

MONROE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

October 5, 2023

7:30 p.m.

The regular scheduled meeting of the Monroe County Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Carlyle Mueller. Members present were James Agne, Laurie Brown, Brian Coats, Dan Davis, Dave Glosecki, Dale Haudrich, Carlyle Mueller, Robert Schlegel, Walter Wetzal. Ex-Officio Members present: Chris Voelker and Jon McLean

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Motion Brian Coats, second Walter Wetzal to approve September 7, 2023 minutes, Voice vote – all aye.

NEW BUSINESS: Resubdivision Plat of Lot 1 of “Steingrubey Park” and of Lot 2 of “a Resubdivision of Lot 2 of “Steingrubey Park”, Monroe County Illinois

Dan Davis started the Land Use portion of the meeting. The petition is for Steingrubey Park filed by Jim Vogt. The property has been subdivided twice and this would be the 3rd resubdivision of the property. The petition was withdrawn at the last meeting. Dan asked Jim Vogt to present the information to the board.

Jim Vogt said that he believed that they had addressed the concerns that were raised at the July meeting and if anyone had questions that he would answer them.

There was a discussion about extending the sewers and who would be responsible for extending them. Jim Vogt said that the developer would extend them as the lots were sold.

Dan Davis brought up the concerns of the County Clerk’s office that this was the 3rd resubdivision and it could be confusing for title companies. Jim Vogt said that it shouldn’t be confusing because each plat has a distinct name and recording number. Jon McLean said that the confusing part is how we ended up with the current configuration. The current configuration was created by using both plat and deed. Lot 4 was created by deed. It was not platted. The current lot 4 is land locked. How was this created because it is not something that would be approved. There was a lot of title work on this and it was discovered that it was done by deed. It was stamped by Mapping & Platting. An additional lot was added without going back through the platting process. That’s where it gets confusing. If you have a subdivision where lines are combined or moved you do not come back to the boards, but if you are creating new lots, you would need to come back to the Planning Commission. There originally were two lots and currently Steingrubey Park has 4 lots and now they are requesting 5 lots. The process we are going through is the correct way to accomplish this. Jon McLean recommended that the changes to lots 3 and 4 be set aside. The changes that are being proposed right now can be done without having to go through the Planning Commission.

There was a discussion about the correct road frontage. Jim Vogt thought it was 25 feet, but Jon McLean said that it was his understanding that it was 50. He suggested that lots 3 and 4 be

flagged and, in the future, if someone wanted to purchase them, they would have to come into the office and work out an easement at that time.

Jon McLean explained that on the northern side of the subdivision they would be moving boundary lines about 100 feet to the north and then take what is remaining and divide it in half. That would create lots 1 and 2. You would end up with lots 1,2,3,4 and the existing 5th lot which would not be part of the resubdivision. Lots 3 and 4 would be flagged.

There was discussion about the flag lot 4 not be considered. There was discussion as to how that lot was changed to resolve the issue of it not having any road frontage. It was discussed at the July meeting. There was more discussion about the 36-foot road width, but the consensus was that the road width requirement was 50 feet plus additional for utilities.

There was more discussion about setting aside lots 3 and 4 and not considering them when deciding on the plat. Mapping & Platting would flag these lots and deal with them administratively if one or the other was sold. Jon McLean referred to Aaron Metzger's comments #1 in his review of the preliminary plat.

There was a discussion about assumed bearings and accurate bearings. The subdivision code requires accurate bearings. Prior to GPS it was hard to get accurate bearings. It took a lot to get accurate bearings. Now with GPS it is easier to do. Back in the day they were based on compass readings and surveyors used the term assumed variance so that they could be off a couple of degrees. Brad Hausman showed the committee how the preliminary plat drew out on GIS and it was a little off.

Brian Coats pointed out Note 1 on the preliminary plat. Would it create a problem stating that it is the owner's responsibility to extend the sewers. Should it be the developer's responsibility? It was pointed out by Jim Vogt that the Village of Maestown approved it. There was discussion about who would put the sewer in – either the developer or the person buying the lot. Jim Vogt said that Mr. Steingrubey did not want to put the sewer in until the lots were sold. The committee would like to see this issue clarified. Jon McLean reiterated that the Village met, they approved it. The only concern was drainage and Jon discussed this with Aaron Metzger and they both felt that there would not be a big difference with what was being proposed. Brian Coats pointed out that when the lake was put in, it did create some drainage issues for the next three lots to the south. Brian said that a couple of the neighbors were concerned about drainage.

There was more discussion about who would put in the sewer. Jim Vogt said that Mr. Steingrubey did not want to be responsible for putting it in before the lots were sold. Carlyle Mueller said that he would like to see this clarified. There could be negotiations between Steingrubey and the purchaser at the time of the sale to discuss who would pay for extending the sewer. Jim Vogt said that he would discuss it with Mr. Steingrubey and see what he says.

