

**MINUTES**  
**WILL COUNTY LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**  
**December 8, 2009**

**Pledge of Allegiance**

Chairman Weigel led the pledge of allegiance.

**Call to Order:**

Chairman Weigel called the meeting to order at 10:31 a.m.

**Members Present at Roll Call:**

Tom Weigel, Debra Rozak, Katrina Deutsche, Sharon May and Kathleen Konicki (arrived at 10:35).

**Members Absent:**

Brian Smith and Michael Wisniewski.

**Staff Present:**

Curt Paddock, David Dubois, Brian Radner, Eileen Franz, Michael Smetana, Anita Wesse, Howard Hamilton, Jaime Lyne and Leigh Kelley.

**State's Attorney Present:**

Melanie Manning

**Others Present:**

See sign in sheet.

**Approval of Minutes:**

**Debbie Rozak made a motion to approve the minutes from November 10, 2009; seconded by Sharon May.**  
**ALL IN FAVOR** **MOTION CARRIED (4-0)**

**FINAL PLATS**

**TABLED ZONING CASES**

**REMANDED ZONING CASES**

**NEW BUSINESS (ZONING CASES)**

**5874-M Roemer**

Chairman Weigel asked Mr. Smetana to open Case 5874-M. The applicant is requesting a Map Amendment from A-1 to E-1. The purpose is to bring the property into compliance with the Will County Zoning Ordinance.

There was one objection from the Will South Cook Soil and Water Conservation District because of the floodplain /floodway that is located on the property. This is a Map Amendment request not a building proposal.

Staff is recommending approval of a Map Amendment from A-1 to E-1.

Chairman Weigel asked if they were building in the floodway and Mr. Smetana answered no, they are bringing the property into compliance with plans to sell it.

There were no objectors.

**Katrina Duetsche made a motion to approve a Map Amendment from A-1 to E-1; seconded by Debbie Rozak.**

**ALL IN FAVOR**

**MOTION CARRIED (4-0)**

**5875-M Legunas**

Chairman Weigel asked Mr. Smetana to open Case 5875-M. The applicant is requesting a Map Amendment from A-1 to E-1. The purpose is to allow the division of 10-acres to two 5-acre parcels and allow construction of a single family residence.

Staff received an objection from IDOT due to the close proximity to the SSA inaugural airport footprint.

Staff is recommending approval of a Map Amendment from A-1 to E-1.

There were no objectors.

**Debbie Rozak made a motion to approve a Map Amendment from A-1 to E-1; seconded by Katrina Deutsche.**

**ALL IN FAVOR**

**MOTION CARRIED (4-0)**

**5877-SV2 Krystal View Industries**

Chairman Weigel asked Mrs. Franz to open Case 5877-SV2. The applicant is requesting a Special Use Permit to allow two (2) residences on two (2) parcels/lots to be consolidated into one.

Mrs. Franz explained this is a parcel with a single family residence and a garage that a previous owner converted into a residence. The options to bring the parcel into compliance were either several Variances on each parcel separately or a Special Use Permit for two residences on one parcel and converting it to one lot.

There was one property owner who came and objected because he was worried about the resale value of his property and his taxes.

Staff is recommending approval of a Special Use Permit to allow two (2) residences on two (2) parcels/lots to be consolidated into one based upon the findings of fact with the following one (1) condition: 1. Upon (fourteen) days of written notice to the owner of record at their last known address, Will County Land Use Department and Will County Sheriff's Department employees are hereby granted the right of entry in and upon the premises for the purpose of inspecting the premises and uses thereon for compliance with the terms and conditions of the special use permit.

Mrs. Rozak asked about the two separate residences and Mrs. Franz explained that there were two separate water bills.

There were no objectors

**Debbie Rozak made a motion to approve a Special Use Permit to allow two (2) residences on two (2) parcels/lots to be consolidated into one based upon the findings of fact with the above listed one (1) condition; seconded by Katrina Deutsche.**

**MOTION CARRIED (4-1)**

Minutes

Land Use Planning, Zoning & Development Committee

December 8, 2009

**5883-MV2 Tracy**

Chairman Weigel asked Mr. Smetana to open Case 5883-MV2. The applicant is requesting a Map Amendment from R-2 to C-2.

