

**PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**  
**McHenry County Government Center – Administration Building**  
**667 Ware Road – Conference Room A**  
**Woodstock, IL 60098**

Minutes of Thursday, November 12, 2009

	Tina Hill, Chairman	
Randy Donley		Mary L. Donner
Sue Draffkorn		Marc Munaretto
Lyn Orphal		Ersel Schuster

Chairman Hill called the Planning and Development Committee meeting to order at 8:30 am. The following members were present: Tina Hill; Mary Donner; Sue Draffkorn; Marc Munaretto; Lyn Orphal; and Ersel Schuster. Randy Donley was absent. Also in attendance: Planning and Development Department staff members; members of the Regional Planning Commission (RPC); County Board Members (Mary McCann, Dan Ryan, James Kennedy and Kathleen Bergan Schmidt); interested public; and press.

MINUTE APPROVAL: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT: The following person(s) spoke:

Emily Berendt , Woodstock, addressed the Committee and provided her written comments on the 2030 Plan to the Committee. She stated she had attended all the Regional Planning Commission meetings and felt the Commission was an unbalanced one when two members were replaced by only one.

Conner Brown of Crystal Lake addressed the Committee and asked that if an item is removed from the map during the “map review stage” that it is replaced somewhere else on the map.

Kim Willis addressed the Committee noting that she had e-mailed her comments to the members yesterday. She asked that members take into consideration issues raised in that correspondence.

Gene Boppart, a Hartland Township Trustee, addressed the Committee commenting that it is important to contain development. He asked that members listen to townships on zoning changes and increase METRA transportation . He also noted that the proposed expansion of Plum Tree golf course goes beyond their present zoning.

Pat Kennedy, Harvard, addressed the Committee and asked that the Mayors Caucus letter that was presented at the RPC’s July meeting be reviewed.

Noting no other wishing to speak, Chairman Hill closed this part of the meeting.

PRESENTATIONS: None

SUBDIVISIONS: None

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS: *Review of RPC recommended 2030 Comprehensive Plan:* Chairman Hill stated that during the meetings today and tomorrow the Committee would be taking a higher level view of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan as prepared by the RPC. Mr. Munaretto asked if RPC members could walk the committee through the plan. Chairman Hill thanked the RPC members for all their work on the 2030 plan and invited RPC members Mr. Charles Eldredge and Mr. Dennis Dreher to join the Committee in the discussion of the Plan. Mr. Dreher began by going to Page 129 and reviewing trends in the County’s population growth. He noted that ultimately the RPC compromised and endorsed a projection of 540,000 persons in the 2030 Plan. Mr. Eldredge added that members felt this was a solid comprise number after reviewing other projects that were in the 650,000 range. He pointed out that the 2030

Plan promotes contiguous population growth. If municipalities follow transportation and density suggestions in the Plan the County will have enough room to support the population growth. He stated that density should be encouraged. Mr. Dreher stated the policy basis is strong and progressive. The challenge will be in the sprawl pattern. The vision is to embrace compacted orderly development which is supported in the Plan. Ms. Hill questioned "yellow" areas on the map in the southwest. Mr. Eldredge noted that there are areas of estate development that are already in place. Mr. Dreher added that the RPC was being consistent with township and municipal plans. Mr. Munaretto pointed out that most townships do not have plans. Ms. Donner added that Nunda Township has a detailed plan. Ms. Schuster stated that a letter from McCog had requested a review of the population growth. She stated she would like the CMAP or census number used, noting that the County needs to be realistic in their population forecast. She noted that population growth will impact infrastructure and costs for such services all which need to be considered. She commented that we are inviting more growth than can be handled or afforded. Mr. Munaretto stated that these were fully reviewed issues and the numbers should not be messed with at this point. Mr. Eldredge stated that the RPC looked at population trends back to 1970 which over time included many "up" and "down" periods. He stated that history indicates that 90% of growth has been in municipalities and that most areas are annexed before development. Mr. Dreher noted that it is not just the population but how it grows and where that need to be considered. Ms. Schuster stated that water is a critical factor and more development on smaller lots would not support services or water. She noted that the western recharge area would be used up by the eastern part of the County. She commented that townships are currently looking for more water. Mr. Dreher noted that by 2030 five townships will have potential water shortages. He stated water needs to be treated as a valuable resource. Water consumption needs to be reduced and aquifer capacity needs to be considered. Chairman Hill commented that state law indicates that whoever can capture the water gets the water. Mr. Ryan stated he is concerned with the "yellow" area on the map and noted that the population concentration needs to be near transportation services and in higher density, "yellow" areas should be limited. Ms. Schuster added that having the "yellow" areas sends a red flag to developers to invest in these areas. She stated such designations add more problems. It was noted that the 2030 vision is for compact development. The County Board must be vigorous and uphold the goals of the Plan. Mr. Munaretto stated the Plan is the protection and mirrors the pattern of growth. Mr. Eldredge added the Plan is not parcel specific. It does encourage compact contiguous growth.