Jon McLean referred to Aaron Metzger's notes about road frontage improvements that meet county standards. Chris Voelker said that he didn't think that they could do anything with the bank because there is a water main. He didn't think that they could slope it because of that.

Brian Coats said that there is a neighbor who questioned if they were impacted by the run-off from development what recourse they would have. There was a discussion about stormwater not being on the plat. Aaron Metzger's comments asked for a preliminary drainage plan. Brian Coats thought most of the run-off from lots 1 and 2 would go to the pond. The pond is on lot 3 and lot 4. Chris Voelker pointed out that one of the questions on the preliminary plat checklist is about showing water features. Jim Vogt asked if this was considered a preliminary plat or a final plat. Jon McLean said that he would consider it a final plat since there were not major changes. Jon felt that this was a minor change. The drainage would have to be addressed either way.

There was discussion about the original plat and if all the requirements were met when it went through platting process.

Dave Glosecki asked about the electric line that ran through the plat. Is there a public utility easement that should be considered in the platting process. Carlyle Mueller said if they don't change the lower portion at this time and leave it up to the clerk's office when something gets sold, they would have to address it at that time.

There was more discussion about drainage and if there could be restrictions added to protect the neighboring property owners. Jim Vogt said a note could be added to the plat to address the drainage issues. Chris Voelker asked if this was an improvement plan. The consensus was that it was a slight modification to the final plat.

There was discussion about the easement that went through Flinders property. Should the easement be moved, Jim Vogt said that you would have to vacate that easement. Carlyle Mueller asked what the easement was for. Jim said that it was an easement either for drainage or utility. He thought it was probably for drainage.

Brian Coats asked if there are concerns about parts of lot 1 and 2 being in a conservation program. Jim Vogt said that he was not aware of that. Dan Davis said that just means that they have a conservation plan so that the land would be considered agricultural and not be taxed as residential. It's just an assessment tool. Dan said that if they maintained the same use it would not affect it. If it's still under one ownership and they maintain it as woodlands – it would remain the same.

Jon McLean talked about lot 4. We are making a modification to lot 4. It is no longer the same as it was before. When someone comes in to apply for a building permit, is it grandfathered in? Brian Coats felt that it was the committee's opportunity to right a previous wrong. It's the committee's duty to look at it from a code standpoint and make it compliant. He felt that it should be dealt with now and not make the clerk's office deal with it. Chris Voelker agreed. It landlocked – there is no easement. Jim Vogt said that there was no easement because Mr. Steingrubey owned all of the lots. Jon McLean said that that was something that could be taken back to Harry – saying this was a substantial change. That lot was never platted.

Jon talked about the state plate act. He said it was a pretty vague statute and that Chris and he had to use other local regulations that are within our code to enforce it. There are several places

in our code that state we cannot create a non-conforming parcel. They have been on the books for a very long time.

There was a long discussion about lots 3 and 4 and what would be the best way to deal with them. Jon suggested that before lot 3 could be sold, lot 4 would have to be conforming. Carlyle Mueller agreed. That is what the code says. Dan Davis said that there should be no option for lot 3 and 4 – it should just be lot 3. Jon said that before he could sell lot 3 or 4 that they would need to be made conforming lots. Carlyle Mueller read from the code book that when you have two or more lots in common ownership and they are not conforming, they shall be considered as one lot and shall be brought into compliance before they are developed. Dale Haudrich asked why Mr. Steingrubey didn't come up with a plan that encompasses the whole property. Jim Vogt said that he doesn't have any intention to develop lot 4. There was a discussion about what the intent was for lot 4. The committee felt that they should follow the code.

There being no more discussion, motion by Dan Davis to recommend the approval of the re-subdividing lots 1 & 2 and the developer will have to extend the water and the sewer at the developer's expense when the lot is sold and with the understanding that parcels 10-32-317-001 and 10-32-318-002 cannot support more than one residence unless both lots are made code conforming and a plan be developed between lots 1 and 2 with stormwater runoff from the houses be directed to the pond on Lot 4. Second Laurie Brown. Motion passed by voice vote.

OLD BUSINESS: None

TREASURER'S REPORT: None

ZONING OFFICER'S REPORT:

(Chris Voelker) In the month of September 2023, there was (1 Single Family Dwelling) permit. Fees collected for the building & electrical permits were \$7,266.00. Inspections \$6,760.00, Electrical Contractor Registration \$1,000. Municipal Inspections \$1,690.00. Total fees collected for the month of September 2023 was \$16,716.00.

Motion Laurie Brown second Brian Coats to approve Zoning Officer's Report. All aye by voice vote

ROAD REPORT: None

COMMISSIONERS REPORT: None

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE:

POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE: Hand out by-laws to the committee

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Annual meeting with a banquet at The Falls.

ADJOURNMENT: Motion Jim Agne , second Walter Wetzel . Voice Vote – All Aye.

Next Regular Meeting – November 2, 2023