

JO DAVIESS COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION/ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MEETING MINUTES
JUNE 17, 2026

I. Call to Order

Chairperson Huschitt called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM on Wednesday, June 17, 2026 in the Jo Daviess County Highway Department Building, 1 Commercial DR, Hanover, Illinois.

II. Roll Call

Roll Call was answered as follows: Present – Gary Diedrick, Don Hill, Steve McIntyre, Ron Mapes, Peter Huschitt. Present: 5. Present electronically – 0. Present electronically: 0. Absent: 0.

Staff Present: William Meeker, Planning & Development Administrator; Melissa Soppe, Planning & Development Office Manager.

III. Establishment of a Quorum

Chair Huschitt declared that a quorum of members was present.

IV. Approval of Minutes (None)

None

V. Unfinished Business

A. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING RE: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO TEXT OF THE JO DAVIESS COUNTY ZONING REGULATIONS (Title 8, Jo Daviess County Code of Ordinances): Title 8, Chapter 5, Use Table and Regulations (Accessory Dwelling Units, Guest Accommodation Standards, Home Occupations) Title 8, Chapter 4, Supplemental Regulations (Sign Standards) Title 8, Chapter 7, Definitions (Signage)

SECTION II

TITLE 8, CHAPTER 5, USE TABLE AND REGULATIONS & TITLE 8, CHAPTER 2, ORGANIZATION, ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT: The following amendments were recommended.

Accessory Dwelling Units: Permit Accessory Dwelling Units in all zoning districts permitting a single-family residence: Agricultural (AG) zone, Single-Family Residential (R-1), Multi-Family Residential (R2), Planned Residential (RP). At the present, Accessory Dwelling Units are only permitted with approval of a Special Use Permit in the AG and R-1 zoning districts. This amendment would declare the uses as “permitted” (i.e. no need for a Special Use Permit) in any zone permitting residential development (as noted above).

Guest Accommodation Site Development Standards: The Ad Hoc Zoning Ordinance Subcommittee recommended that special site development standards for properties to be licensed for short-term rental be the same as the base zoning district within which the property is situated; specifically:

MINUTES – PC/ZBA

June 17, 2026 (Continued Hearing RE: Text Amendments)

- Eliminate the standard that required parking spaces have a maximum slope of 8%.
- Eliminate the standard that access roads/driveways leading into a property not exceed 15%.
- Eliminate the special side-yard setback requirement of five-feet per bedroom with a maximum setback of 35-feet; require the setbacks applicable to the underlying zoning district.

Home Occupations:

Home occupations are currently permitted in all zones where a residential use is the principal use of the property. Proposed amendments are as follows:

- Home occupations may occur within the primary residence and/or accessory building (currently only permitted in the residence).
- Eliminate the maximum number of employees permitted on the property (limited to four currently); the number of employees working off-site is not limited.
- Permit the sale of ancillary items not made/assembled on the property.
- State that equipment used for the home occupation not create nuisance or excessive noise.
- Eliminate the prohibition of deliveries by tractor-trailer combination trucks.
- Add the following home occupations: antiques (retail), automobile and other motor vehicle maintenance and repair services, veterinary clinics, and design, development and other related services.

Potential Concerns to Consider:

Will the lessening of restrictions create potential negative impacts upon surrounding land-uses, particularly modifications to standards for accessory dwelling units and home occupations? The specific standards for properties to be licensed for Guest Accommodations (short-term rental) were created to ensure that the activities of short-term renters do not unduly disturb permanent residents that may reside in a particular neighborhood. The setback standard was adopted to ensure a greater separation between properties used for short-term rental and full-time occupancy properties to reduce any potential noise impacts. Driveway and parking grade standards were adopted to ensure ease of emergency vehicle access is required.

Public Testimony Opened

Jayne Hartley, 2 Laurel Court, Galena

I moved here six years ago and live in the Galena Territory, which puts me in a certain category of people that live in Jo Daviess County. I don't envy any of you as a retired lawyer I have had to make so many rules for so many organizations and even with the best of intentions, people are still are always going to read into things that you didn't intend or whatever. I just want to say, I strongly, strongly request that you exempt the Galena Territory from all of these changes at least for now. Because the more I dig into it with my legal background the rules we have out there vary state statutes and I read

MINUTES – PC/ZBA

June 17, 2026 (Continued Hearing RE: Text Amendments)

what you have here, it's a quagmire and I see litigation coming, to be honest with you. I don't think anybody wants that or intends that, these rules on the face don't strike me as being erroneous or bad or awful or horrible in general, but when you start applying them in the Galena Territory, it's just going to be a big problem. I don't represent the Galena Territory, but I just really strongly encourage you as a former practicing attorney to put the brakes on and treat the Galena Territory separately, whatever that really means in the long run. I think you will save yourselves a lot of headaches if you consider doing that.

Carol Schwerdtfeger, 1126 S Elizabeth-Scales Mound Road, Elizabeth

I have had lots of years of experience managing vacation rentals, we even had a division of our own Northwest Land Company. We own some ourselves and I know that all of the requirements for safety and that are in place are for the benefit of the property owners and the risk management is a real thing that is pushed, they recommend that the property owners be protected because if they need to keep up with all of their inspections on a regular basis and follow the county rules to the letter of the law, they are definitely at risk financially. In this hilly area, lots of properties that are very accessible in the summertime when the roads are good can be treacherous driveways and with steep inclines and so forth especially when there are a lot of guests there and vehicles parked. I think it is important that resort property owners understand that those rules are to protect them. Secondly on the home occupations on the number of employees that can work out of a small acreage rural home to make it unlimited on premises seems to me asking for huge potential problems both for employee parking being a safety hazard, if it is on a road frontage as well as overloading a septic system. Potential for problems with waste removal, depending on what type of business. I think there should be a limit of some number that is reasonable and then have the unlimited number apply only to the off-premises working, remote working. So they can run their business without harboring people they need, but not all on premises at one time.

Meeker - we did receive three items of correspondence that were included with your staff report and included in the packet online. Letter from the Galena Territory Association Civic Affairs Committee that does oppose a number of the amendments related to Guest Accommodation. You have a similar letter from John Lang from East Dubuque raising the issues with the proposal of Guest Accommodation. Also a letter from John Perry who lives on Lookout Trace in the Galena Territory who also raises the issues regarding the Guest Accommodations standards.

Mike Dittmar, 117 West Main, Elizabeth

I want to start with a question. I was on the Ad Hoc Committee and when we did the discussion, none of these changes were to supersede anything out at the Galena Territory or Apple Canyon Lake. I don't know what changes there. I recommend that it don't, I don't want it either. To me the Galena Territory has their own covenants, that should be honored. If the county makes their Guest Accommodations License 15-feet or whatever the covenant is, that is what our requirement is going

