton, Bill Lavine, Tom Casey, Larry Nelson, Vern Poppen, Claire Wilson and Budd Wormley
Others present: Planning & Zoning Manager Angela Zubko
Members Absent: Brian Leonard, Tim Sidles and 1 vacancy (Big Grove)
In the Audience: Attorney Daniel Kramer, Attorney Ken Carlson, Barry Narvick, Barry Stevenson, Bob & Sharon Friestad, Valerie Dobson, Wayne/Harold & Betty Schlappi, Doug Knudson, Dale Howard, County Board member Amy Cesich and County Board Chairman John Shaw

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Planner Zubko just wanted to note before we start that Petition 14-21 for the David & Cathy Price rezoning of 9480 Walker Road has been withdrawn, if the petitioner request a rezoning in the future everyone would be notified again.

Tom Casey a motion to approve the agenda as written. Bill Lavine seconded the motion. All were in favor and the agenda was approved

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Budd Wormley made a motion to approve the minutes from May 28, 2014 meeting, Larry Nelson seconded the motion. All were in favor and the minutes were approved.

PETITIONS
Mr. Ashton state again that Petition 14-21 for the David & Cathy Price rezoning of 9480 Walker Road has been withdrawn

#14-12 Central Limestone Company, Inc.
Planner Angela Zubko did an overview of the request stating the petitioner are seeking approval to rezone 10 acres from M-2 to M-3 and also seeking a special use to operate an asphalt and concrete mixing plant with associated recycling facilities. This will be located on 10 acres of the 150 acre parcel. Central Limestone has a total of about 200 acres. It is located at the southwest corner of Joliet Road and Route 47. An endangered species report is completed and the Illinois Natural Heritage Database shows the Aux Sable Creek INAI Site is in the vicinity of the project location, they
might contact the petitioner for more information. An NRI will not be necessary unless the petitioner or staff would find the report and associated LESA score helpful. The original soil profile has been disturbed and is no longer present on site. Planner Zubko stated she has talked to Lisbon Township and their next meeting will be August 12th and Planner Zubko talked to the mayor of Lisbon and his questions are on truck traffic and expected truck traffic. Planner Zubko would like to know if the asphalt is running at full capacity, and if not, how many trucks are expected per day, also how many trucks for the concrete plant. Staff is of the opinion this is an appropriate location since it is a manufacturing district. It is also appropriate as other mines are to the west and the property north is zoned for mining. The closest home to this site is about 1,300 feet (0.24 miles) southeast of this property, Quarry Road is to the east and a little further east is Route 47. Any building or structure must be located 150’ from the centerline of the roadway and 50’ in the side and rear yard from all property lines dividing lots held in separate ownership. Staff would like to note to the east is a Com Ed right of way so the east property line is considered a side lot line. Staff has received and reviewed the plat of survey showing where the asphalt plant is located and they do meet the 50’ setback requirement. No new access points are being proposed at this time. The trucks will enter and exit the proposed site from Quarry Road. The applicant will post signage on the proposed site which advises drivers that travel on Joliet Road west of the intersection of Joliet Road and Quarry Road is prohibited. The proposed hours of operation for both plants will be 6am to 6pm during weekdays. The plants will operate outside of those hours as may be required to perform projects on governmental projects. It is anticipated that the plants will be operational from April 15th to December 15th (depending on weather). The subject site will not generate waste from the proposed operations. The petitioner has stated no new lighting is proposed other than lighting on the plants. The applicant will focus all such lighting in a downward direction. The applicant also has stated no new signs are proposed at this time. Staff has asked if berming or fencing is proposed or provided on site. There is an existing berm that will shield the concrete plant. The petitioner has stated no additional berms, fences or trees are proposed along Quarry Road. Planner Zubko asked the petitioner what are the heights of the tallest equipment for both plants are? The petitioner has stated the height of the silos for both the asphalt plant and the concrete plant are less than 61 feet. Planner Zubko asked the petitioner to explain how each plant works and they provide the following information:

Asphalt Plant: The asphalt plant will be owned and operated by D Construction. The asphalt plant is a batch plant style asphalt plant, that is asphalt in batches are made as needed to go straight to work sites (rather than a plant which makes and stores asphalt for several days). In an asphalt plant, aggregates are put into a dryer and are dried and heated by drying with hot air. Once the aggregate is dried, it is fed via an elevator into a bin which separates aggregate by size. Once the aggregate is separated, the aggregate is mixed with the petroleum components which bind the product and creates what we know as “asphalt”. The asphalt is then unloaded directly into trucks and delivered to the work. The benefit of the location of the proposed site is that the aggregate component of asphalt is produced in the quarry on the adjoining site. Trucking raw aggregate into the proposed site over
public roads will not be required in most cases. Similarly, it is close to several significant upcoming projects which will help to minimize traffic.

