KENDALL COUNTY
AD HOC ZONING ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

MEETING AGENDA

May 24, 2017

5:00pm – 6:45pm
Kendall County Office Building
Rooms 209 & 210
111 W. Fox Street
Yorkville, Illinois

1. Approval of Agenda

2. Approval of Minutes from the March 22, 2017 meeting

3. Hearing Officer/Code Hearing Unit

4. Stormwater Ordinance Amendment(s) and/or Variance(s) Related to Projects in Plano and the Forest Preserve Projects

5. Yorkville Comprehensive Plan/Land Resource Management Plan Differences

6. Adjournment

Next meeting will be on June 28, 2017
KENDALL COUNTY AD HOC ZONING
ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

Kendall County Office Building
Rooms 209 & 210
111 W. Fox Street, Yorkville, Illinois
5:00 p.m.
Unapproved Meeting Minutes of March 22, 2017

Present: Larry Nelson (Chairman), Robert Davidson, Judy Gilmour, John Shaw, and Jeff Wehrli
Others Present: Mike Hoffman from Teska Associates, Inc., Greg Chismark from WBK Engineering, LLC, Greg Peterson, Sherman Tweed, and Matt Asselmeier, Senior Planner

Chairman Larry Nelson called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
   Mr. Wehrli made a motion to approve the agenda with an amendment moving the Plano Stormwater issue ahead of the Hearing Officer/Code Hearing Unit item. Mr. Shaw seconded the motion. All agreed and the agenda was approved as amended.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   Mr. Wehrli made a motion to approve the minutes from the November 30, 2016, meeting. Mr. Shaw seconded the motion. All agreed and the meeting minutes were approved.

3. STORMWATER ORDINANCE AMENDMENT RELATED TO PLANO’S PROJECT IN FOLI PARK
   Plano Mayor Bob Hausler explained Plano’s situation. The City of Plano received an OSLAD Grant from the State in the amount of $202,000 for improvements at Foli Park. Plano must provide a $202,000 match. Based on their engineer’s calculations, this project needs approximately 0.33 acres for detention or $58,000 of a fee-in-lieu contribution. The subject property is in a floodplain. Mayor Hausler believes that this situation was not discussed when the County considered the Stormwater Ordinance. Accordingly, he would like a variance and possibly an amendment excluding five (5) acre public projects.

   Mr. Nelson noted that Big Rock Creek overruns the area in flood events.

   Mr. Davidson asked how the pond discharges. There is no overflow; the level rises and falls as needed.
Mayor Hausler stated the creel previously went through this area and was diverted at some point in the past. The area was a gravel pit. Plano acquired the property in the late 1960s or 1970s.

Mr. Wehrli suggested a variance would be more appropriate than an amendment.

Mr. Chismark indicated the variance process was in the Stormwater Ordinance.

Mr. Asselmeier read the criteria for applying for a variance and the criteria of the findings of fact for granting a variance. The Oversight Committee is the Committee of the Whole, per the Stormwater Ordinance.

Mr. Nelson stated that he did not see any negatives with the variance proposal and that Plano could justify the variance using the criteria in the Stormwater Ordinance.

Mr. Wehrli made a motion to send this variance request to the PBZ Committee with a favorable recommendation, seconded by Mr. Shaw. With a voice vote of five (5) ayes, the motion passed unanimously.

4. **HEARING OFFICER/CODE HEARING UNIT**

Mr. Asselmeier read a memo drafted by PBZ Department Intern Michael Goers regarding his research on the subject. The memo outlined the reasons and potential ordinance changes required to implement the program. The memo also stated the methods local municipalities used in relation to hearing officers.

Mr. Nelson explained that the Special Use Hearing Officer was originally intended to hear code violations because the States Attorney’s Office had other cases.

Mayor Hausler stated that Plano has a hearing weekly and they use the Illinois Debt Recovery Program. By using this program, the fine goes with the person; the State pulls the fine out of tax refunds. Plano uses the hearing officer for police issues and zoning issues. Most zoning issues, like property maintenance issues, are resolved before adjudication.