to be, and the Galena Territory wants to make it 50-feet, the Galena Territory can, that is fine and I am okay with that. I am willing to testify and everything not in the Galena Territory or Apple Canyon Lake. The Galena Territory and Apple Canyon Lake is unique and they should have their special rules. 8% parking grade and 15% driveway grade requirements only apply to Guest Accommodations not permanent residents or long-term rentals and that raises an important question, why? Safety, if these grades are truly unsafe then why are they acceptable for full time residents, families, elderly individuals, delivery services, emergency responders, and long-term renters and unsafe for short-term guests. The distinction becomes harder to justify when the same driveways, roads, and parking areas of who occupies the property, a homeowner, tenant, or guest would encounter identical physical conditions whether impacts an access limitations apply only to Guest Accommodations create an inconsistent standard that appears disconnected from actual safety risks. It also plays an unequal burden on one category of property owners without demonstrating why temporary occupancy creates greater danger than permanent residents. This creates another inconsistency in the argument that these grade requirements are strictly about safety. The same individual vehicle, weather conditions and terrain exist regardless of whether the property is classified as a permanent resident, long term rental, or guest accommodation. If the concern is truly that certain grades are unsafe for human travel or occupancy then the standard would logically need to apply equally to all the residential areas and not short-term guests. Jo Daviess County is naturally hilly and many homes and developments were built decades ago with these conditions the county already allows people to live permanently on these properties so this suggests that the regulation is not truly based on safety alone but instead targets a specific property use classification. And by the way before I get going I have a guest accommodations. I have no plans to build another one. I already meet all the standards if I did build another one my wife would divorce me. So, it's I'm encouraging more of these to compete with me because I think it's the right thing to do. I was at a meeting I've been here for 20-years coming maybe not that long where the eight percent grade was discussed once and one of one of you members brought up that some people might still have two door cars and eight percent could bruise a thigh or sprain an ankle if the door swung downhill too much. Jo Daviess County should not legislate sprained ankles and bruises on cars that don't exist anymore. I was also later in a meeting where I didn't know this was possible someone applied for an eight-percent variance and you discussed it for less than 30 seconds and it was granted. So why do we have it. I also have an issue personal issue with the 15 percent grade you have to have a survey which costs two thousand dollars. I watched my inspector come to my guest accommodations with the level it took them five minutes checked it off. Why do I need the survey for that when the level is good enough. It just needs to go. So why do we have this is it really about safety, EMS accessibility. I have renters on my one guest accommodation almost every weekend I don't have a lot of weekday stays. I wish I did. If you lived in the house year-round where is the greater chance of having an emergency vehicle come out there if you live there seven days a week or two days a week the greater is for the local people but they don't have the requirements. What are the odds of a random heart issue on a guest accommodation versus someone who's living here. There is no percentage is random. What about a random appendicitis attack, it's random, but if I have a known heart condition I don't travel. The local people would need

the EMS service. If I have an emergency pregnancy I don't travel, but the local people would have that emergency service, so why do we have the difference. Also I do care about taxes well let me start over. Let's be honest this was I firmly believe this was printed to restrict general accommodation things so we could have a little control over it not for safety. Why and by who? I don't know and I don't care to me that's not an issue. We've been at several meetings, I've asked Bill several times how many of the new houses permits are guest accommodations and I'm not going to hold them to it but it usually says nine out of ten. I want more property tax to keep my taxes low I want more visitors to come here and spend money to create sales tax to keep my property taxes low. Yes, they also compete with me I want more but buy and for capitalism and competition. If you guys on this board think we have too many or too little guests accommodations that is actually irrelevant that is not your job. Your job is this a safety issue or not and it's and it's clearly not. So that's my argument for the 15 and the 8 percent. Sorry I kind of wish we would have done it one at a time but you said all of them so on the setback issue. I think this is a simple housekeeping issue and it makes total sense I don't think we need to tax people for variances that are always given a fee is a tax in my opinion. This is an unnecessary tax an unnecessary hardship that creates bureaucratic red tape. The changes go with whatever the PUD or covenant area is a logical thing to do it would save you guys a lot of time and save the zoning office a lot of time. Apple canyon and the Galena Territory were both plotted before zoning or the general guest accommodation craze, AirBnB craze came into effect. I think this is a byproduct of it that needs to be addressed again if the Galena Territory or Apple Canyon Lake want to meet tougher restrictions god bless them all for it. For home occupations I've said this before so I apologize. When I've been here Hewlett Packard, Amazon, Google, Apple, Walt Disney, Dell, Mattel, Harley Davison, Nike, Microsoft and Square all started in a house or a garage. We're not going to have those companies come out of Jo Daviess County, god I wish we did, but we could have a painting group from in the rural area of Warren. We could have a mechanic start his garage out in the country and grow. And I don't have, obviously, I'm for getting rid of the restrictions because the house is only so big you can't put 50 people in there you can't put 50 cars in the driveway that only four can fit in. We don't need to regulate that. I think the people can do that themselves. Many small businesses began as side businesses this increases the pool of entrepreneurs. Most businesses start small most entrepreneurs cannot afford commercial rent on day one. Home-based businesses allow people to test an idea before investing thousands of dollars successful home businesses often grow and then leave economic development without major government spending. This is this is an economic development tool that the government doesn't have to spend any money on we're not building an industrial park we're just hey you can have businesses in your homes. Farms are home businesses. What's the difference? Every major business starts somewhere in rural counties that somewhere is often a garage basement bar or spare bedroom. If you want economic growth more jobs and opportunities for young families to stay here we should make it easier not harder for responsible home businesses to get started. Good regulations should stop nuisances not entrepreneurship so. Also on the phone I've argued against that because no one has a home.

Meeker - states that's not part of this. The phone was taken out before.

MINUTES – PC/ZBA

June 17, 2026 (Continued Hearing RE: Text Amendments)

I think I talked about everything. Go back to home businesses. All's we are changing really besides the four is allowing antiques, automobiles, and veterinary clinics. I had an issue as mayor as automobile repair shop that also did farm work and I brought it here a long time ago I don't think any of you guys were on the board. They're like well we don't want that business out in the country and my answer was I don't want a 10-ton tractor implement driving on my village roads. So I think there needs to be that's why they need to be allowed. That repair facility needs to be allowed in the country area the rural area so they're not driving down the streets that are congested so, I think that is a safety issue. I don't know I talked about so thank you guys very much.

Dan Caswell, 8775 S Town Hall Road, Stockton

Let me start with the accessory dwelling unit proposal which I think is a simple one. ADU's are already permitted uses in two of the four areas where housing is allowed in the county, but you need a special use permit if you live on a farm instead of in a planned development. This is simply allowing ADU's in all areas of the county where housing is allowed without needing to pay the fees and ask permission of the county. ADU's have become an increasingly popular option across the country as a tool for increasing housing affordability, it's done in rural areas, it's done in towns, it's done in cities, and it's for both homeowners and tenants it creates a wider range of housing options within the community and it enables seniors to stay or live near family as they age. Which I think is particularly important for many of us in this room. It provides housing options for young adults or young families. It can create flexibility for agriculturally related housing needs and it can provide supplemental income for homeowners. You know we all love this county but should it be a place where families need special permission from the powers that be to build a granny flat or a place for kids to live and work on the farm. There have been some concerns raised by folks from the Galena Territory and already is as I read information about it, I'm not an expert on them, but they seem to allow guest houses on single family lots, but things are subject to covenants and restrictions in the Galena Territory and including the use restrictions on single family lots and also approval by the architectural review committee. So I think concerns about the change impacting the Galena Territory would seem to be misplaced, but I agree with Mike that they're a unique area that I could see them having unique rules and I think they already do to some extent. I think the same could be said for the City of Galena, which is not directly impacted by changes in county zoning. Any opposition to ADU's would seem to be a little inconsistent with the city's stated goal in a June 25, 2025 planning commission meeting where they said one of their goals was to simplify the city's ADU regulations. I think the county's ADU regulations could also be simplified somewhat but that's kind of an issue for another day. I would say at least let's allow reasonable changes to meet the needs of rural county residents. I'm actually still a practicing attorney and it seems to me that some of the regulations in our zoning code reflect that we're fearful that people cannot exercise freedom responsibly or we feel like we need to control other people's property to conform to our particular standards and preferences. This year we're celebrating 250 years of the land of the free and the home of the brave. And I'm a little concerned we're starting to look a little bit more like the land of the regulated and the home of the fearful and controlling. Let me