Concrete Plant: The concrete plant will be owned and operated by Narvick Brothers. The concrete plant is a portable central mix batch plant style asphalt plant. The central mix batch plant will mix the ingredients required to form concrete before being loaded into the truck. The concrete plant will be portable. Cement or cement supplements are stored in a silo to insure that the materials are maintained at appropriate moisture levels. Aggregate and sand are placed in a hopper which transfers the material via a conveyor into a storage bin. The cement and cement supplements, aggregate and sand are then transferred to the central mixer where the components are mixed to create what we know as “concrete”. The benefit of the location on the proposed site is that the aggregate component is produced in the quarry on the adjoining site. Trucking raw aggregate into the proposed site over public roads will not be required in most cases. Similarly, it is close to several significant upcoming projects which will help to minimize traffic.

Planner Zubko also asked where the employees park? The petitioner stated if both the asphalt plant and the concrete plant are in operation, it is anticipated that there will be four (4) to five (5) employees and the applicant anticipates designating an area for employee parking in proximity to each of the facilities.

Planner Zubko stated that at this time staff would recommend to continue this petition until the next Plan Commission meeting on August 27th to allow us to hear the township and surrounding residents’ comments. Also this will allow sometime to set up a meeting on site to discuss the operation and invite anyone interested. Planner Zubko stated an updated site plan was passed out today which shows where the asphalt plant is located.

Bill Lavine asked why the asphalt plant is up and running. Planner Zubko stated they received the proper building permits and was of the opinion it was a grandfathered use but was told otherwise by the States Attorney’s Office. Mr. Lavine also inquired about the Health Department and the holding tanks. Planner Zubko stated the Health Department looked up the regulations during the meeting and confirmed holding tanks is permitted.

Claire Wilson asked about dust generation on the site and smell and would like to hear information if it will produce lots of dust and odors and if mitigation needs to be looked at.

Bill Ashton asked if berms would be required due to being M-3. Mr. Nelson stated he would have to re-read but is of the opinion it was only for a quarry and not required for asphalt plants. Mr. Wilson stated since it is a special use can we request it as a condition? Planner Zubko stated yes it could be a condition placed on the approving ordinance. This will be confirmed before the next meeting that a berm is not required. Mr. Nelson stated since they will not be scrapping off the overburden to get to the limestone they would need to truck in dirt for a berm.

Ms. Wilson asked if there is anything we’d want to shield this from an aesthetic point of view? There is ComEd easement and a roadway and then agricultural field. Mr. Nelson stated he is not sure what
Mr. Ashton stated the grain bins are pretty tall out there as well. Ms. Wilson stated there really are not many houses out there for right across from this operation. Mr. Nelson stated this is why there is a mining district out there so everyone is aware it’s a mining district and to expect quarries and other activities like this. So if you buy or build a house there it is a buyer beware, and know mining would be there there is noise, trucks, dust and smells out there. Mr. Wormley stated a shooting range was approved on the same property to the west.

Mr. Nelson stated with all the construction this is an appropriate location. There was a brief discussion on the closest plants which is Yorkville for concrete and Joliet for asphalt.

Attorney Ken Carlson came up to the podium with Barry Narvick to answer some of the questions. Barry is the president of Central Limestone and a principal of Narvick Brothers, who will own and operate the concrete plant. They do not perceive there to be any greater impact from these operations for dust and there are state standards that need to be complied with. Central Limestone is diligent with providing a dust control program and it will be the same for these plants. With regards to smell concrete does not have a smell. Asphalt has a smell but unfortunately that is the product society has decided to build roads out of. The asphalt will come out of the silo into the bed of a trailer and leave the site, not sit on site like other sites. The asphalt plant and concrete projects 30-50 trucks per day for both plants so about 200 trips a day. The good thing is the materials are coming out of the mine and not being trucked in separately. Mr. Narvick stated sometime in the future they would like to manufacture sand but do not currently.