Mr. Wehrli stated that residents, in addition to property owners, should be notified as well.

Mr. Hoffman noted that the Special Use Hearing Officer has not met for several months and he likes the idea of units of government working together.

Mr. Wehrli asked for the definition of hearsay evidence. Mr. Asselmeier stated that, in zoning hearings, letters and emails were considered hearsay evidence if the person that wrote the letter or email did not personally read the letter or email into the record.
Mr. Wehrli also suggested that the County inform Plattville and Millbrook of the proposal.

Mr. Wehrli made a motion to forward this issue to the PBZ Committee, seconded by Mr. Shaw. With a voice vote of five (5) ayes, the motion passed unanimously.

5. **SHOOTING RANGE ORDINANCE UPDATE INCLUDING A POTENTIAL MORATORIUM ON OUTDOOR SHOOTING RANGES DURING THE REVIEW PERIOD**

Mr. Nelson stated that he had some concerns regarding the present outdoor shooting range regulations in the Zoning Ordinance. Any revisions, amendments, or moratorium would not impact the Delaney proposal that is currently making its way through the process.

Noise was mentioned as a major concern.

Mr. Asselmeier stated that the Illinois Association of County Zoning Officials would be discussing outdoor shooting range regulations at their meeting in April.

Ms. Gilmour asked for an update on the Delaney case. Mr. Asselmeier stated that Staff requested additional information from the petitioner. The proposal is currently scheduled to go before the Special Use Hearing Officer on April 3, 2017.

Mr. Wehrli suggested that a specific time period, like six (6) months, be placed on the moratorium.

Greg Peterson, neighbor to the Delaney property, expressed concerns of gun ranges containing thirty-six (36) lanes. He would like to see further discussion making guns ranges a zoning issue instead of a special use issue. Mr. Davidson invited Mr. Peterson to the April Planning, Building and Zoning Committee meeting.

Mr. Davidson made a motion to recommend to the PBZ Committee that a moratorium of six (6) months be placed on special use permit applications for outdoor shooting ranges, seconded by Ms. Gilmour. With a voice vote of five (5) ayes, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Davidson left at this point in the meeting (6:02).

Mr. Asselmeier will report back to the Committee regarding the Illinois Association of County Zoning Officials meeting.

Sherman Tweed, Brisbin Road, expressed concerns that the Plattville Fire Chief could make it to the Delaney property in five (5) minutes. Mr. Nelson advised Mr. Tweed to inform the Hearing Officer of his concerns during the special use hearing.
6. **ITEMS FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION**

   Mr. Asselmeier provided a memo on the differences between Plano’s proposed Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map and the County’s Land Resource Management Plan.

   Discussion occurred regarding comparing Yorkville’s new plan with the Land Resource Management Plan.

   Discussion also occurred regarding studying noise regulations in the future. Mr. Wehrli mentioned that the cost of barriers is approximately $150/linear foot; this material and cost are cheaper than what the State pays.

   There were no additional comments from the public or press.

**Adjournment:**

The next meeting will be April 26, 2017. Ms. Gilmour made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Wehrli seconded the motion. With a voice vote of four (4) ayes, the motion passed unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 6:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Matthew H. Asselmeier, AICP
Senior Planner
ORDINANCE # 2004- 28

AN ORDINANCE OF THE KENDALL COUNTY CODE CREATING A CODE HEARING UNIT

WHEREAS, Kendall County has adopted rules and regulations intended to protect and enhance the public health, safety, and welfare, and these rules and regulations are set forth in the Kendall County Code; and

WHEREAS, enforcement of the rules and regulations of the Kendall County Code sometimes requires County staff to notify a property owner or other person of a violation of the duly adopted rules and regulations; and