talk for just a minute about home occupations, a home occupation ordinance. I think it's actually a pretty good ordinance already it allows a degree of latitude while giving some guidelines and limitations, but the changes suggested by the committee are fairly minor and I think they give homeowners just a bit more freedom to structure their home occupation in a way that works for them and for their business. The home occupation regulations in paragraph six already contemplate the use of accessory buildings. It's right there in paragraph six and the change to paragraph one just makes it clear that homeowners can use an accessory building as part of their home occupation. I think that's the way the ordinance already reads it's just clarifying it. We currently specify in paragraph two that no more than four people who don't live there can be working on a given day. How can we know how many employees the wreath making business needs in late November to meet the holiday rush. What if five of my grandkids were visiting and I wanted them to help with our home business, which by the way I don't actually, that week. That would be illegal. Does it make any sense in paragraph three from a business perspective to prohibit a home occupation that sells honey from also selling a plaque made off-site that says kind words are like honey for the soul. Why would we micromanage a home business in that way. Do we really need to be in the business in paragraph five of telling a homeowner where they can put their sign not knowing anything about their property or their sight lines, which wall is the main wall and can anyone see it from the road. One more, paragraph nine prohibits the regular delivery by tractor trailer combination trucks. What is regular, once a day, once a week, once a month, once a year, every one of those could be called regular or not. I mean it's just vague, too vague I think to be useful especially in where a lot of areas of our county we have semis running all hours of the day and night when it's harvest time and that's okay. I think the home occupation ordinance already provides protections under the law from acts which constitute a nuisance taking into account the character of the surrounding area and neighborhood, that's what it says. We're taking into account the surrounding area and neighborhood and I think instead we have a tendency to try to make sure there's never any risk of bothering anyone and in the process, we place limits that may not make any sense for a given location or a given home occupation. I suggest we leave home businesses to make some more basic decisions for their businesses so long as they're not constituting a nuisance taking into account the character of the surrounding areas in the neighborhood. So the suggestions for the ADU's and home occupations and I think for the guest accommodations too are ways to make the county just a little bit more friendly for housing options and economic activity that would have minimal impact on the things that us older folks really want to preserve, things like agriculture and tourism and the natural beauty of the county. So I would recommend that we approve those. Thanks very much.

James Asta, 500 N High Street, Galena

Resident of Galena, Illinois and Jo Daviess County. I'm here to speak in opposition to the adoption of these amendments. Cancer Mike there just comment on that about fees and why fees, right, well fees pay for things and if we don't have fees where do we come up with the money for the services provided. Higher taxes, okay so we got to get that money somehow or we just don't offer services,

which some people would like to shut down government too so I know that is a valid argument for some, but again talking about starting businesses in garages growing them right Microsoft, Apple we've got a whole list of businesses that start in a garage or a home. So, when Microsoft and Apple when they started growing, they moved to an office. They didn't make their house bigger or add buildings on their residential property, this is what businesses do. You start at home; you grow you move to an appropriate location where you can grow and you can continue to grow. You don't just add to your residential property your country property, so now we can do auto repair, right. So, we have a six-stall garage, I don't know what can we do here. Can we make something that big, we can also sell tires, batteries, oil, how about a transmission. How about a complete vehicle because isn't that ancillary to this right. You can repair a vehicle well could sell that vehicle too. We can have semis coming rolling down the road delivering all that stuff can have a whole bunch of people rolling in parking their cars no limit on that. I don't know where all their wastewater goes or all that float but I guess that'll get figured out after somebody complains and has to bring a suit or a complaint. So, there are a lot of things here that are super vague I agree with what Dan said that there is a ton I think that should really be addressed. One thing that just really jumps out at me here this what is it number 10, under 8-5B-16, design, want to be allowed home occupations right, design, development and other related services. Like what is that, that could be anything like everything is designed like a sheet of paper gets designed, a paper clip right here gets designed, everything in front of us has designed the building right. Development, what is that we already have software development on there, so what is development, why we need to specify that could be literally anything or almost anything here. Excessive right we've got excessive noise what is that, sound pressure level I have a sound pressure level meter at home, I can measure this. This can be quantified this is one of the few things that can be quantified let's do that let's understand what this is because this is serious someone's working on cars, they're using air impact tools, right. Bang, bang, bang all day long and doing whatever else they're doing. There's a lot of potential for excessive noise so what happens somebody sets up this business make an excessive noise now as their neighbor I have a conflict now. I have to create a situation to address this and my neighbor's already running his business so now my complaint affects his or her business over here so we're instead of dealing with this up front with a special use or a variance, we're going to where someone just does what they want and then if there's a problem, we'll just handle that. Why don't we deal with that up front, why don't we handle these things beforehand and if everyone's getting a variance except maybe a few here or there, yeah that's how it's supposed to work. You know people like we don't have cookie cutter properties here so there are going to be a lot of variances. So, but what it does is it prevents those edge cases that are likely to cause those conflicts from being identified it gives that opportunity and it also gives a public opportunity for neighbors to come up and have their voice heard and raise their concerns so without that process just saying let's get rid of it. All of that goes away and we're setting ourselves up for conflict and possible lawsuits too. So, if everyone is or almost everyone is getting the variance it doesn't sound like it's broken it sounds like people are getting what they want by and large. I haven't heard like a real business case here other than growth and like things that are more general I mean we really haven't seen I haven't seen maybe it's out there like some kind of harm report or just who's

been hurt by the way it is. Or you know how would that not have happened with these changes like I don't think the public understands what is happening here and who this is going to benefit and who was harmed and who can then receive a remedy because of this. Haven't seen data here, I think that would go a long way talking about ADU's and that there's evidence to support it great put it out there like let's get that to the citizens, publish that, so we can understand what that is and make a decision based on that and really highlight, what is the problem, where was the harm, and how does this address that. I think this goes well it does it goes directly against the Comprehensive Plan, so we've seen that in other places but if you read this Comprehensive Plan as far as the plan for the development and the continuation of the county in important ways these amendments contradict it. We've got that traffic nuisance as well another vague point I think that should be addressed we don't know what that means, is that how many cars, what size, what weight, it's just vague again it just sets up for another conflict for somebody to say, I've had it. Now I have to do something. I think well I know this one of our board members wrote on social media I saw they said you know I would like people to be able to do whatever they want with their land, whatever they want. People say that's freedom, but it's not freedom for me and I'll tell you why. I had a case like this so across the street from me in town I had a resident there who liked to work on vehicles right. So eventually we had a stack of wheels and tires, we had batteries, we had a transmission sitting out there, we had a whole bunch of that auto parts, a bunch of other crap just sitting there in front of a garage and then we had six lawn leaf bags full of aluminum cans that were oh, that's gold we're going to recycle that someday you know we're going to get a bunch of money for that. Well, those bags were there so long that they deteriorated and you could see the cans in the rolling out. I talked to that property owner who felt it was just his right and his freedom to just do that and I had nothing to say about it, I shouldn't say anything about it, well I did, I didn't like that, I don't like seeing that, in fact I run a vacation rental too, permitted in town, one of the 20 licenses and permits that's allowed. So, I care about my street, I care about the way it looks, care about my business. Well, this guy didn't care about me and he didn't care about my business and that's freedom damn it. That's what freedom is he can just do whatever he wants and if I don't like it go pound sand, right. Well so let's get the police involved to enforce the ordinance, this is ridiculous. Former Alderman actually owned this property. So, talk to the police, nothing. Okay we'll take a look, nothing three times. Talked to my Alderperson, she says well here's the thing, he's connected, the police aren't going to do anything. I said okay well I'm looking right here at the State's Attorney's phone number right in front of me, you don't want to do anything about this environmental hazard here and all this pollution, there's oil leaking out of this stuff, there's batteries sitting here. Okay let me talk to him, let me see what I can do. She talked to that property owner, two days later a truck is there picking up all that crap, so this is the kind of conflict I'm talking about. When people say it's my freedom to do whatever the hell I want with my property, no it is not, we have restrictions so people do not pollute their land, so people do not cause problems for their neighbors, their city, their county, their state. This is why we have regulations, right this is why we don't just allow anyone to drive on our roads or drive a truck without training or even get a motorcycle license without taking a special test, right. These are to protect everybody that's why we have regulations, that's why we have a board, it's why we have government is to handle these things

MINUTES – PC/ZBA

June 17, 2026 (Continued Hearing RE: Text Amendments)

and prevent conflicts, that's what regulations need to do and they are never perfect and they're never great for every single person. There are things that people will not like that's how it is but we can't just unleash all these changes here that go against our Comprehensive Plan which are very controversial or we wouldn't have had all those people at the last meeting at this one too. So again, like I did at the last meeting I urge the board to bring these amendments to a referendum and not to hang them around their own necks. Bring it to the people, let us decide and don't rush this through. We need to have the information published what the points are for and against so people can make an informed decision and not have this done to them. Thank you.