Planner Zubko asked the petitioner if they knew where the Route 47 project will move the roadway to. Mr. Budd Wormley thought further east. That was confirmed by the petitioner that the intersection will move further east.

Mr. Wormley asked if the asphalt is trucked in and if there is storage on site for that? The petitioner stated it is stored on site and believes it is delivered as needed per day.

Mr. Ashton asked if they will be doing any grinding with the old asphalt. The Petitioner believed they do which would qualify for recycling.

At this time Mr. Ashton opened it up to the public for comments.

Bob Friestad who lives across from this property would like to see berms and thought they were required. He stated the asphalt plant does smell and there are about 5-6 houses the smell will effect. Mr. Friestad has concerns over truck traffic and one morning on a Saturday about 30-40 trucks an hour were going up and down Quarry Road. Also the trucks that currently use the asphalt plant use the south entrance the quarry uses and goes back north but wondered if they could enter closer to the plant. Mr. Friestad asked how long the plant will be there? Planner Zubko stated it would be a permanent fixture. Mr. Ashton had a question about the previous asphalt plant and if he lived there at the time? Mr. Friestad stated yes they moved there in 1957 but after the roadway project was completed it was removed. Mr. Nelson verified Mr. Friestad bought his property knowing the quarry and a temporary asphalt plant was there? Mr. Friestad stated he did but as soon as Route 47 was completed the asphalt plant was removed.
Valarie Dobson stated the light does affect her into her bedroom window. She is not aware of an asphalt plant in Kendall County for at least 25 years. She asked if there will be another entrance on Joliet Road? She stated the truck estimates are incorrect, D Construction employs over 1,000 people, own 165 semi's and each truck holds 22 tons of asphalt and there could be several hundred trucks a day. There will be a lot of truck traffic. She also touched on the government road contracts and how the night hours could affect her and her neighbors. Also she is worried about accidents and road closures and would love to see a stop light on Route 47.

Mr. Ashton asked about the truck traffic and mentioned the materials are not being trucked in so it is kind of a wash and they would haul limestone out of there anyway. Ms. Dobson’s concerned the trucks are going to be parked there and there is no traffic light at Route 47. She feels something needs to be regulated for the truck traffic because everything will be concentrated at this site. Mr. Larry asked if the quarry was there when she moved in and she stated yes. She also mentioned she’s lived there 12 years and the truck traffic has doubled or tripled.

The petitioner has stated there will be no Narvick or D Construction trucks parked on site. Also the petitioner has stated no new access point off Joliet Road is proposed that does not already exist. The Petitioner is fine with putting a condition no semi’s can park over night. The attorney stated the plan is to make both plants permanent. There is an immediate need but hope the need is there in the future.

Mr. Nelson asked about the sales tax? There was a brief conversation.

Bill Lavine made a motion to continue this to the August 27th meeting and in the interim consideration be giver to make a recommendation for the County Board to petition IDOT about to take a look at traffic control at that particular intersection (Route 47 and Joliet Road) and also add an amendment that there will be no overnight parking of semi’s on the property. Tom Casey seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Planner Zubko stated the Village of Lisbon stated the petitioners do not need to go to their meeting as they feel the County meetings and township meeting will be enough.

Claire Wilson would like to look at the berming requirements and check the Zoning Ordinance.

**#14-20 Peaceful Pathways Montessori School**

Planner Angela Zubko did an overview of the request stating the property is located at 8250 Route 71 on the south side of Route 71 west of the Ravine Woods Subdivision. The site is about 7 acres and was originally approved in 2005 and limited to 24 students. In 2007 they petitioned to have 75 students and again in 2009 for up to 200 students. The petitioners are requesting a major amendment to their special use to modify their site plan to construct around a 6,000 square foot (two classroom) building for the purpose of teaching and modify the existing parking lot and the conditions. They will still have the maximum capacity of 200 students, the current site plan could not accommodate 200 students and it still will not. Planner Zubko stated currently their enrollment is 105 students enrolled and with the new building it should allow for about 185 students. Access already
exists as a right in, right out. During ZPAC some concerns over people turning left was brought up but when Route 71 is widened a left turn lane will be provided and the petitioner has a no turn left sign and also notifies that parents in their newsletters. The current parking lot has 16 parking stalls. The proposed parking will be able to accommodate 30 parking stalls. The condition will remain that the existing gravel driveway shall be paved by May 15, 2017. Since the parking lot will be all new they must meet today’s size standards of 24’ wide drive aisles and 9’x20’ parking stalls. The parking ratio would be based as a junior high. The requirements would be 1 parking stall per employee and 1 per each 20 students. That total would be 25 parking stalls required and 30 are proposed. The petitioner is seeking a variance to the 24’ drive aisle as it’s currently 20’ and there have been no issues to date and the petitioner is working with the Bristol Kendall Fire Protection District to make sure a fire truck can get in and out of the site. An EcoCat has been completed and IDNR has contacted the petitioner and has no concerns. A new NRI will not be needed as they completed one in 2009. Also the petitioner has talked to the Health Department and the septic is already properly sized to accommodate this new building. Staff recommends approval of the major amendment to the special use and went over the current and modified 6 conditions.