There were no objections from any agencies.

Staff is recommending approval of a Map Amendment from R-2 to C-2.

There were no objectors.

**Katrina Deutsche made a motion to approve a Map Amendment from R-2 to C-2; seconded by Debbie Rozak.**

**ALL IN FAVOR**

**MOTION CARRIED (5-0)**

**5844-V23 Dryier**

Chairman Weigel asked Mr. Smetana to open Case 5844-V3. The applicant is requesting a Variance for existing swimming pool in side yard setback from 10 ft. to 6.77 ft., a Variance for existing swimming pool in rear yard setback from 10 ft. to 6.81 ft. and a Variance for existing swimming pool setback from house from 12 ft. to 8.47 ft. The purpose is to bring the property into compliance with the Will County Zoning Ordinance and allow construction of a deck.

Mr. Smetana explained that the applicant applied for a building permit on April 13, 2009 and at that time staff advised the applicant numerous times that a pool could not be constructed in that location and Variances would need to be obtained. Based on verbal statements on May 1, 2009 a Code Enforcement officer did a site inspection of the property and determined the pool was built. The applicant did not follow staff's advice. The pool is also located within a drainage easement. The Engineering Department has taken a look at the pool's location in the drainage easement and determined that it would not impact drainage for the Lakewood Falls subdivision.

Staff is recommending denial of all three requests as did the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Chairman Weigel stated he spoke to the applicant and they should have followed our procedures but the LUDC should approve this. He has gone through a large expense to install this and then to have to take it down.

Ms. Konicki stated she believed we are sending mixed signals. If we have regulations we should enforce them. Ms. Konicki suggested some type of financial punishment to discourage this.

Mr. Paddock advised the Committee that whenever an action has been taken that creates a situation where something is not in conformance with our zoning regulations we inform the individual with the violation what the violation is and explain the route that they can pursue to come into compliance. If the advice is ignored like this applicant did for many months, then typical enforcement action would be taken. If there was still no compliance the matter would go to the State's Attorney and wind its way into the courts. However, it has always been the policy/direction from the Board that an opportunity be provided to the individual who is in violation to avail themselves of whatever potential remedy that might exist. In this instance it would be to obtain a Variance.

On any Variance there has to be a hardship, there has to be something about the nature of the lot that prohibits some type of function. You may have to ask yourself is there some inherent right of property ownership to have a pool. There is if you can meet the required setbacks. Why do we have setbacks, they have to do with safety

## Minutes

Land Use Planning, Zoning & Development Committee

December 8, 2009

considerations – access of safety equipment or the chance of someone jumping from a roof into the pool. This is why the particular standards are in place.

Mrs. Rozak asked what would have happened if this applicant had come in and applied for the Variances, would staff still have recommended denial and Mr. Paddock answered yes, denial would have been the recommendation.

Ms. Konicki asked about a paragraph on page 3 of the staff report that states there may be few pools that are constructed within easements the aerial shows this is not a common occurrence. There are some pools in the drainage easement and Mr. Smetana answered no, no pools are constructed within the drainage easement. Mr. Smetana showed on the overhead the location of the drainage easement that runs along Lakewood Falls Drive and explained there is only one other pool and that owner obtained a building permit. Mr. Smetana advised that staff would not permit any pool in the drainage easement.

Mr. Dubois explained that in this particular instance one of the primary concerns is the easement. We have to focus on this particular piece of property and rely upon our Engineering staff's review of the topography as to whether or not there would be adverse impacts by this particular pool at this particular location in this easement.

Mrs. May asked if this applicant comes back and complain that other people have pools what will we do?