Gerald Podraza, 3219 E Stagecoach Trail, Apple River

I'm going to make these comments very brief and I'm going to address this issue more from a public policy viewpoint, okay. So, these are some of the questions that I want to propose to you all. Is there a decrease in affordable long-term rental properties in this community and does that affect people who work at the restaurants, people who work at the golf courses, people in communities like Apple River or Warren or Scales Mound or Hanover that are just that are working every day maybe making minimum wage that need affordable rental long-term housing. Is there an increase in daily and weekly short-term rental properties recreational properties, if that is the case, how do those two variables impact each other, the long-term decrease and the short-term increase. Sale of properties with rental permits are they driving up sale prices in the entire county, if they are, do they do they contribute to over valuation of properties in the neighborhood that these are located in. These overvalued rental properties are they driving up inflated assessments, it seems like they are. Another thing that's very disconcerting is, is there an appearance of real estate investment trusts all of a sudden coming into the community whether it's gobbling up farm acreage and or buying properties and aggregating them into rental systems. I looked at, one last comment, I looked at Mr. John Lang's letter and I'm hoping that each of you get a chance to take a look at it. He brought this up at a county board meeting years ago and this is something that is really, really critical to take a look at and study. Thanks so much.

Tracy Diestelmeier, 4602 S Derinda Road, Elizabeth

First of all, I want to thank you I appreciate your attentive listening and the discussions that have taken place with public concerns in mind demonstrating that you're serving with integrity and that is does not go unappreciated especially when it's in line with the Comprehensive Plan that was made by many people over a long period of time and a lot of consideration. There's been overwhelming pushback since people were made aware of the recommendations. I as I stated the last time, I spoke I feel like many of the recommendations disregard the preservation of land both farm and our beautiful landscape which is total in direction to tourism that is a huge part of our county. I heard Mike Dittmar say the Galena Territory and Apple Canyon Lake are unique, in my opinion I think everybody's here because Jo Daviess County is unique and they've set up regulations. As the previous speaker said regulations are to preserve and we need those preservations to keep us unique. I would like you to make sure you're still considering that you are the gatekeepers of the regulations that provide the

freedoms that the previous speaker spoke for all of us not just for the select few who are going to build with less regard for their neighbors than their own pocketbook and that does not help us together. Specifically, the detached accessory dwelling with especially considering manufactured homes, I read that and I envisioned oh that means in my backyard or your backyard your neighboring yard there could be torn down trees and a series of the little mini houses and they could rent those out. Would that be special for them then we talk about well what happens with the noise I'm aware of that because I have a rental property near my house it's maybe a quarter of a mile away through the woods but I know when there's a rental there because I can hear them. I'm enjoying my pool with the radio low but their booming is excessive in my opinion apparently, it's not excessive to someone else's opinion. I think we need to look at as one of the previous speakers said you need to look at more specific's things like regular things, like things that are subjective are not enforceable. It does create conflict in your neighborhood and nobody wants that, nobody wants that, try to prevent that someone says they're going to build this building they're going to put storage in it I was sat here at the last the earlier meeting where somebody said they were going to store their grandchildren's toys, but nobody follows up on that if instead they decide to run a business out of it and they employ eight people, whose following up on that. Then the neighbor has to sign their name and create the conflict with the neighbor you should be able to report that anonymously you shouldn't have to create the conflict, there's no follow-up there and I think those are things that I would like to see ad hoc committees work on to make things more fluid and make more friendly to the neighborhoods. We talked about we had people at the last meeting who talked about trying to generate and somebody previously here also said especially our small communities we have empty houses sitting in those and those communities that are not getting utilized. We have empty storefronts, we have empty properties all in the neighborhood that are within walking distance that what people put their businesses they can start a little business with four or five employees started at home but then move it to town where people can walk, people can stop at the restaurant, people can. It will grow the community rather than put up blocks with your neighborhood that aren't in that area. And when I say blocks, I mean like conflicts. I apologize I get emotional and rambling. As far as the guest accommodations, I also noted that it's not, somebody spoke, about the safety I would like to see safety for all, what's not safe for one is not safe for another. That's another thing the ad hoc committee perhaps would like to be looking at let's make the whole county safe. And keep it beautiful. It is what makes us unique. As far as the residential home occupations, I am absolutely in agreement with the last speaker who said start your little business that's fine but when you grow, grow it elsewhere. I can speak from experience that if you're running a business and you have a dozen people and your neighbors are literally feet from your business and your trucks are coming in and out and there's semis dropping off things, your neighbors don't appreciate, especially when they have house guests that or whatever that you've got trucks running at six o'clock in the morning, you've got drop-offs running with little kids are running around in the neighborhood and you've got semis dropping off supplies, it is not conducive to a happy neighborhood, it creates conflict and I don't think anybody wants that. The signs very few people have talked about the signs.

Huschitt - states, that is next.

Okay, I appreciate that. Sorry. I already talked about subjective being problematic, so I don't I just to reiterate excessive and regular and reasonable. I think those are problematic, so I would ask to please be considerate of that. And I talked about noise. I also wondered or would like to have you consider when you talk about not just noise but also the infrastructure when semis are dropping off things in locations that aren't graded for that kind of weighted truck. That's going to cost the county more or the township more as Mike Dittmar said, he doesn't want tractors coming into town, we don't want those trucks on roads that aren't graded for trucks either. I had a similar story to the gentleman who said he doesn't want piled up batteries and hazardous material leaking out of somebody's garage, I totally agree. I reiterate that I would like to be able to have a place that we can report those things and have some action taken to try to keep the preservation of this very special place that we are fortunate enough to call home. I thank you for your service.

Mel Gratton, 7914 US Route 20 W, Galena

I served on this committee for a long time that I'm addressing tonight and I would like to give my thanks to the work that they've done. I hear a lot of accolades for the ad hoc committee and everything I know people who have served for years and years and have not received a thank you. You gentlemen deserve that. So, thank you for what you're doing its hard work and its thoughtful work and it's quasi-judicial, which means that you are here to listen to things as objectively as possible and then rule, not on your own thought process, but the evidence which has been presented for you every time. That's a hard thing to do to look at the world through a lens where you're deciding on somebody's future and their goals and to help them do it in a way that does not cause problems for somebody else. That is a hard job, I understand it, because I've been there. After listening to people tonight I think it's very apparent that we all have a different world view. We get up in the morning and we look out a different window. I hear people from one side of the county to the other one side, they'll say well this is not an issue, on the other side it is an issue. It depends which window you're looking out of. I want to go over a real quick history and I'm not going to waste a lot of time on this. Zoning came into effect back in 1995, the Comprehensive Plan came into place very shortly after that. After that, Comprehensive Plan update there was a major overhaul of the zoning ordinance. Recently or most recently there was a new Comprehensive Plan presented. The most recent Comprehensive Plan, mostly reiterated the vision and the feelings that people had about this county that they had in the first Comprehensive Plan. There wasn't a big change, the dates changed, the places changed, names changed things like that it was updated, but there wasn't a big vision difference between the vision that we started with back in 1995 and the vision that people have today. I think you heard that at the last meeting. The vision is that people love this county, they enjoy living here, they want to protect it, and they want to preserve it. And this is a document and we're looking at changes to it tonight that helps us to do that. I'd like to ask a question and the question is you know we're here tonight and I'm not sure why we're here tonight. I want to know what's broken; I have not heard that enunciated very well. What's wrong, just because you have a different philosophical viewpoint on