WHEREAS, failure by a property owner or other person to correct an identified violation of the Kendall County Code currently requires staff to take further action through the circuit court; and

WHEREAS, it is desirable to have an alternative procedure for the abatement of Kendall County Code violations which is less complex and less time consuming; and

WHEREAS, Chapter 55, Section 5/5-41 of the Illinois State Statutes allows counties to create Code Hearing Units for the administrative adjudication of code violations; and

WHEREAS, Kendall County staff and the Kendall County State's Attorney have reviewed the enabling legislation and have drafted rules, regulations and procedures for a Code Hearing Unit for Kendall County, attached hereto as Exhibit "A"; and

WHEREAS, the Planning, Building and Zoning Committee of the Kendall County Board has reviewed the drafted rules, regulations and procedures for the Code Hearing Unit and has determined that such a Unit will expedite the adjudication of Code violations and improve the administration of the Kendall County Code, and has forwarded a recommendation to the County Board that a Code Hearing Unit be created for Kendall County; and

WHEREAS, the County Board of Kendall County has determined that it is in the best interest of its citizens of the County to amend the Kendall County Code to establish the Code Hearing Unit in order to better protect the public health, safety, and welfare;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNTY BOARD OF KENDALL COUNTY, ILLINOIS, as follows:

SECTION ONE: The conclusions set forth above and the recommendation of the Planning, Building and Zoning Committee of the Kendall County Board are hereby adopted as the conclusions of the Kendall County Board.

SECTION TWO: The Kendall County Code is hereby amended to create a Code Hearing Unit, as set forth in Exhibit "A" attached hereto.

SECTION THREE: This Ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon its adoption by the County Board of Kendall County, Illinois.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Ordinance was approved by the Kendall County Board on August 17, 2004.

[Signatures]

Attest:

[Signatures]

Paul Anderson
Kendall County Clerk

[Signature]

John A. Church
Kendall County Board Chairman
EXHIBIT “A”

CODE HEARING UNIT

Section 1. Definitions

a) “Code” means any County ordinance that pertains to or regulates any of the following: animal control; the definition, identification, and abatement of public nuisances; the accumulation, disposal, and transportation of garbage, refuse, and other forms of solid waste; the construction and maintenance of buildings and structures including improvements; sanitation practices; or subdivision zoning.

b) “Code Enforcement Officer” means a County employee or independent contractor or investigator authorized to issue citations for County Code violations.

c) “Hearing Officer” means a person other than a Code Enforcement Officer or law enforcement officer having the following powers and duties:

1) To preside at an administrative hearing called to determine whether a Code violation exists;

2) To hear testimony and accept evidence from the Code Enforcement Officer, the respondent, and all interested parties relevant to the existence of a Code violation;

3) To preserve and authenticate the record of the hearing and all exhibits and evidence introduced at the hearing;

4) To issue and sign written findings and a decision and order stating whether a Code violation exists;

5) To impose penalties consistent with applicable Code provisions and to assess costs reasonably related to instituting the proceedings upon finding the respondent liable for the charged violation. In no event, however, shall the Hearing Officer have the authority to impose a penalty of incarceration.

c) “Property owner” means the legal or beneficial owner of an improved or unimproved parcel of real estate.

d) “Respondent” means a property owner, waste hauler, or other person charged with liability for an alleged Code violation and the person to whom the notice of violation is directed.

c) “Solid waste” means demolition materials, food and industrial processing wastes, garden trash, land cleaning waste, mixed refuse, non-combustible refuse, and trash as defined in the Illinois Solid Waste Disposal District Act.

f) “Waste hauler” means any person owning or controlling any vehicle used to carry or transport garbage, refuse, or other forms of solid waste.
Section 2.   Code Hearing Unit – Establishment and Jurisdiction.
There is hereby established a Code Hearing Unit as a division of the County Planning and Zoning Department which is authorized to conduct administrative adjudication proceedings for the County, its departments and officers. The function of the Code Hearing Unit shall be to expedite the prosecution and correction of code violations. The Code Hearing Unit is authorized to establish a system of administrative adjudications for the enforcement of all provisions of Kendall County Code, except those pre-empted by State law or County ordinance.