Mr. Paddock answered this is a common occurrence, when people come before use through some type of enforcement action. We look at it with respect to that particular parcel and its conformance with the adopted ordinances of Will County. Often the argument will be advanced “why are you picking on me, I know that there are a variety of situations around me that are doing the same thing”. The point is we have an adopted policy and the County has pursued this for approximately thirty years. We respond to complaints, we do not cruise the streets looking for violations. When we confront an individual who makes that type of observation we will advise the persons that if they would like to file a complaint against any particular situation we will assertively investigate the matter. And that same comment was made in this instance as well.

Ms. Konicki asked if someone reported a violation on this applicant and Mr. Paddock answered no, the applicant told staff that he was going to put the pool up and an inspector was dispatched to see if the applicant did do what he said he was going to do.

Mr. Dryier and his attorney approached. The attorney questioned when the inspection took place. She stated that her client was flummoxed by the time that they were told it was going to take and the complexity of the whole process when many of their neighbors had not gone through the process. With regard to her clients having the knowledge of the Variance process and ignoring it, there is certainly egg on their face, but they have paid a substantial amount in fees and fines in order to remedy the situation. Some of the fees they have paid are the punishments for ignoring the statutes, they have paid fines.

Mr. Kevin Dryier stated the only reason he had a problem with this situation is because he asked if the process could be expedited and staff told him it would take a minimum of six months. He thought he was giving enough time by coming in, in April.

Mrs. Rozak asked how Mr. Dryier knew that his neighbors did not have the correct permits and Mr. Dryier answered he knew when he saw what the actual statute said.

Mr. Brumley stated he researched Mr. Dryier's neighbor and they obtained a pool permit in 1998 and it is ten feet off of the property line.

Ms. Konicki stated it would be good to have the information on each pool in each subdivision.

Mr. Dryiers attorney stated the rules should apply to everyone.

Mrs. Rozak stated that you also should not just do something because other people are doing it.

Mrs. May stated to Mr. Smetana you were not going to issue Mr. Dryier a permit any way and Mr. Smetana answered that is correct. We would not issue a permit when Variances are required.

Mr. Smetana addressed a comment made by the applicant's attorney. The applicant was put in violation on May 1, 2009 and did not apply for these Variances until October 22, 2009.

Mrs. Franz advised the Committee that everyone is told that it can take as much as 4-6 months for the entire process but when the applicant did apply in October our case load was lighter so it took less time.

**Tom Weigel made a motion to approve a Variance for existing swimming pool in side yard setback from 10 ft. to 6.77 ft.; seconded by Kathleen Konicki.**

**MOTION DENIED 2-3**

**Tom Weigel made a motion to approve a Variance for existing swimming pool in rear yard setback from 10 ft. to 6.81 ft.; seconded by Kathleen Konicki.**

**MOTION DENIED 2-3**

**Tom Weigel made a motion to approve a Variance for existing swimming pool setback from house from 12 ft. to 8.47 ft; seconded by Kathleen Konicki.**

**MOTION DENIED 2-3**

## **FORECLOSURE**

**Steeplechase PUD – NL - \$50,040.30**

Ms. Anita Wesse advised the Committee that staff is recommending pre-authorization to foreclose on Steeplechase PUD in New Lenox Township in the amount of \$50,040.30.

**Kathleen Konicki made a motion to approve pre-authorization to foreclose on Steeplechase PUD in New Lenox Township in the amount of \$50,040.30; seconded by Debbie Rozak.**

**ALL IN FAVOR**

**MOTION CARRIED (5-0)**

## **OTHER**

### **1. Scrivener's Error**

Eileen Franz gave an overview of this topic. This was a case that was approved earlier this fall; while looking at the conditions after it was approved she noticed that an incorrect Section was referenced. Condition #6 stating "the cargo containers shall be screened from the public right-of-way and adjacent properties. A landscape plan that meets the requirements of Section 8.3-4 (16) and 8.10 be submitted within 60 days of County Board approval" is wrong and should state "the cargo containers shall be screened from the public right-of-way and adjacent properties. A landscape plan that meets the requirements of Section **6.3-4 (16)** and 8.10 be submitted within 60 days of County Board approval".