something doesn't make something wrong. It just makes it different than what you believe and if we live together in a civilized society where we interact with each other we're going to have some rules and laws. Certainly, all of us would love to have all of these rules apply to everybody except me. That's the way people think. And the thing I've heard the most is not necessarily why can't you do that, but somebody will come up and they'll say why did you let them do that. It might be some something that you don't want in your backyard, why did you permit that. Sometimes it wasn't permitted, sometimes it was oversight, but I want to know what has changed to facilitate what we're doing here tonight. And I haven't heard that, I had I don't think the argument has been made for that. Let me get on topic really quick here and I think this is a great example, I'm going to talk about guest accommodations first of all. Guest accommodations are something that happened in the Galena Territory, they were unregulated in the beginning, that did not exist. It exists because an incident happened in the Galena Territory which was life-threatening. When you go to a hotel or motel you see all of the alarms, and the carbon monoxide, the fire, everything else, the sprinkler systems, the exits. That didn't exist, but because of this, the county was forced to do something, I wasn't a part of this. This wasn't my deal at all, I didn't even get to have input. This was something that would notice that there was an issue, so result guest accommodations. Okay, guest accommodations give like everything else, they gave a voice. This committee heard hundreds of requests for guest accommodations. It started out much stricter than it is written right now. This has been liberalized and watered down to make this is a process that can be done in house, so we didn't sit there every night and hear the same thing. And that wasn't the problem, but it was because of the process that you know the answers were the same given the same information. Okay I think there's an elephant in the room. Let me add one thing, you have three letters in your packet, one's from Marshall Brown from the Galena Territory, one is from John Lang who is a board member, and the other is from John Perry. I am not going to argue, you know what is right and wrong about guest accommodations, but I certainly support every one of these letters and if people haven't read this these letters yet, please do. They're eloquent, they're well stated, they lay out the positions very easily. So, I'm not going to review those. They're there for you to read most of you probably have. They're also I think it is still an elephant in the room regarding guest accommodations. People argue about you know planning and oh is it a good thing or a bad thing, if there would have been planning for guest accommodations at the outset of when the Galena Territory and Apple Canyon Lake were developed, you wouldn't have these issues. Those guest accommodations and rental units would all be in the core area, where everybody next door does the same thing, they party on Saturday nights when the college kids fill the houses and stuff like that. Talk to people in Galena Territory and listen to what they say. There's a big elephant in the room right now and it's something we don't talk about, but needs to be talked about. People who have saved their life savings for retirement and a place to come to live that's peaceful and quiet and surroundings in a setting that they really love and enjoy are living next to rental homes. And what we're doing here we tried to make that a little bit softer for people you know add distance, add screening, add this, do that, that doesn't take it away the young lady said you know you can hear it a mile away. And there are a lot of calls out there, there's not as many as there used to be, but it shouldn't be an enforcement thing in in a true well-planned development these things would be in the same area,

your residence in one area and your rental units in another area. What we've done here or what someone is trying to do tonight is to take some of those rules away, it's going to the person who lives here full-time can now under the proposed legislation get to live within 20 feet of that house that gets rented maybe it's an eight bedroom maybe, well not eight, but five or six bedroom and they'll squeeze all of them people in there they can, they'll park the cars, and if they can't get their whole group, there they'll rent another one someplace and they'll all meet in one of these. I hope you would enjoy living there I don't think I would, but these people have rights. We're taking some of those rights away from them, we were giving them a little piece of crumb here, you know giving them you know an extra five or ten feet and now we want to take that away. That makes absolutely no sense in my mind. Okay there's another thing we do and it's called variances and if I can agree with one thing that the ad hoc committee has raised, there are too many variances granted. I will wholeheartedly agree with that and somewhere we got off base doing that especially on guest accommodations because what happened was, we were able in our minds, at least, to say well if this is green space and it's three or four hundred feet between this and the next house on that side, what difference does it make. And being pragmatic we allowed some of those things, I was guilty of that too because it made good sense in my mind, but in the process, it got watered down to where people came in and said I want it I want a rental unit there. And the other thing we started doing was saying well is this exclusively to make more money, that's one of the questions we all answered when we do this. Let's be honest with ourselves, most people do this in order to make more money. Let's call it what it is. Okay, so I would oppose any weakening of these and here's the thing, a lot more work has to be done on this issue at the Galena Territory with guest accommodations. One of the things, one of the reasons I read you the chronology of zoning, there's a commonality among all of those things that happened, large numbers of people were invited to take part in those discussions so even though we weren't able to satisfy everyone, most of the people who had whatever their thinking was they could agree with it and accept it. I don't care if it was a Comprehensive Plan, a rewrite, or an amendment people were included in that process. I don't believe anybody in the Galena Territory, not to my knowledge has been it doesn't sound like they've been addressed as far as the changes that need to be made. And I would suggest that you put this specific project on hold until you can sit down and have committees representing everybody all the stakeholders involved in making some kind of a decision that works for everyone. This is not the answer. This is making it worse. Okay I'm going to have a couple of quick comments on the other parts of this as far as signs.

Huschitt - states, no that's later.

Okay I'll hold that one, home occupations is that free. As I read that it reads more like a small business to me but it's not a big thing, but it is a big thing if it's next door to you and it's generating traffic. Has anybody thought about what you've done when you've changed where that would be allowed in the use table. Used to be that was in the Ag District and the R1 District, now it's R2 and RP, these are small lots, these are subdivisions that exist in the county. Do you want these some of these are half acre lots, do you want these things happening in that area. I don't. Do you want on your basically

residential street, do you want that truck making deliveries and trying to turn around. I don't think so. So, there are a lot of things to do with this. I can't support most of the changes. You gentlemen have done a fine job in weighing and balancing what has to be done to make this make sense. And I think there's been enough public input out there that most people say, yes we want freedoms, but sometimes we want freedoms from things, not in what we do, but from things, from what might be going on next door. The major tenet of zoning, it is not to make like a lot of people tend to think, not to think that this is to increase economic activity, it's to preserve property values. Let's keep doing that, that's your job. You don't have to make it worth three times as much as it was by what you do here but you are, I'm pretty sure, you're required to keep this from being devalued if at all possible. Keep those things in mind. Thank you and I will quit talking.