Mr. Nelson verified the reason for this amendment is to allow a building and modify the parking lot, Planner Zubko stated that is correct.

Mr. Lavine stated the original was for a preschool and wanted to be run out of the house? Mr. Kramer verified that is correct and it has morphed and now teaches preschool up to eighth grade. Mr. Lavine stated the first special use ordinance granted had a few conditions he had a few questions on. Once was about the driveway and an occupancy permit, was that complete? Mr. Kramer stated it used to be a 10’ private drive. Mr. Lavine also asked about the right-in and right-out and asking if it conforms to IDOT standards. There was some discussion on the parking ratio and Mr. Lavine read it incorrectly.

Mr. Larry Nelson asked why do we require asphalt? Mr. Lavine also asked about pervious surfaces like brick pavers so water can run through. Planner Zubko stated those are permitted and asphalt has been a condition since 2007, if the Commission would like we could eliminate that condition but we typically make other petitioners abide by putting in asphalt in the future. Mr. Poppen stated only the driveway has to been asphalt and not the parking stalls, Planner Zubko agreed and will make sure the condition reads that way.

Ms. Wilson hates adding conditions that cause burden to the petitioner (referring to the asphalt). She asked if the petitioner would like to keep it gravel. Attorney Kramer stated they are not requesting it and do not object to asphalt.

Mr. Ashton asked what the ultimate capacity is since it’s come back three times now? Attorney Kramer stated right about 200 students, anymore they would need to acquire more land or move to a commercial site. Mr. Kramer also stated the petitioners still live on site.

With no further comments Budd Wormley made a motion, seconded by Vern Poppen to recommend approval and forward the petition onto the Zoning Board of Appeals and Hearing officer with staff’s recommendations. With a roll call vote all were in favor.
#14-11 Concrete Crushers
Planner Angela Zubko stated last month this was tabled and some modifications have occurred since last month. The first major change is to create a new section in the General Provisions section of the Zoning Ordinance that addresses temporary uses in all zoning districts (although not all temporary uses would be allowed in all zoning districts). Also add a fee of $100 for each temporary use on the fee list. The permit would be just like a conditional use that would just go through a staff review and if for some reason staff is not sure if it meets all the conditions or the petitioner does not agree with staff it can be taken to the PBZ Committee for approval or denial. On the memo all the blue is new text that the Plan Commission has not seen yet and the red was previously discussed. The other conditions that are just in black are other temporary uses that were moved from the agricultural section of the Zoning Ordinance. Staff recommends approval of the text amendment. Planner Zubko also mentioned the changes to the performance standards.

Larry Nelson made a motion to un-table the petition, Vern Poppen seconded to un-table the petition. All were in favor so this can be discussed.

Mr. Ashton asked about crushing concrete if that is part of the special use for the concrete plant or need a temporary permit? Planner Zubko stated yes that is considered the recycling materials so it would be permitted with the special use.

There was discussion on the distances to single family residents, townhomes/duplex and the commission decided to change it to residence. There was also discussion on occupied verse foreclosed, verse abandoned so made it residential structure.

Ms. Wilson stated these make a lot of noise so maybe 300 feet is too close to a business. There was discussion if you put too many regulations they will just locate in the ROW instead of on private property and apply for a temporary use. The Commission would like to change it to residential building.

With no further suggestions or changes Larry Nelson made a motion with the suggested changes, seconded by Tom Casey to recommend approval and forward the petition onto the Zoning Board of Appeals. With a roll call vote all were in favor.

