

**McHenry County Regional Planning Commission**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**May 14, 2009**

**Members Present:** Charlie Eldredge, Chairman; Jerry Davenport, Ron Bauman, Frank Harrison, Bill Swenson, Craig Hubert, Jeremy Shaw, Nancy Schietzelt, RB Thompson, Jim McNutt and Mike Rein

**Commissioners Absent:** Dennis Dreher

**Staff Present:** Dennis Sandquist, Maryanne Wanaski, Darrell Moore, Sean Foley, Ben Wellington and Cindy Sassaman

**Also Present:** Jim Heisler, Ersel Schuster, Mary Donner, Tina Hill, Kathy Bergan Schmidt; County Board members, Diane Kriete, Richard and Sonja Brook, Chuck Dubsy, Mike Von Bergen, Jack Proesel, Evert Evertsen, Eugene A. Boppart, Tim Dilsaver, Patricia Kennedy, Emily Berendt

The meeting was called to order at 6:09 p.m.

**Approval of Minutes**

Minute approval was deferred until later in the meeting.

**Public Participation**

Rich Brook from Harvard area in Chemung Township, complimented the Commission on their work. He produces local agriculture, and supports farmers markets since he grows vegetables. He felt it is a positive change in attitude for the County and he applauds the change. He asked that the Commission protect farmland. Development is not worth destroying prime farmland. He questioned that the aggregate area north of Harvard and asked if it would be mined.

Tina Hill, Chairman of Planning & Development Committee explained that this is the time the Committee will be working together with the Commission. The next meeting will be a joint meeting to be held next Thursday, May 21, 2009 at 6:00 p.m. The two groups will be coming together at critical decision making points. This way the plan will be supported by both groups. She asked for feedback and concerns from the Commission. Mr. Hubert explained that it was his understanding that the Committee was continually receiving information from the Commission as it was reviewed, but was not finalized. Ms. Schietzelt asked if there would still be the opportunity to talk about the items that have not been resolved and since changes have been made by the Committee, she requested to see the changes in advance of the joint meeting. Ms. Hill noted that the changes will be available prior to the meeting. Mr. Harrison felt that the Commission has never received any feedback from the Committee. He stated that the Commission discussed the entire document only once. Mr. Harrison feels that Houseal Lavigne & Associates (HLA) was to write a plan making it sound like one person, but in his opinion they have rewritten the plan. Mr. Davenport said that the language in the text needs to support the policies. The Commission needs to resolve issues on policies. Ms. Schietzelt explained that the public meetings are to gain input from various municipalities and members of the public to gain input to resolve conflicts. Ms. Hill explained that these meetings (Planning and Development with RPC) were to resolve any of the conflicts that are glaring. Mr. Sandquist felt that the public input is a good way of resolving conflicts, as well as, comments from the Planning & Development Committee. He also stated that there will need to

be a process to make sure that the text is consistent with the goals and policies. Chairman Eldredge felt that the meeting next week is a chance for the Commission and Committee to explain why certain changes have or have not been made and the reasoning behind statements. Mary Donner noted some wording in the plan needed to be removed because the County and/or municipalities could not comply with the proposed policies. Mr. Shaw said that the words to be used should be “encourage” instead of “require”. Mr. Bauman explained the RPC spent 3 – 4 meetings reviewing ag policies and wordsmithing them. Ms. Hill noted that the next meeting is where they will talk about the reasoning behind the policies and the choice of wording

Mr. Harrison was upset and voiced his objection to one person dictating to not only the RPC but also that Planning and Development Committee. Mr. Harrison said that Dennis Dreher does not speak on the behalf of the Commission. Mr. Harrison explained that he felt that the Committee should bring those items to the Commission not the Subcommittee Chairman. There are no more subcommittees. Ms. Hill explained that the Committee reviewed the water resource policies and felt that many were duplicative. Mr. Dreher, as the chairman of the subcommittee, volunteered to redraft the policies and organized the goals into categories with assistance of staff. Mr. Davenport reported that that Commission has had long battles and the policies that are in the plan are those of the Commission not the subcommittee. He requested that discussion should happen with the full Commission or Chairman Eldredge. Ms. Hill explained that the process is the priority, but at the joint meeting she will not let conversations drag out, there will be discussion, voting and everyone will move on. There was a brief discussion on whether there will be a quorum for the next meeting. It was noted that Jim McNutt will be absent from the Commission and Randy Donley and Lynn Orphal will be absent from the Committee.