Daisha Boehm, 7 Frontier Trail, Galena

I actually own two guest accommodations, but in addition to that I live in the Galena Territory full-time and I live smack dab in the middle of two rental homes. I have heard a number of times the negative side of rentals in the Galena Territory, I guess my favorite part, part about freedom and living here in the US is that we have a choice. If we're really truly unhappy with where we're at, we can get up and move, if we're financially able to do so. If it's that big of a hindrance in our life, we have the option to move. I have had a number of rowdy parties next to me and I have a three-year-old daughter and not once has she woken up from that because I shut the door turn the air conditioners on, not a big deal. The best part about living in the Galena Territory and having guest accommodations, is it's a part-time thing, this isn't a full year-round like booked all the time sort of situation. So, we do hear so many negatives but I also pay an HOA fee and we have separate rules in the Galena Territory and if that needs to be looked at to strengthen to change those rules, I'm with Mr. Dittmar like, I'm sorry I don't know why I called you mister. They are free to make those changes and have those rules set in place and I have no issue with that. And you know the quarter mile distance that you might hear some booms, those are 20 feet from me never once have I made a complaint, never once have I thought it was that big of a deal. We've had parties till 5 a.m. slept right through them. I just I really think it's easy to complain and I don't think you see a lot of people that are okay with the situations of short-term rentals in this area coming forward because it usually is the naysayers that are coming to these things, but I think it's important to respect what short-term rentals do for this area without the Galena Territory, Galena wouldn't be what it is today. It was pretty much in shambles before the Galena Territory came and provided all the restaurants and the shops and the Galena that we have as full-time residents wouldn't be here without tourism. And tourism is moving towards that short-term rental and I think those are very valuable assets in addition to building homes and providing property taxes you're also providing a secondary economic impact in this community. People are coming here, they're spending money, they're buying from all of our shops, they're buying gas to get here. And a lot of the Galena Territory are those people that came here through Airbnb's, loved it, fell in love with this place and wanted to call it their own. And when you live in the Galena Territory you know that this is a second home community, so whether it's short-term rentals or

someone that owns a second home and brings a party on the weekend, that's to be expected. And I know that living in the Galena Territory that, I could live next to someone that doesn't live there full-time. And it's great because I don't have neighbors Monday through Thursday, most of the time, in the winter I don't see people for months. So, I just want to say it's not all bad and the Galena Territory has the ability to make these rules and which whatever way that board votes to amend them, but to be so negative about guest accommodations I don't think you're valuing the economic impact that they provide for Daviess County.

Jenny Sarna, 12 Timberline Drive, Galena

I live at 12 Timberline Drive. I'm also in the Galena Territory and I definitely understand the desire to make these regulations simpler and more flexible I think for me as I reviewed the amendments I kept coming back to this question of, what problem are we trying to solve, which I heard that earlier tonight and is it significant enough to justify removing these protections. And I think there was some question about like whether or not these protections apply to the Galena Territory or if they have their own their own set of rules and amendments and I can tell you at least in some cases I've seen firsthand why these protections exist and so my family lives next to a short-term rental that can accommodate up to 12 guests it was one of those worst-case scenarios shared earlier tonight. And earlier this year the owner wanted approval to install a large fire pit about 15 feet from the side lot line so it triggered this zoning board review when it went for when it went for approval. So, going through that process really gave me a new appreciation for the zoning standards and the fact that they're not arbitrary rules, they are these guardrails that balance the way I see it is the rights of one property owner against the rights of everyone around them the community and protect the finite resources of this community. At the last hearing I think water and the unique nature of like the driftless region and the water table kept coming up and up again so and that's really my concern tonight because what I see is with each one of these amendments we're being asked to remove a guard rail and earlier an example for me was the discussion about like the 15 percent driveway grade and there's an argument or statement made that like if part-time owners or short-term rentals are held to this standard what about full-time owners like this should be this is just like this is an arbitrary rule. And so if someone who lives on a property with a driveway grade of about 19%, I would respectfully disagree with that because I can tell you from going up and down that steep driveway and backing out of it even with my backup cam it's taking some experience to understand how to get down that driveway and up it and with between contractors and like delivery workers we've had more than one vehicle end up dangerously close to the edge and so I think the difference is my family uses the driveway every day and short-term rental guests and I know this because I was next to one, they come at any time of the day, in the dark, and all weather, and the snow and ice, and so those driveway standards, I would argue are there in place for reason. And so I would just ask like has the county evaluated whether eliminating that would affect for example like insurability of those short-term rentals or liability exposure for example of these properties like we had a safety restriction in place for reason that we removed it. So, that's one like I think again I have personal experience with

both the side setbacks in the driveway and the other piece, the home business piece is interesting to me my husband and I both work out of our homes, but as employees, we were we worked remotely, but I definitely appreciate this idea of like how do we get more local businesses, how do we get more people to come to Galena, spend money in Galena be a part of the community and stay here. But I my big worry just is like at what point does home occupations actually become a commercial business occupant operating in a residential or agricultural area and I think about you know I just always go to worst case scenario 10 employees working in the home, where do they park, where all of the traffic. Again, I live next to what I would argue is a small business with all the traffic coming going. So, how do we again protect both the resources someone mentioned the roads earlier and also the community the neighbor to how do we how do we keep people being good neighbors. And I think for the ADU's again I see that as like a lower impact way to get more housing in the community and you know not as controversial perhaps as some of the zoning regulations we discussed at the last meeting. I guess again for that one though I think about the resource question that was brought up and like I'm really curious like do we have a study on what would be the cumulative impact on with ADU's that we're having septic system or just again water usage, roads wear and tear, emergency access all those things so I think it would just be super helpful again to make sure we have like have the data and have the rationale to make good decisions here because at the end of the day I think and I heard that theme about like people come here because they love it whether they're coming as a visitor or they're coming to retire they've saved, this is their dream to retire here. For me and my husband we don't we decided to come here in our 30s and we call it like a staycation that hasn't ended and so I think for me it's like it's living here as a full-time resident for the last six years. I think like not one of these amendments that's upsetting it's concerning the directions like cumulatively that they're headed because I think with one change like doesn't seem like a big deal, but over time these this kind of weakening of the zoning regulations ultimately like we're going to reduce the safeguards for the guest accommodations bringing more commercial activity into residential areas and ultimately I think this idea like the Comprehensive Plan isn't that old I think it was put in place for a reason because of what people really love and care about living here in this county. And so, I just really think the burden on these changes should be on demonstrating that the benefits really do outweigh the risk. And I'm just not really convinced that the case has been made. Thank you.

Steve McIntyre stepped out of the meeting 8:48 pm

John Lang, 33 Roosevelt Drive, East Dubuque

I believe I'm correct, we already have about 800 guest accommodation licenses in the county already, don't we?

Meeker - states, yes that's true.

Okay, I think it's time that we start thinking about how many are we going to put input in residential neighborhoods and give the people that are going to be affected by it have some say whether they

want it in their neighborhood. I live in a subdivision Presidential Manor, which has some very nice large homes in and we're seeing a trend of people who to try and buy these homes up and possibly turn them in to guest accommodations. There's only one way in and out of part of the subdivision and that affects us greatly. And I appreciate Mel Gratton and some of the other comments on it. Thank you.

Steve McIntyre returns 8:50 pm

Public Testimony Closed

Accessory Dwelling Units

Huschitt ask about an ADU, we're not necessarily talking about a second freestanding home right there are there some qualifications that make it an ADU, they have to share a septic system, share a meter that kind of thing, am I correct?

Meeker states well let me start by saying one of the speakers did imply that there'd be opportunities for multiple ADU's on the property, no that's not true. One would be allowed. I believe there are minimum or maximum size standards, Melissa.

Soppe states there are size limitations. They can be a standalone, because you're allowed one detached, you can do a manufactured home, it cannot be older than 15 years at the time of placement. The parcel has to be five acres in size or more. The accessory dwelling shall be not less than 400 square feet and no greater than 900 square feet, it must be located no more than 150 feet from the principal dwelling measured from outside of structure to outside of structure. Shall utilize the existing driveway that's serving the principal residence and needs to be metered off of the existing electric and water. Septic they will need to have their own. They cannot be used for guest accommodations.

Huschitt states my own opinion is I'm in favor of this recommendation, again we have it in two of the four classes already without a special use. My time on the ZBA, I can't recall a time where we saw concerns permitting the ADU's. We've heard a lot of compelling stories of whether it's an elderly family member wanting to move back or a younger family member wanting to move back so they could take care of the elderly family member. So I'm personally am in favor of this particular recommendation of the committee, but just so we go on the table. Any other discussion

McIntyre states just my comments are we just had in the last year I think we've had three or four made exactly that where the elderly parents or whatever was in a two-story home and they wanted to build a home for them on a single level so that they can manage and take care of the elderly. We do have an aging population in this county and it's getting older and older and older and the concerns are

there. So, I agree with you I would be in favor of this and that was one of the reasons that ad hoc committee talked about this.