Chairman Hill asked the Committee if they wanted to keep the RPC's population recommendation of 540,000 or if this number should be changed. Ms. Schuster stated that if the number is changed a 5 year trigger should be included to revisit the Plan. Mr. Dreher commented that this is a land use plan and not zoning, noting that the Plan can only go so far. Mr. Munaretto commented that 90% of the growth will be contiguous to municipalities and this is an opportunity to take a thoughtful look at a plan, issues should not be politicized.

Ms. Schuster made a motion that the County adopts the CMAP number of 457,000 to be consistent and should revisit the plan in 5 years. Chairman Hill stated that the motion dies for lack of a second.

Ms. Orphal then made a motion to accept 540,000. Mr. Munaretto seconded this motion. On a roll call vote of four ayes (Munaretto, Draffkorn, Orphal and Hill) and two nays (Schuster and Donner) the motion passed.

Chairman Hill asked if there were other major issues.

Ms. Schuster stated to help clarify the direction the Committee will take in dealing with the process, she would like to make the following motion: "That this committee review and amend the proposed plan...reflecting the stated, and underlying goals and concepts within the plan...by supporting compact and contiguous infill and new development at existing municipal and village boundaries where infrastructure is/or will be available to serve that growth. And, further, that...in this review, the committee is committed to the preservation of water resources, preservation of food producing farmland, and open space (pg 125 goals). Ms. Orphal stated we already do that. Ms. Schuster stated she just wanted the Committee to fully understand. Ms. Schuster's motion was seconded by Ms. Donner. Chairman Hill stated she understands the motion and wants the Committee to uphold the standards. Mr. Munaretto commented that Ms. Schuster's motion is perfunctory. He stated he did not want to be bound in his

thinking. Ms. Donner commented that the intent is to hold the Committee to the standard and to formalize what we already intend to do as much as possible. Ms. Schuster stated that we need to think seriously and hone in on the hard work and concepts that are being presented. She stated she would like the Committee to be honest enough to agree or disagree. After discussion, a roll call vote on the motion was called. The motion failed with two ayes (Schuster and Hill) and four nays (Draffkorn, Orphal, Munaretto and Donner).

Mr. Munaretto asked if the Committee could go through the Plan chapter by chapter with the RPC during the meetings today and tomorrow after which the Committee can do their review chapter by chapter.

The chapter by chapter review with the RPC was begun.

Mr. Dreher noted that the Introduction Section was put together by staff with and input from the RPC.

*Section 1: Our Vision* – This section was done early in the process with continued review throughout. The vision is not just a plan for the County but encourages an interrelationship with municipalities and townships. Mr. Munaretto stated that the County can only encourage, but has no authority over municipalities. He stated that on Page 12, the third point from the bottom is implying that the County is encouraging development.

Ms. Schuster made a motion, seconded by Ms. Donner, to replace the word “development” with the word “planning.” Members discussed with motion and pointed out that the word “development” is used throughout the document. On a roll call vote, the motion failed with two ayes (Schuster and Hill) and four nays (Munaretto, Donner, Draffkorn and Orphal). Ms. Donner commented that today is not the time to make such a wide sweep in wording.

*Section 2: Community Character & Housing:* Mr. Dreher stated that text boxes on Page 15 are to address definitions to have a better understanding of the meaning of leapfrog development as mentioned in the Plan. A text box was also added on Page 17 to define Build Form.

Ms. McCann suggested changing the word “provide” to “promote.” Members noted they are just walking through the Plan at this point and rewording would be addressed at a later time. Mr. Dreher stated that RPC would have no objection to using the word “promote” instead of “provide.”

Mr. Munaretto commented that the use of the word “farmsteads” as appears on page 23, 3<sup>rd</sup> column, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph is a little too idealistic in his opinion. Mr. Dreher explained that the word was chosen as a rural word addressing buildings and quality of life. After discussion, it was agreed to keep the wording as is.

Mr. Munaretto stated that he is uncomfortable with the use of the word “encourage” as it appears on page 24, #13. He noted that the County has no power over municipalities. Mr. Eldredge responded that municipalities were supportive and seemed generally to accept this wording. Mr. Dreher added that it was recognized that we have no authority, but we do have the opportunity to encourage.

Page 25 – under affordable housing, #30 – it was noted that this addresses specific issues and includes potential sources of funding which goes beyond supporting and is a political statement. Mr. Munaretto suggested deleting the last sentence of this item which begins...Potential sources for the fund.....” Mr. Dreher agreed with Mr. Munaretto’s suggestion. He suggested this sentence could be put in the body of the text instead of as an item on page 25. Ms. McCann noted that on Page 25 there was no mention of water resources under “Sustainable Design or Conservation Design.” In response, it was noted that water resources areas discussed at length in the Water Resources Chapter.

There were no recommendations noted for page 26.

Mr. Dreher and Mr. Eldredge reviewed the map appearing on Page 34. No suggestions were made at this time.

REPORTS TO COMMITTEE, AS APPLICABLE: No reports.

MISCELLANEOUS: None.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: None

ADJOURNMENT

Noting that the Committee would continue their review at tomorrow's meeting, Mr. Munaretto made a motion, seconded by Ms. Draffkorn, to adjourn at 12:02 p.m. The motion carried with a unanimous voice vote.

\* \* \* \* \*

:bjt