**Debbie Rozak made a motion to approve the resolution for the Scrivener's error for Case 5840-SV; seconded by Katrina Deutsche.**

**ALL IN FAVOR**

**MOTION CARRIED (5-0)**

Minutes

Land Use Planning, Zoning & Development Committee

December 8, 2009

## **2. Text Amendment –advertising signs**

Mr. Radner proposed a change to the schedule that was adopted in November. The change would be that the Planning and Zoning Commission hear the public hearing portion of the text amendment at their January 19, 2010 meeting.

Chairman Weigel stated that would be fine.

Mr. Radner explained at the January 12, 2010 LUDC meeting they would look at preparing the final document that would be ready to go to the public hearing.

Brian Radner advised the Committee a stakeholders meeting was held on November 19, 2009. Participants that day included an employee from Clear Channel, two employees from Lamar and Ed Cage a representative from the Village of Homer Glen. Chairman Weigel, David Dubois and Mr. Radner were also in attendance. The Will County Governmental League, Scenic Illinois and the Joliet Region Chamber of Commerce were unable to attend the meeting.

### **Stakeholders' Comments:**

**13.14(1)(c)** – Clear Channel would like to suggest that the calculation of a new sign permit for an advertising sign should be calculated in the same manner as an on-premise sign (as mentioned in Section 13.4(a). The fee for an “on-premise” and “advertising” sign is calculated at 50.00 plus an additional \$2.00 per square foot on the gross surface area of the sign. The square footage calculation is based on “one” face for an on-premise sign and for “each sign face” for an “advertising” sign.

The Committee agreed with this suggested change.

**13.4(2)** – Clear Channel: In regard to the annual registration fee for an “advertising” sign, will the Will County Land Use Department be issuing an invoice annually to the company or party who owns the subject advertising sign? Will every on-premise sign be registered with the Will County Land Use Department, and if so, what would the annual registration cost be for an “on-premise” sign?

The Committee agreed.

**13.8** – Clear Channel: Does this section pertain to “on-premise” signs (removal of obsolete signs)? If so, we would like to suggest that this is clarified in this section that the paragraph would begin with “Any on-premise sign” etc.

Mr. Radner explained that this is for on-premise signs only, not billboards.

The Committee agreed with this suggestion.

Ms. Konicki asked if staff recommended any time frame with regard to vacant billboards and Mr. Radner stated he would check with the consultant.

**13.9** – Clear Channel would like to recommend the following language (delete and replace with):

“No sign shall be altered, rebuilt, enlarged, extended or relocated except in conformity with the provisions of this Ordinance, with the exception of an existing advertising structure that can be upgraded or rebuilt to add a dynamic display sign(s) on the subject property as explained in Section 13.14 (4)(k) Additional Standards and requirements for Dynamic Displays”.

Minutes

Land Use Planning, Zoning & Development Committee

December 8, 2009

**13.14(2)(a&b)** – The Village of Mokena supports the requirement for a special use permit for a straight conversion or new signs. The Village recommends that municipalities within one and one-half mile of any proposed new or converted advertising sign be given the opportunity to comment on the proposed use prior to consideration by the County Board or staff.

The recommendations in the current ordinance are that a Special Use Permit is required

Staff believes that if we were to agree with this, we could lose some of the incentives to lose some of the nonconforming billboards where as if we do allow conversion without a Special Use Permit then we know we will lose some nonconforming signs in the County and that is really the benefit of allowing conversion, that we reduce the number of billboards throughout the County.

The Committee agreed with staff's recommendations.

**13.14(2)(c)** – Lamar supports the removal of two (2) nonconforming sign faces in exchange for one (1) dynamic display.

Clear Channel would like to recommend the following language (delete and replace with):

“A single existing conforming advertising sign face may be converted to incorporate a dynamic display as of right in exchange for the removal of two (2) square feet of “conforming” or “nonconforming” advertising sign face(s) for one (1) square foot of dynamic display sign face without the requirement of a Special Use Permit, and subject to compliance with all dynamic display regulations as of this section.” **Please see further recommendations regarding Dynamic display signs that would pertain to this draft ordinance.**

If the faces that were being removed were conforming or non-conforming, the Will County Land Use Department would have to approve a “Special Use” permit for the removed sign face(s) to be rebuilt on the subject property.