Section 3.   Hearing Officer – Appointment.
The Chairman of the County Board, with the advice and consent of the County Board, shall appoint one or more Hearing Officers for the purposes of this Section. A Hearing Officer may not be a Code Enforcement Officer or other law enforcement officer.

Section 4.   Hearing Officer – Powers and Duties.
The Hearing Officer shall have the following powers and duties:

   a) All powers and duties set forth in Section 2, above.

   b) The authority to call and preside at conferences for the settlement or simplification of issues.

   c) The power to administer oaths and affirmations.

   d) The authority to rule on motions, objections and the admissibility of evidence.

   e) Subject to the provisions of this Section, the authority to subpoena relevant witnesses and the production of relevant documents, records or other information.

   f) The authority to exercise all powers and duties necessary and proper to the administration of fair hearings.

Section 5.   Code Enforcement Officers – Appointment.
The County Planning, Building, and Zoning Director and County Environmental Health Director (or their designees) are hereby authorized to serve as County Code Enforcement Officers. In the event that the County Planning, Building, and Zoning Director or the County Environmental Health Director positions are vacant, the County Administrator shall appoint an interim Code Enforcement Officer.

Section 6.   Instituting Administrative Adjudication Proceedings.

   a) Any Code Enforcement Officer or designee of the County may institute an administrative adjudication proceeding with the Code Hearing Unit by forwarding a copy of the complaint and all relevant supporting materials to the Code Hearing Unit.

   b) When a Code Enforcement Officer observes a Code violation, the Officer may file a formal complaint by noting the violations on a violation notice and report on a form approved by the Code Hearing Unit.

   c) The written complaint shall contain, at a minimum, facts sufficient to inform the respondent of the violations alleged, including the order allegedly violated.
d) The violation notice and report form shall contain a file number and a hearing date noted by the Code Enforcement Officer in the blank spaces provided for that purpose on the form. The violation notice and report shall state that failure to appear at the hearing on the date indicated may result in determination of liability for the cited violation and the imposition of fines and assessment of costs as provided by the applicable County ordinance. The violation notice and report shall also state that upon a determination of liability and the exhaustion of or failure to exhaust procedures for judicial review, any unpaid fines or costs imposed will constitute a debt due and owed to the County.

e) A copy of the violation notice and report form shall be served on the respondent either personally or by certified mail with return receipt, postage prepaid, sent to the address of the respondent. If the name of the respondent property owner cannot be ascertained or if service on the respondent cannot be made by mail, service may be made on the respondent property owner by posting, not less than twenty (20) days before the hearing is scheduled, a copy of the violation notice and report form in a prominent place on the property where the violation is found.

Section 7. Subpoenas.

a) At any time prior to the hearing date at the request of the Code Enforcement Officer, the attorney for the County, the respondent, or the attorney for the respondent, the Hearing Officer may issue subpoenas directing witnesses to appear and give testimony at the hearing.

b) If the respondent or the respondent’s attorney fails to appear on the date set for the hearing, the Hearing Officer may find the respondent in default and shall proceed with the hearing and accept evidence relating to the existence of a Code violation.

Section 8. Representation At Hearings.
The case for the County may be presented by a Code Enforcement Officer or by the State’s Attorney or his/her designee. In no event, however, may the case for the County be presented by an employee of the Code Hearing Unit. The case for the respondent may be presented by the respondent or the respondent’s attorney. If the respondent is a corporation, it may appear through any officer, manager, or supervisor of the corporation.