#### **OLD BUSINESS**

**Review LEAM Model LUCA Tables** – Mr. Sandquist explained the two LUCA tables that were included with the memo and reviewed the conclusion noted in the summary which explains the differences between the tables. The numbers are based on the LEAM modeling. Ms. Schietzelt confirmed that that southeast corner of the County has the lowest level of growth potential. Mr. Davenport mentioned that this is a result of the policies that the Commission has suggested. The map shows the location where pressure for growth will occur. Mr. Hubert said grey areas are neutral and do not reflect any ag protection areas. Ms. Schietzelt requested that since staff has spent hours analyzing the information maybe staff would like to share any thoughts to help the Commission make a more informed decision. Chairman Eldredge felt the CCG reflects the development from the east and south. It is also true that the differences are relatively minor. Mr. Davenport mentioned that he is bothered by things. He felt that Algonquin Township mentioned the 178 acres. In Coral Township there are over 1,000 acres of platted lots, most have been sold. Dorr Township 7,000 acres is scary to him there are lots of environmentally sensitive lands south of Woodstock. Huntley is projected to grow to 50,000 by the end of the plan. Nunda Township is 6,000 acres of development, Riley has 872 acres of residential this is everything we do not need.

Motion by Mr. Hubert, seconded by Ms. Schietzelt to reaffirm the CCG scenario. Mr. Shaw mentioned that he was having difficulty supporting this route because it is a computer model not taking into account the factors that have driven growth. Mr. Davenport was in agreement. Chairman Eldredge felt this is a background tool and is a useful tool that has several interesting features. Mr. Hubert mentioned that we are encouraging growth near municipal centers. Roll call vote: Aye: McNutt, Bauman, Hubert, Schietzelt, Thompson, Eldredge. Nay: Davenport, Harrison, Shaw, Swenson. Motion carried.

Chairman asked if the Commission would like to review the maps or discuss further. They Commission reviewed the maps presented.

Mr. Sandquist began by explaining the differences in the maps and the layers as noted in the memorandum. He noted that the maps are not land use maps. He said that there was support for transit oriented development (TOD) and would encourage policies for municipalities. Maps are showing natural resources, RPC priority ag zoned, public open space, flood hazard areas, MCNAI sites, ADID wetlands, existing and proposed transit centers and general agriculture. Mr. Harrison voiced concern with the MCNAI site north of Harvard that is not shown in the HLA plan is not in the MCNAI inventory and is not all ADID wetlands. Mr. Sandquist requested staff to keep a list of items to research and continued to review each layer of the maps. He showed areas on the maps relating to Employment Growth Points, Residential Growth Points, Primary CCG Areas, and Secondary CCG Areas.

Mike Rein arrived at 7:11 p.m.

The Commission felt it was difficult to see the difference in the maps based on the coloring. Mr. Davenport questioned why the model puts growth and development near Botterman Farms. Mr. Sandquist felt maybe the LEAM model sees it as density issues. Mr. Moore explained that Map 1 has less yellow area than Map 2. The Commission mentioned that the area shown already exists. Mr. Sandquist explained that they are looking for the areas where they want to accommodate growth. Map 1 is trimmed to the primary growth area according to Mr. Moore. Mr. Harrison asked about the employment centers on Route 176 and if water and sewer would be available. It is 3 miles from Crystal Lake and far from Woodstock. The Commission compared areas of the maps to show the differences. Mr. Sandquist hopes to determine which map is the best outline to show the detailed land use that is consistent with the plan. Map 6 has priority of ag areas to the front. Otherwise, it is the same as Map 5. Mr. Harrison felt maybe he did not remember accurately, but he thought the goal was not to keep ag areas forever, but protect them for as long as possible. It was noted to move the Hebron train station north. Ringwood station should be located on the north side of McCullom Lake Road. The Huntley Train Station has tentatively voted to be located on the Rosenquist property. The Ridgefield station needed to be moved slightly north.

Mr. Eldredge proposed that at the south end it has to go west some from the development pressure from Huntley. Bull Valley and Greenwood zone stop protecting and at the north end go to the Richmond Township line.

Mr. Shaw asked if it is the Commission's intention to keep these zones static as identified. He would like input from the Commission because he does not know where he stands. He would also like to consider the municipal plans. Would the Commission show the land around municipalities as high quality ag land and suggested that they develop in other places or would the Commission defer to the municipals plan. Ms. Wanaski agreed that the Commission should look at the municipal plans because they have the mile and a half, but is their plan the best approach to planning? Mr. Sandquist said that tonight he is looking for the best areas for growth to occur and then work on the details looking at the municipal plans. That would entail putting all the municipal plans on a map and calling it the County land use map. This would be a different approach and the Commission will lose the vision they are dealing with tonight. He felt this would be a good discussion topic at the joint meeting. Mr. Harrison suggested a new cross hatching be placed on the areas around a municipality with ag land that would

indicate ag lands that are within a municipal area but it could be a “flex” parcel. Mr. Shaw mentioned that when a person wants to develop land the first thing that is done is to confirm if compatible with the land use plan.

The Commission took a short break.