Mr. Radner stated this is an acceptable proposal and is actually more than the current proposal.

The Committee agreed with this suggestion.

**13.14(2)(d)** – Lamar recommends changing four (4) faces to two (2) faces in exchange for one (1) dynamic display.

Clear Channel would like to recommend the following language (delete and replace with):

“A single existing, non-conforming advertising sign face may be converted to incorporate a dynamic display as of right in exchange for the removal of two (2) square feet of “conforming” or “non-conforming” advertising sign face(s) for one (1) square foot of

Dynamic display sign face without the requirement of a Special Use Permit, subject to compliance with all dynamic display regulations of this section. **Please see further recommendations regarding Dynamic display signs that would pertain to this draft ordinance.**

If the faces that were being removed were conforming or non-conforming, the Will County Land Use Department would have to approve a “Special Use” permit for the removed sign face(s) to be rebuilt on the subject property.

Mr. Radner explained that most signs in Will County are non-conforming. Industry was pushing for a 2-1 conversion and staff had recommended a 4-1 conversion. Chairman Weigel asked if anyone wanted the

Minutes

Land Use Planning, Zoning & Development Committee

December 8, 2009

conversion to be something other than 4-1 and no one answered. An additional thing that could be asked for could be: A provision could be added for separation distance. You can only do this if you are 300 – 400 feet from a residential zoning area – (this is above and beyond current draft ordinance).

Ms. Konicki liked the idea of some minimum separation distance.

Mr. Radner mentioned that a certain amount of free advertising could be required.

The conforming sign portion is a 2-1 but the non-conforming portion would be 4-1.

Chairman Weigel stated he agreed with that.

**13.14(3)(a)** – Lamar suggested that 15 days be changed to 90 days.

Clear Channel suggested the following: Before issuance of a sign permit for an advertising sign that incorporates a dynamic display, applicants **(The owner of the sign face(s) shall also have the right to remove their conforming or non-conforming sign face(s) in advance prior to submitting a permit application to the Will County Land Use Department. Upon the owner of the sign face(s) showing evidence to Will County Land Use Department that the sign face(s) have been removed (how many and what size are the face(s), the Will County Land Use Department shall issue a letter within thirty (30) days to the sign face(s) owner that the sign face(s) that were removed will be a credit towards a dynamic display sign(s). There will be no expiration date regarding the credit letters from the Will County Land Use Department. If the sign owner that receives a credit letter from the Will County Land Use Department has sold his/her company, the subject credit letter can transfer to the new owner after proper evidence is provided to the Will County Land Use Department that the subject owner has sold his/her interest in their company. An owner of a sign face(s) shall also have the right to remove a conforming or non-conforming sign face(s) that the sign permit was originally issued by Will County, and now the subject property has been annexed into a community, to receive a credit letter from Will County Land Use Department towards a dynamic display. The dynamic display would have to be installed on a sign face that is located in unincorporated Will County.**

Staff agrees that there should be no type of credit system. Chairman Weigel advised that the Committee agreed with staff's recommendations.

**13.14(3)(b)** – Lamar suggested that the language be changed to say something along the lines of restoring the site to its previous condition or something like removing the foundation to one (1) foot below grade.

Clear Channel suggested the following: Signs to be removed must be owned (**delete "or leased"**) by the applicant for the dynamic display. Removal must include the complete removal of the structure **above grade** and the foundation will be removed **(as subject to the lease terms with the property owner)** supporting each sign face.

Chairman Weigel stated the Committee agreed with this recommendation.

**13.14(3)(c)** – Clear Channel suggests the following copy (delete and replace with): The applicant must also agree in writing that the county may remove the sign if the applicant does not do so within the time required (30 days) and the applicant shall be responsible of reimbursing Will County for the costs associated with the removal of the sign within 30 days of invoice.