Section 9. Hearing Procedure.

a) The Hearing Officer will begin the Officer’s call by introducing himself or herself to the respondents and other attendees. Opening remarks should include informing the citizens as to the nature and manner of the proceedings. Opening remarks may include information about the order that cases will be called, the need to maintain proper decorum, continuances, acceptable and unacceptable defenses, and the fees and range of potential fines.

b) The Hearing Officer may grant continuances only upon a finding of good cause. Continuances shall not be granted as a matter of course.

c) All testimony shall be given under oath or affirmation.

d) Upon the timely request of any party to a hearing, any person who the Hearing Officer determines may reasonably be expected to provide testimony which is material and which does not constitute a needless presentation of cumulative evidence, shall be made available for cross-examination prior to a final determination of liability.
e) The record of all hearings before the Hearing Officer shall include: all documents admitted into evidence at the hearing; a copy of the notice of violation and hearing; and a copy of the findings and decision of the Hearing Officer.

f) The record of a hearing before the Hearing Officer may include a record of the testimony presented at the hearing, which may be by means of a tape recording, transcription or other appropriate means. The Code Hearing Unit shall not be responsible for providing recording services or equipment. Any party desiring to record the testimony presented at the hearing shall provide its own court reporter, transcriber, or recorder at that party’s own expense regardless of the decision of the Hearing Officer. The Hearing Officer may reasonably limit where the court reporter, transcriber, or recorder may be placed in the hearing room.

Section 10. **Evidence At Hearings.**
The Hearing Officer shall preside at the hearing, shall hear testimony, and shall accept any evidence relevant to the existence or non-existence of a Code violation on the property indicated. The Code Enforcement Officer’s signed violation notice and report form shall be prima facie evidence of the existence of the Code violation described in the form. The strict rules of evidence applicable to judicial proceedings do not apply to hearings authorized under this Section. The Hearing Officer can take notice of all orders and regulations enacted by Kendall County.

Section 11. **Findings, Decision, and Order.**
At the conclusion of the hearing or any reasonable time thereafter, the Hearing Officer shall make a determination on the basis of the evidence presented at the hearing as to whether a Code violation exists. The determination shall be in writing and shall be designated as the Hearing Officer’s findings, decision and order. The findings, decision and order shall include the Hearing Officer’s findings of fact, a determination of whether a Code violation exists based on the findings of fact, and an order imposing a fine or other penalty, directing the respondent to correct the violation, or dismissing the case if the violation is not proved. If the Hearing Officer determines that the respondent is liable for the cited violation, the Hearing Officer shall enter an order imposing sanctions that are provided in the Code for the violations proved, including the imposition of fines and the recovery of the costs of the proceedings. Costs may be recovered in the same manner as fines and penalties. A copy of the findings, decision and order shall be served by personal service or by any method provided for service of the violation notice and report form under Section 6. The payment of any penalty or fine or costs of the proceedings and the disposition of that money shall be in the manner provided in this Section.

Section 12. **Payment of Penalties, Fines and Costs.**
All fines and other monies paid to Kendall County in accordance with this Article shall be remitted to the Kendall County Treasurer. In order to ensure that Code violations are remedied or fines are paid in a timely manner, the Hearing Officer, upon issuing a final determination of liability, may further require a respondent found to be in violation to post with the County a compliance bond or, as appropriate, to consent to the granting and recording of a lien against property (per 55 ILCS 5/5-41050). Bonds and liens shall be approved by the State’s Attorney as to form. Whenever it is necessary for the County to make repairs or otherwise expend funds to mitigate a Code violation for which a bond was posted, or whenever fines or costs remain unpaid after a respondent has exhausted or failed to exhaust judicial review procedures, the Hearing Officer may, after giving the respondent notice and an opportunity to be heard, issue an order permitting the County to draw against the bond in an appropriate amount, or to foreclose the lien. The Hearing Officer shall order the bond or the property or proceeds from the property, less the
costs incurred by the County, returned to the respondent upon proof of compliance with the applicable Code provisions and the payment of the assessed fines or costs.