Diedrick states, I have to agree very much with what McIntyre has said I think, it is apparent as the community as the county ages and you know with the needs of having facilities to accommodate some of the elderly folks. I know over the years of we've had to do that at our place at our own personal and so I've got to agree that I think we've got to be in favor of this ADU.

Hill states, I'm just sitting here trying to think of all the cases we've had and what they were about. We did one not too long ago up towards in the Warren area and I know the people that lived there originally and they sold the house and they became older and now they wanted to add on so they could stay there and have their children live in the house and they could be with them. We also had a farm, I can't think of anything that was bad with bad said about any of these cases and no objections about them so I think I would also go along in favor of this one right.

Mapes states, yes I agree what I think everybody said on the committee here that we need it and I think it's a good thing to have and so I will go along and I'll agree with everything too.

Huschitt states, I do think it helps us accomplish our goal in the Comprehensive Plan of trying to bring more affordable housing to Jo Daviess County. I think it does so with that being said I would say the floor is open for a motion for our recommendation to the county board regarding the accessory dwelling unit recommendation of the ad hoc committee.

A motion to recommend approval of the Proposed Amendments to the text of the Jo Daviess County Zoning Regulations (Title 8, Jo Daviess County Code of Ordinances): amend to allow accessory dwelling units (ADUs) as a "permitted use" in any zoning district permitting residential development was made by Steve McIntyre

Seconded by Ron Mapes.

The motion carried by roll call vote. Ayes – Gary Diedrick, Don Hill, Steve McIntyre, Ron Mapes, Peter Huschitt. Ayes: 5. Nays – None. Nays: 0. Absent: 0.

Guest Accommodations

Mapes states, I want to thank the ad hoc committee for doing what they've done. I think that I had there's a lot of good points and a lot of things brought out that we need to move this county board and so we can't sit here to let it go, the guest accommodations thing I'm in favor of guest accommodations, but I think what I've heard tonight, I think they can work out you know they need to get together and work it out. So I don't want to say we have to make this make that I think they bring back the committees together or somebody work out a better plan or a different plan everybody agrees on. That's my opinion.

McIntyre states, there was one thing that was brought up that sparked my little realtor antennas that went out and that had to do with that if you have a guest accommodation license the value of the home ends up being jacked up. It's very similar to the docks the Apple Canyon Lake how that raised at some point it raised the price is almost forty thousand dollars if you had a transferable boat dock at ACL. So I'm not sure what we need to do in that regard because it does affect the appraisal values and it affects our property values and our taxes because the guest accommodation does add value to that home and how do you separate that out. I don't know. So I mean from a realtor standpoint that's a very hard nut to crack and I don't know how to solve that problem but it was brought up tonight and I appreciate somebody bringing that up and it's something that I'm not sure how to handle.

Meeker states based on that comment, I know the Assessor's Office is looking into that issue right now. It's not in our area of expertise but they are looking at that.

McIntyre states but it's one of those things where you know people brought it up and I thought I would address it at this time.

Diedrick states, yes there was a statement made about the possibility that you know for guest accommodations that maybe the two main entities that have that most of those licenses are located in the Galena Territory and Apple Canyon Lake and that maybe it should go to their responsibility to handle that situation and not being totally versed on the covenants that go along with the plats of either one of those developments, it's not something that can be done very easily on a local basis by the Galena Territory or the Apple Canyon Lake. It requires a change in the covenants and that usually requires as I understand it a certain percentage of the property owners. It's not something that can be done on a board type of situation. So it's not something that's easily done if that's the case that we want to just waive our right to do anything here on the in the county and to just turn it over to these developments and say well you have it it's your problem and I don't think we can, that's going to work with if that's the way we decided to go.

Hill states, I respect John Lang and the letter he wrote and what he said here tonight with guest accommodations as far as Apple Canyon Lake and Galena Territory when I sat on the board and I was the chairman of the board, I once inquired whether or not we could just let them be their own governing bodies and I was told by the State's Attorney that the county oversaw everything especially the setbacks and things like the grades and the parking and the county oversaw that. And so that was not something that I could initiate having them take over their own governing of those particular areas. Some of the things, yes they do, but for those things I was told I could not change There's enough things that we're good on the ad hoc committee, I do think that something can be worked on but I'm not in favor of going through with this tonight. Thank you.

Huschitt states, just for all of us here and I do have some comments in general I'd like to share about the guest accommodations, but just from a housekeeping standpoint we do have an action item to take so whenever that motion is made I mean it does have to be in the form of some type of action

because you know our purpose here is to have this public hearing and to make a recommendation to the county board. You know my own opinion I mean there's been so much that's been talked about guest accommodations, in general I mean just a couple comments as I was listening everything tonight, you know Hill you made a good point and I myself don't know exactly what the GTA and ACL maybe does or doesn't have authority over in their covenants and restrictions, but I myself would openly you know really push them to look at this issue. I really, really do because a comment someone made in last month's meeting was you know she had said in general she goes well maybe this wasn't guest accommodations but she used the term maybe we can't zone our way out of this issue and to me guest accommodations that rung with me when it comes to guest accommodations. I think there's other ways to approach it I mean I personally think let the market regulate this I think personally and then I'm going to get back to my point I think our fee for guest accommodation, in my own opinion is too low. It's I think that's one way where if we feel that these are just becoming too rampant I wonder if the fee mechanism needs to be raised to make this is one way to regulate it because then too it may just have even more responsibility for the people who hold these permits to continue to monitor the activity that happens. You know the other thing is I live at Apple Canyon Lake, I asked Apple Canyon Lake POA and there is a protocol and if there are so many complaints of a home they do have the authority to pull this. So, to me the biggest thing that I have with the guest accommodations and it was said tonight and I appreciate it made me think but I sort of always wondered this did in the past were some crumbs given to say we're going to give an extra five or ten feet, okay we're talking a difference maximum where I'm sitting to that edge of that table and to me fundamentally I'm just going to be honest that doesn't make any difference if that home next to me is going to interfere that's just how I personally feel. It's not going to regulate how many cars are going to be on that road it's not going to regulate how many times people are coming and going so I just fundamentally am asking myself do we have a set of rules that fundamentally don't change what it is we're trying to change. We have had in my opinion way too many variance requests granted on this. I'm guilty as charged because one of the discussions I had my mind was okay is this really going to make a difference, is it really going to alter it. As far as the two other things mentioned it, so what I'm speaking to is eliminate the special side yard setback requirement of a five foot per bedroom with a maximum setback of 35 feet require the setbacks applicable to the underlying zoning district, the one thing I like about that is it is if it went that route is a very straightforward rule, people understand it. I want to buy this house and I want guest accommodations, am I going to get it, you just yes or no you're going to get it or not based upon that. So, that's just my own opinion. As far as the eliminate the standard required parking spaces for maximum slope of eight percent I do appreciate some of the comments that were made that people who stay in guest accommodations may not be aware of the property, but I also believe that at one point in time too I mean people do have to be responsible for their own actions. You know I had this post me in a number a while ago on a special use case and it's like we're sending our school buses up and down these treacherous rural hills in Jo Daviess County yet we're saying a driveway has to be eight percent type of thing the point. I mean I have struggled personally with the disconnect of if the person can live there year-round if the eight percent and the fifteen percent eliminate the standard access roads right away leaving the property not exceed 15

percent, I just sort of question why do we have a subset of rules in my own opinion. I do feel the tourism market is changing, I don't know how many I think 10 years ago guest accommodations you asked a lot of people what short-term rental is and guest accommodations and Airbnb, I don't know that a lot of people really knew, maybe 15 years. I think it's change. I think it is how a lot of people want to travel and how a lot of people want to stay. I also do feel while I don't have the specifics, I do feel it is a huge driver of our economy as we've talked about last month or I did you know to me ag and tourism are two number one industries that I hang my hat on that a lot of times when I'm trying to make certain decisions and I personally feel that the guest accommodations has helped increase the tourism industry in Jo Daviess County. I don't have numbers and I can't quantify it, but I think it's a fair statement to say it's help. So, I myself I mean I am in full favor of the three recommendations as stated by the ad hoc committee. So just for whatever that's worth.