Ms. Schietzelt asked specifically what is being asked of the Commission tonight. Ms. Wanaski explained that the maps presented were only to show “growth areas”. She said that the dark yellow areas were the primary growth areas. She then referred to the LEAM maps with the light and dark blue areas. She said that they would like the Commission to direct staff to hold growth to the primary growth areas and open up areas originally held as “no growth” because of ag protection (Bull Valley/Greenwood). Staff would like to be able to target their mapping to one of those choices.

Mr. Davenport suggested using this map as a background and using municipal plans and then review each township individually on the map.

Ms. Wanaski explained they are just looking for growth areas only.

Chairman Eldredge recommended letting staff recommend areas on the east side of the County for infill and remove the “finger” of growth that extended westward on Route 176.

Mr. Harrison asked if the maps were proactive or reactive. He found it hard to believe that they are proactive since no growth is shown in Marengo or Harvard areas. Ms. Wanaski explained that based on the assumptions that Commission asked for on the maps. Mr. Harrison explained that 20 years ago Lake County had a look similar to McHenry County with ag land on the west, and 20 years later the market decided that it would be residential. He feels the maps do not take the market into consideration. He spoke about Roger Naylor and the growth he anticipates on Route 20 and none of that is shown on the map. He felt that all the input economic development subcommittee received is not on the map. The reality is not lining up on the map. He felt there may be more than what is shown.

Ms. Wanaski explained that the model is black and white based on facts. It shows what will happen based on policies. It does not mean growth cannot occur in other areas. On the map, red indicates non-residential and yellow indicates residential. All areas assume 80% growth in municipalities and 20% in unincorporated areas.

Mr. Sandquist heard that they should go back to municipalities and see where it makes sense to have development and work on a section by section basis. Mr. Davenport does not want any hard and fast lines. Chairman Eldredge explained that this map shows that there is room for 520,000 people. Mr. Harrison said that we have not given the housing policy the same attention because it is new.

Chairman Eldredge asked if there is consensus on a couple of points:

Bull Valley and Greenwood ag protection nodes not be restricted from development.

Motion by Ms. Schietzelt, seconded by Mr. McNutt to remove the Greenwood and Bull Valley node to start designating future land uses and that the Commission take the suggestion from Chairman Eldredge and move the growth line a little to the west of Route 47.

*Discussion* – Mr. Bauman wanted to clarify that because something has an LE score of 80 does not mean it is good for farmland. Mr. Shaw will vote no because he cannot proceed until policies are resolved because of impacts to what municipalities will be looking to do. This is to give staff direction to move the map forward.

Roll call vote: Aye: McNutt, Bauman, Hubert, Schietzelt, Swenson, Eldredge Nay: Davenport, Harrison, Shaw, Thompson, Rein. Motion carried.

Chairman Eldredge asked the Commission if anyone was in favor of shortening the “finger” on Route 176 and moving the growth area down Route 47.

Motion by Mr. McNutt, seconded by Mr. Shaw to shorten the “finger” on Route 176 and move the growth area to Route 47.

Discussion- Mr. Davenport asked if this would be a line that is drawn on the map and he is not in favor of drawing lines.

Roll call vote: Aye: McNutt, Bauman, Hubert, Schietzelt, Rein, Eldredge Nay: Davenport, Harrison, Shaw, Swenson, Thompson. Motion carried.

Chairman Eldredge proceeded to inquire if there was interest in the Richmond area to move the ag area west. No interest was shown.

Mr. Davenport mentioned that he would like to move the yellow area by the county line in Harmony to Route 20 as shown during the meeting.

#### **Subcommittee Report**

Revised timeline – Mr. Sandquist said that the timeline is the same format and was explained to Chairman Koehler that the completion date will be past the July deadline. Chairman Koehler understands that the Planning & Development Committee needs ample time to review the information from the Commission, but would like the Commission to meet the new deadline of September. Based on the Chairman of the Planning & Development Committee and the Regional Planning Commission they will continue to meet jointly at decision points in time. On the new revised timeline the two groups will have 4 joint meetings with the deadline of September or October

The next regular meeting is scheduled for June 11<sup>th</sup>.

HLA will have the changes incorporated and the draft for public comment for next meeting on May 21<sup>st</sup>. This draft will be added to the 2030 website.

#### **Minute Approval**

Motion by Mr. Harrison, seconded by Mr. Bauman to approve the minutes of April 9, 2009 and April 16, 2009. All members present voting aye. Motion carried.

**Public Comment**

Charles Dubsy, unincorporated Hebron Township, felt that the Commission ignored the comments in the first public comment session regarding ag land. He asked if the County was leading or following. He asked that the Commission not follow the municipal plans because they are not necessarily right in a true vision for the County. He asked the Commission to lead.

Motion to adjourn by McNutt, seconded by Bauman. All members present voting aye.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:14 p.m.

DRAFT