Section 13. Violation of Findings, Decision and Order.
Any respondent, having received notice and an opportunity for a hearing as provided in this Article, who fails to subsequently comply with the findings, decision and order of the Hearing Officer, including failure to respond to the issuance of a subpoena, shall, if the order is not stayed by a court of competent jurisdiction prior to its effective date, be guilty of contempt. Contempt shall be punishable by a fine of not less than $200.00 and not more than $500.00 for each offense, with each day that the violation continues being considered a separate and distinct offense. In a prosecution under this Article, it shall not be a defense that a person came into compliance with an order, sought judicial review of the order, or made efforts to comply with an order subsequent to its effective date.

Section 14. Election of Remedies.
In no case may the Code Hearing Unit conduct an administrative adjudication proceeding for alleged violations of the Code where the requested remedy is a punishment of imprisonment. However, the provisions of this Article shall not preclude the County from seeking the remedy of imprisonment in a court of law, including imprisonment for failure to comply with the order of the Hearing Officer.

Section 15. Administrative Hearing Not Exclusive.
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Article, neither the authority of the Code Hearing Unit to conduct administrative adjudication procedures nor the institution of such procedures under this Article shall preclude the County from seeking remedies for Code violations through the use of any other administrative procedure or court proceeding.

Section 16. Administrative Review.
The findings, decision and order of the Hearing Officer shall be subject to review in the Circuit Court of the County. The Administrative Review Law and the rules adopted pursuant thereto shall apply to and govern every action for the judicial review of the final findings, decision and order of the Hearing Officer. Where the Circuit Court upholds the findings, decision and order of the Hearing Officer following administrative review, the County may request and the Circuit Court may require that the respondent pay all costs incurred by the County in the administrative review process.

Section 17. Sanctions, Transfer or Conveyance of Property.
The order to correct a Code violation and the sanctions imposed by a County against a respondent property owner as the result of a findings or a Code violation under this Section shall attach to the property, subject to the interests of all lien holders of record, as well as to the owner of the property, so that the owner cannot avoid the finding of a Code violation against the owner by conveying or transferring the property to another. Any subsequent transferee or owner of property takes the property subject to the findings, decision and order of the Hearing Officer under this Section if a notice consisting of a copy of the order to correct a Code violation and imposing any sanctions and costs, if applicable, and a description of the real estate affected that is sufficient to identify the real estate has been filed in the office of the Recorder by the County prior to the transfer or conveyance to the subsequent transferee or owner.
Section 18. Collection of Unpaid Fines or Other Sanctions.

a) Any fine or other sanction or costs imposed, or any part of any fine or other sanction or costs imposed, remaining unpaid after the exhaustion of or failure to exhaust procedures for judicial review under the State Administrative Review Law is a debt due and owed to the County and, as such, may be collected in accordance with applicable law. Any subsequent owner or transferee of property takes subject to this debt if a notice has been filed pursuant to Section 11, above.

b) After expiration of the period within which judicial review under the Administrative Review Law may be sought for a final determination of the Code violation, the County may commence a proceeding in the Circuit Court of the County for purposes of obtaining a judgment on the Hearing Officer’s findings, decision and order. Nothing in this Section prevents the County from consolidating multiple findings, decisions and orders against a person or property in such a proceeding.

c) Upon commencement of the action, the County shall file a certified copy of the findings, decision and order, which shall be accompanied by a certification that recites facts sufficient to show that the findings, decision and order were issued in accordance with State Statutes (55 ILCS 5/5-41005 to 41060) and this Article. Service of the summons and a copy of the petition may be by any method provided by Section 2-203 of the Code of Civil Procedure or by certified mail, return receipt requested, provided that the total amount of fines or other sanctions and costs imposed by the findings, decision and order does not exceed $5,000.00.

d) If the court is satisfied that the findings, decision and order were entered within the requirements of the applicable State Statute and this Article and that the respondent had an opportunity for a hearing under this Article and for judicial review as provided in this Article:

1) The court shall render judgment in favor of the County and against the respondent for the amount indicated in the findings, decision and order plus court costs. The judgment has the same effect and may be enforced in the same manner as other judgments for the recovery of money.