#14-17 Medical Cannabis Cultivation Center text and Medical Cannabis Distribution Center
Planner Angela Zubko stated she has put together a memo about the background information on the Compassionate Use of Medical Cannabis Pilot Program Act that is scheduled to be repealed January 1, 2018. There are two separate text amendments so we will go over them one at a time, one for the cultivation centers and one for the dispensaries. Note they are called temporary due to this 2018 date. To explain in the memo a little better in red it dictates where that came from whether it be from the Statute, rules and regulations or another ordinance. It nothing is notated in red staff has drafted that on their own. Staff plans to propose 4 definitions that are taken word for word straight from the Statute. There were no questions about these 4 definitions.

First discussed was the text for cultivation centers that are proposed to be a special use in the A-1
and M-1 and M-2 Districts with 15 conditions. There was some discussion that only one cultivation center will be permitted between Kendall, Grundy and Will counties and that is up to the State so many can be approved and apply to the state but only one will be permitted. There was also discussion this HAS to take place in an enclosed building.

Mr. Nelson asked why would we want to approve this in an agricultural area if it is more of a manufacturing project? Planner Zubko stated at the ZPAC Committee made a recommendation to **NOT allow this as a special use in the A-1 District.** (Since there is a petition already submitted in the A-1 Agricultural district staff will leave it as it until the County Board votes on the text amendment and will make sure each Committee knows that recommendation.)

Mr. Lavine asked how the state can go against federal law, aren't we complicit if we establish an ordinance for this text. That would probably be left to the SAO to answer. Also if we don't have a special use how can they apply? Planner Zubko stated we have a lot of text amendments that go simultaneously with the proposed special use. There was discussion why we even have to allow this text? Planner Zubko stated the Statute states: a unit of local government may enact reasonable zoning ordinances or resolutions. We have to provide for it somewhere.

Mr. Lavine does not feel it is appropriate in an agricultural district, Mr. Nelson and Mr. Wormley agree. It should be in manufacturing districts. Mr. Lavine thinks it should be in a manufacturing district and agree with the hefty fee, if legal. There was a discussion if it should be in the M-3 district and the consensus was not to add it into the M-3 district.

Bill Lavine made a motion to approve the text amendment for cultivation centers and only allow it as a special use in the manufacturing districts and wanted to note that there is a question about the legality at a federal level. Mr. Nelson seconded the motion.

Mr. Nelson stated this is the beginning, there will be more and more in the future so to allow it in agricultural may be too broad, this can always be changed in the future if needed.

Before the vote Mr. Ashton asked if anyone from the audience wanted to speak.

Barry Stevenson introduced himself and stated he owns 300 acres on Griswold Springs and Burr Oak Road. He would like to put a cultivation site on that property in green houses. Mr. Nelson stated off Burr Oak Road would be more appropriate instead of Griswold Springs Road. Mr. Stevenson stated he has talked to many investors and feels this would be the highest and best use for the property. He stated the permit asks what the cultivation center can give back to the community. Mr. Stevenson stated giving access for the Forest Preserve and residents through an easement donation agreement could be done so access will be provided to the Little Rock Creek. It will be in secured and locked green houses. He is advocating to permit this as a special use in the A-1 Agricultural district. Mr. Stevenson educated the Commission about medical cannabis. He talked about how this product does not get you high, it heals you. He talked about putting this into a manufacturing district is a bad idea due to air quality in industrial areas getting into a cultivation center building.

Mr. Ashton stated it is noted Mr. Stevenson would like to keep it in agricultural areas.
With a roll call vote and Tom Casey being the only no vote the petitioner is approved. Mr. Casey's no vote was because he does not feel having it in an agricultural area will be a detriment if it's controlled. He feels we are making too much out of it. Mr. Nelson is not so concerned right now but it might be changed in the future. Mr. Nelson asked what the SAO thought about this. Planner Zubko stated they will be asked before the Board meeting on their stance.

There was discussion on allowing this in agricultural areas vs. manufacturing and compared them to current green house operations are that considered agricultural operations like the Orchid farm on Bell Road.

Then we moved onto the text amendment for distribution centers where they will be selling the medical cannabis out of a building. Staff proposes it be a special use in the B-1, B-2, B-3, M-1 & M-2 Districts with 16 conditions and also added suggested some language with regards to an annual renewal fee? Planner Zubko pointed out the zoning requirements from the Statute and said she added the dispensary cannot be within 500 feet of the property line of a pre-existing residential zoning district, place of worship, park or forest preserve. Planner Zubko quickly went through the proposed conditions. Planner Zubko stated she has not received a petition for a dispensary yet but only one would be permitted between Kendall and Grundy County, once again left up to the state.