Minutes

Land Use Planning, Zoning & Development Committee

December 8, 2009

Mr. Radner explained that staff was thinking about requiring a letter of credit and Clear Channel is suggesting a 30 day time frame. Chairman Weigel stated this sounded reasonable.

**13.14(3)(d)** – Clear Channel suggests the following copy (delete and replace with): The applicant **owner of the sign face(s)** must also agree in writing that they are removing the sign face(s) voluntary **in order to receive a dynamic display permit as compensation for the removed sign face(s)**.

Mr. Radner stated he recommended the State’s Attorney’s Office review this language and Chairman Weigel stated that was fine.

**13.14(3)(e)** – Lamar suggested dropping the minimum requirement of 288 square feet and the 90% requirement. The alternative proposal is for a ratio based exchange.

Clear Channel suggests the following: The following language (delete and replace with): All existing sign faces removed (conforming or non conforming) must be the cumulative total as mentioned in Section 13.14.2c \$ 2d in order to receive a permit for a dynamic display sign (2 square feet of existing sign face removal for 1 square foot of dynamic display sign face).

Mr. Radner explained this referred to the 2-1 or 4-1 swap out. This provision would be modified or go away so that it would more reflect the current proposal

Chairman Weigel stated that would be fine.

**13.14(4)(d)** – Clear Channel stated the following: This paragraph deals with content control which we would suggest to delete. We have had clients like Office Depot where they have purchased a few consecutive slots on our digital network to promote their business card promotion (where they will display your business card on their advertising copy if you print them at this company).

Mr. Radner explained that this section pertains to “story boarding”. The language we are suggesting came from our consultant. The State’s Attorney’s Office will review this to make sure we are not violating any case law with content control.

Chairman Weigel stated this is fine.

**13.14(4)(g)** – Lamar said that brightness levels are acceptable.

Clear Channel stated the following: We would like to suggest revised distances for meter reading for Dynamic Displays:

Sign Face Area (sq. ft.)    Feet from Sign Face

- |               |     |
|---------------|-----|
| a. 101 to 300 | 150 |
| b. 301 to 379 | 200 |
| c. 380 to 700 | 250 |

The measurement distances above are based on the average minimum viewing distances for each type of advertising sign which Dr. Ian Lewin a principal at Lighting Sciences in Arizona concurs with.

Mr. Radner stated he would run this recommendation by the consultant again but to stick with the consultant’s recommendation and the Committee agreed.

**13.14(4)(i)** – Lamar indicated that this is too restrictive. Maybe it should be reworded to comply with State/Federal standards.

Minutes

Land Use Planning, Zoning & Development Committee

December 8, 2009

Clear Channel stated the following: We suggest the following language for this paragraph (delete and replace with): Dynamic displays (Multiple Message Sign as defined by Illinois Department of Transportation) are regulated by the Federal Highway Administration and the Illinois Department of Transportation, and any dynamic display sign would comply with any changes to the brightness and dwell time by the Federal Highway Administration or the Illinois Department of Transportation.

Mr. Radner stated this provision should be kept in the ordinance and the Committee agreed

**13.14(4)(j)** – Clear Channel stated the following: Change Illinois licensed design professional to an “Illinois Licensed Structure Engineer.”

Mr. Radner suggested sticking to this wording.

**13.14(4)(k)[new section]** – Clear Channel suggested the following provision: In the event an Illinois Licensed Structure Engineer finds it necessary to have an advertising sign upgraded or rebuilt to accept a dynamic display sign(s), this work can be performed on the subject property only if a dynamic display(s) is being attached to the advertising sign structure. A Special Use Permit will not be required for an advertising sign that is upgraded or rebuilt to have a dynamic display(s) attached to it; the advertising structure will not have to conform to the current sign regulations except the advertising structure cannot exceed the current size of the sign faces and the overall height of the advertising sign. The permit from the Will County Land Use Department will signify that the structure can be upgraded or rebuilt as specified on the plans submitted to the Will County Land Use Department. If an advertising structure does not need to be upgraded or rebuilt to have a dynamic sign(s) attached to it, this could be done to the existing structure as long as the size face are not enlarged, and the existing advertising sign structure shall not have to be brought into compliance with any applicable advertising sign regulations of this section.