2) The court may issue other orders or injunctions, or both, requested by the County to enforce the order of the Hearing Officer or to correct a Code violation.
ORDINANCE # 2017-_____

AMENDMENT TO THE KENDALL COUNTY STORMWATER ORDINANCE
TO CREATE A DISTURBANCE THRESHOLD FOR SMALL NON-RESIDENTIAL
LOTS

WHEREAS, Kendall County regulates all development, stormwater management activities, soil
erosion control practices and floodplain protection measures within Kendall County under
authority of the Countywide Stormwater Ordinance, whether or not such activities occur within
an incorporated municipality; and

WHEREAS, the Kendall County Board amends these ordinances from time to time in the public
interest; and

WHEREAS, all administrative procedures for amendments have been followed including a public
hearing held before the Kendall County Stormwater Planning Committee on Month Day, 2017;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED, that the Kendall County Board hereby amends Section
203.1.c “Applicability of Site Runoff Storage Requirements” of the Kendall County Stormwater
Ordinance as provided:

203.1.c- A non-residential land use or a residential land use other than single family - detached
property of contiguous ownership less than three acres and resulting in disturbance of more than
5,000-10,000 square feet and resulting in 25% or more of the site area as impervious surface or
public trails 14 feet wide constructed on public open space and used for pedestrians and
non-motorized vehicles. The area development and corresponding storage requirements shall be
determined on an aggregate basis from the effective date of this ordinance;

IN WITNESS OF, this Ordinance has been enacted by the Kendall County Board this ___ day of
Month, 2017.

Attest:

Kendall County Clerk
Debbie Gillette

Kendall County Board Chairman
Scott R. Gryder
To: Ad-Hoc Zoning Ordinance Committee  
From: Matthew H. Asselmeier, AICP, Senior Planner  
Date: May 19, 2017  
Re: Yorkville/Kendall County Future Land Use Plan Differences

At the March 22nd Ad-Hoc Zoning Ordinance Committee meeting, the Committee requested that Staff compare Yorkville’s Future Land Use Map with the Future Land Use Map in the Land Resource Management.

Attached is a copy of the Yorkville Planning Area from the Land Use Resource Management. Differences are listed by number; the numbers on the map correspond to numbers listed below this paragraph.

1. Eldamain Road - The Land Resource Management Plan calls for this area to be Mixed Use Business. The Yorkville Plan calls for the area to be Estate Residential.

2. North Side of Galena Road Near Eldmain Road – The Land Resource Management Plan calls for this area to be Commercial. The Yorkville Plan calls for the area to be Estate Residential.


4. Northeast Corner of Route 34 and Beecher Road – The Land Resource Management Plan calls for this area to be Commercial. The Yorkville Plan calls for the area to be Suburban Residential.

5. Southeast Corner of Route 47 and Corneills Road – The Land Resource Management Plan calls for this area to be Commercial. The Yorkville Plan calls for the area to be General Industrial.

6. Southeast Corner of Route 47 and Cannonball Trail – The Land Resource Management Plan calls for this area to be Commercial. The Yorkville Plan calls for the area to be Estate Residential.

7. Area along Blackberry Creek by River Road – The Land Resource Management Plan calls for this area to be Suburban Residential. The Yorkville Plan calls for this area to be Parks or Institutional.

8. West Highpoint Road West of Lisbon Road – The Land Resource Management Plan calls for this area to be Mixed Use Business. The Yorkville Plan calls for this area to be Estate Residential.
Ad-Hoc Memo
May 15, 2017


10. Route 126 at Minkler Road – The Land Resource Management Plan calls for this area to be Commercial. The Yorkville Plan calls for this area to be Estate Residential.

MHA

ENC: Future Land Use in Yorkville Planning Boundary Map