Mr. Nelson stated this should not be in a B-1, B-2 or B-3 districts. There was some discussion this is like a pharmacy. Mr. Lavine said if this a legal drug what is wrong with it being in a business district next to a Target or Walgreens. Mr. Nelson would like to see it out of a pharmacy instead of a standalone store. Mr. Casey would like to ask Mr. Stevenson to come back up and explain the high and low side a little further. Mr. Casey asked about the process. Mr. Stevenson stated you start with a genetic strain with a CBD count instead of a high THC count. It's more similar to hemp and not marijuana. Mr. Stevenson stated it is made into an oil, you can drink it, put it in a capsule, put it into food, you can still smoke it but they do not recommend it since it's a medicine. A medicine in a vial, completely different then everything else you've heard about. Mr. Stevenson suggests the Commission read the cannabis act.

Mr. Nelson stated the only place with similar restrictions being located so far from churches, day cares, schools, etc. is for adult uses, which is in manufacturing districts, not in commercial district. Which is why he suggests to not allow it in commercial districts. Ms. Wilson asked if we need all these restrictions if it is a prescription? There was some discussion on what members saw in San Francisco.

Planner Zubko said in an effort to move this along can we please discuss the actual conditions instead of districts at this moment.

Ms. Wilson asked about condition j. and condition k if staff made those up or where those conditions came from. Planner Zubko will look into it but thought it was from the rules. Ms. Wilson stated if these are like pharmacies why would we be so strict? We would not require a pharmacy to have bullet proof glass or fencing, or have parking in the front. She feels it's singling them out and too restrictive.
Budd Wormley would like the new sheriff to look at this text. Planner Zubko stated she has not. Mr. Nelson asked when we need to have the Zoning law in place? Planner Zubko stated she is not sure but we don’t currently have a petition. The Sheriff’s office took a look at this text at ZPAC and had some concerns but no text was changed but their concerns are written on the memo. Ms. Wilson does not have the same concerns as we have liquor stores and pharmacies do not have bullet proof glass. She feels this is being blown way out of proportion and does not feel the need for all these extreme measures.

After much discussion Larry Nelson made a motion to continue this next month. Tom Casey seconded the motion. Mr. Nelson would like to hear the SAO comments. Ms. Wilson thinks we would all benefit if there is some source that could educate us.

Planner Zubko asked what everyone would like from staff in the next month. Mr. Nelson would like to see colored what the state statute and rules exist and what is extra and email that out. Ms. Wilson asked if staff can point to any references or authoritative sources regarding THC and cultivation of cannabis information. Planner Zubko will work with Mr. Stevenson to get some educational information on marijuana vs. medical cannabis, email out the Statute and rules.

REVIEW OF PETITIONS THAT WENT TO COUNTY BOARD

14-10 Plano Rotary, Plano Boy Scout Troop 71 & Plano American Legion Post 395- Passed at the 6.17.14 County Board meeting- Planner Zubko stated in the packet were the 10 conditions it passed with as some others changed after Plan Commission.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD/ PUBLIC COMMENT: None

NEW BUSINESS

OLD BUSINESS
Update on possible changes for Kendall & NaAuSay Township- Planner Zubko stated in the packet are the RPD provisions from the ordinance. At the last Ad-hoc meeting it was decided t modify these provisions to better suit what the townships are looking for and that basically is to modify the minimum and maximum lot sizes and possibly bonus density credits. Hopefully this will be ready to discuss at next month’s Plan Commission meeting.

Planner Zubko stated she passed out a flyer from the IL Association of County Zoning Officials to put on a seminar that the County will pay for to help educate them on being on the Plan Commission.

Mr. Ashton stated this is Bill Lavine’s last meeting as he is moving next month to North Carolina and thanked him for his time.

Mr. Lavine has stated it has been a joy working with this group and really enjoyed the fact that no grudges are held.

ADJOURNMENT
The next meeting will be on August 27, 2014. Bill Lavine made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Budd Wormley seconded the motion. All were in favor and the meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Submitted by,
Angela L. Zubko, Planning & Zoning Manager