Mr. Radner asked if the Committee agreed to this change and Chairman Weigel answered yes.

**Section 16 Definitions**

Add definition for full motion video.

Mr. Radner explained that a definition will be included, the Committee agreed to this addition.

**General Comments:**

Lamar – Not always available to guarantee “donated advertising”. However, they may be able to add to a static site.

Clear Channel – Has done complimentary advertising for other governmental entities.

Both Lamar and Clear Channel are open to relocating signs to a more desirable location.

Chairman Weigel stated that the Committee would not be interested in this.

Village of Homer Glen would be open to having any existing billboards within their limits removed in exchange for a dynamic display in unincorporated Will County. The Village supports the removal of existing nonconforming signs. The Village also supports lighting that is directed downwards (gooseneck).

Mrs. Rozak left the meeting at 11:45 a.m.

Conversation ensued regarding the removal of signs

Chairman Weigel stated we should not get involved with municipality issues.

Mr. Radner gave an overview of the upcoming schedule.

### **3. Digital Billboard Moratorium Extension**

Brian Radner advised the Committee that in order to allow the County time to address “dynamic” advertising signs, the Will County Board passed a six (6) month moratorium on the issuance of building permits for dynamic advertising signs on June 18, 2009. The moratorium is scheduled to expire on December 18, 2009. Due to the complexity of the project and projected meeting dates it was becoming apparent that it would be difficult to complete the text amendment prior to the expiration of the moratorium. The Land Use Department respectfully asks for a six (6) month extension of the previous moratorium (the resolution is attached). The extension would include a provision that would allow the moratorium to expire prior to the end of the six (6) month period provided a new ordinance regulating digital billboards (dynamic advertising signs) was approved by the Will County Board.

**Kathleen Konicki made a motion to approve a six (6) month extension of the Digital Billboard Moratorium; seconded by Sharon May.**

**ALL IN FAVOR**

**MOTION CARRIED (5-0)**

Conversation ensued regarding feedback from municipalities and Mr. Radner explained that the only municipalities that responded were Homer Glen and The Village of Mokena.

### **4. Draft Water Resource Ordinance for Unincorporated Will County**

Howard Hamilton explained that the unincorporated areas of Will County are currently subject to two stormwater ordinances; the Stormwater Management Ordinance (known as the countywide ordinance) and the Water Resource Ordinance (applies only to unincorporated areas). In an effort to reduce conflicts between the two ordinances and help eliminate confusion that occurs when two different ordinances must be adhered to, we have compiled the stormwater management ordinances into a single document entitled “Water Resource Ordinance for Unincorporated Will County.”

This draft has been submitted to the Army Corps of Engineers, the Illinois Department of Natural Resources, FEMA, the Will County Farm Bureau, The Will South Cook Soil & Water Conservation District and the Will County States’ Attorneys Office. Comments from these agencies will be forwarded to the LUDC for discussion.

Ms. Konicki asked if our ordinance addressed different surfaces like concrete versus blacktop versus crushed limestone.

Mr. Hamilton answered no not specifically. There is a credit built in for ground water recharge.

Ms. Konicki spoke about water runoff standard guidelines. Mr. Hamilton advised Ms. Konicki that he would email her or Ms. Wesse could get this information to her.

Ms. Konicki spoke about water runoff and trails. Mr. Hamilton explained that there is an exemption for trails

Ms. Konicki stated she felt something should be in the ordinance with regard to wide trails and Mr. Hamilton advised that a properly designed trail would not concentrate stormwater Ms. Konicki asked about a trail that went downhill and Mr. Hamilton answered that he would take a look at this issue

Minutes

Land Use Planning, Zoning & Development Committee

December 8, 2009

**REPORTS, COMMUNICATIONS, CORRESPONDENCE**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Kathleen Konicki made a motion to adjourn; seconded by Katrina Deutsche.**

**ALL IN FAVOR**

**MOTION CARRIED (4-0)**

The meeting recessed at 11:52.