Mapes states, I agree with you but I was we don't want to lose it, it's a good for the county everything else but I would like to see if all the groups together agree on everything that's what we don't have. We're just doing what we want I mean I'm not against it, but I'm sort of against look tonight I think it should be set back and we have you know both sides get together and come up with them. They come up with a mutual plan that's my.

McIntyre states, I think about Jenny's comments that she had on here it's the first time I've ever heard that side where she talked about you know as a property owner full-time that grade we know it, we've driven it umpteen thousand times, but as a transient yeah once or twice is probably all you're going to do and it can get bad if it's really, really steep. So that's the first time I've heard that argument and I appreciate that so thank you Jenny. And as the one that actually does do transit rentals in other locations like it might be Flagstaff or other such areas I can understand the steepness and the concerns that people have about that. But you know what if I didn't want to drive down that driveway I would park the top and walk down so that's neither here nor there. Now as far as the five feet per bedroom mix and that and just letting the setbacks be whatever the setbacks are within that particular district, I'm in favor of that one only because noise is going to travel no matter what you do and what it was stated I think it was Mr. Asta that stated that he's heard you know noise from this or that you know when I lived out in the country that corn grain dryer was 120 decibels that's what a corn grain is and if I live next to it that's my problem. I knew it was there and that's my problem not the farmer's problem. Now having lived in town and I live across the street from a noisy bar at two in the morning when I wake up because the guy's the drunk guy coming out of the bar, it's my problem I'm not going to go complain to the guy because I live across the street and I chose to live across the street. So, it's a double-edged sword it really is, but I would pretty much be in favor of all these changes considering what's being asked.

Diedrick states, I think McIntyre brings up a good point as you do also Huschitt when you mentioned the you know the 10 feet distance from you to the end of these tables here, I don't see where that is going to hold much water and make a difference. So I think that's something that we no longer need to have in the code. It's something that I think we can we can address through the through the natural

hearing process when folks come before us and you know we look at how things are landscaped, you know something that might break up the sound whatever and it's something that I think we as a committee can still monitor that issue and I would definitely think the side lot setbacks could be dropped from this as the committee have recommended.

McIntyre states there was one comment that was made about making it measurable, I've always had that issue. As it relates to sound carries, the 4a about the so many feet setback has to do with buffer zones, right, how much sound etc. It might be a better way to look at this would be to talk about okay from a nuisance standpoint and deal with it as a nuisance standpoint. I have a decibel meter as well and I did it because I play music and there were some things that came before the zoning about rural music and we've never put anything like that so it's the same kind of or similar thing about noise that carries. Maybe we should be looking at something like that as a stock to try and figure out okay you're the noise can't be greater than a certain decibel instead of creating land for measurement distance and use decibels instead.

Huschitt states I see your point right instead of distance it's sound because it could be a four mile away playing very, very loud music that could still violate an acceptable decibel.

Diedrick states I think I'm going back a few years now and I'm dating myself but when Galena Cellars was looking at having outdoor music but that was through a special use permit if I recall that was not through a variance right.

Huschitt states they had a special use that had some specific language in it or I don't remember the specific language it was specific yes what they could do, what hours of amplified not. Yeah that was monitored by the special use permit that that was originally passed.

Mapes states, I think there's merit of what everybody said, but I just I would myself I want guest accommodations I want to go but I wish that they would get together a little closer there's a couple points that I disagree with but that's just my opinion but it seems like there's the people if they just get together so everybody was happy

Huschitt states so we need a motion to the County Board on the recommendation regarding guest accommodations.

Meeker states per the State's Attorney's comments at the last hearing it's up or down on the recommendation as proposed if you have additional suggestions to the Board you can make those additional statements and we'll put it in the record but it's a yay or nay on what the recommendation is.

A motion to recommend denial of the proposed amendments to the text of the Jo Daviess County Zoning Regulations (Title 8, Jo Daviess County Code of Ordinances): amend the site development standards for properties licensed for Guest Accommodations to: eliminate the requirement that guest

MINUTES – PC/ZBA

June 17, 2026 (Continued Hearing RE: Text Amendments)

parking spaces have a maximum slope of 8%; eliminate the standard that access roads/driveways leading into a property not exceed a slope of 15%; and eliminate the special side-yard setback requirement of five-feet per bedroom, with a maximum setback of 35-feet, and require the setback applicable to the underlying zoning district was made by Don Hill.

No second, motion died.

A motion to recommend approval of the proposed text amendment to the Jo Daviess County Zoning Regulations (Title 8, Jo Daviess County Code of Ordinances): amend the site development standards for properties licensed for Guest Accommodations to: eliminate the requirement that guest parking spaces have a maximum slope of 8%; eliminate the standard that access roads/driveways leading into a property not exceed a slope of 15%; and eliminate the special side-yard setback requirement of five-feet per bedroom, with a maximum setback of 35-feet, and require the setback applicable to the underlying zoning district was made by Ron Mapes stating the following: there needs to be additional conversations with public to tweak it a little better so everybody is happier.

Seconded by Huschitt.

The motion carried by roll call vote. Ayes – Steve McIntyre, Ron Mapes, Peter Huschitt, Gary Diedrick. Ayes: 4. Nays – Don Hill. Nays: 1. Absent: 0.

Home Occupation

Hill states, the problem I have is you took away a number and as it's been mentioned you could have x number of people coming into that house now if you change it to four or eight and who are not family members I could agree with that but the way it's saying anybody can come in anybody can work I just don't think that's a good idea to have that in any home whether it's in the country or in town or wherever you have it. I think you need a number and I think if you add who are not family members that would probably do what everybody wants to have done. That's what I say about that

Huschitt states, yeah I think I first I agree in principle but I think the idea of the non-family members I think it would be almost next to impossible to try to enforce I think it would be impossible to enforce you know I mean neighbor drive by and say yeah I saw 20 people working that house and I mean I appreciate what you're saying Mr. Hill, I really do you know I think it would impossible to enforce, impossible to define but if I may piggyback on that, you know I understand I think the intent again is we're just trying to make it maybe a little bit more user friendly a little bit easier to streamline some of these home occupations. Just as an aside I will put my plug in again I do want to make sure we're trying to do what we can to help our towns and villages because there are a lot of empty storefronts where perhaps a small startup business could start, but with that said to me I appreciate the intent of this motion. The two concerns I have is because we are also allowing it now it being the home

occupation to be in a detached building and we recently have greatly enlarged the size of those detached buildings and last month how the county board's going to act on this is yet to be determined. It was recommended that there be no size limitations so I mean I'm just saying is when we work through it theoretically, we could almost have a shed which could be defined as a warehouse for lack of better word and we're saying it is okay to have a home occupation in there which is unlimited now. I'm not I don't know if that's the worst thing in the world I understand it's like hey they're employing people in economic benefit and if it gets big enough it can move better location so I'm not really opposed to the recommendation other than because we may be unlimiting the size of these detached buildings and we're saying it is okay to be an attached building do we want to try to at least have some type of number on the number of employees working on the premises.

McIntyre states one of the things that was brought up and I think it was Mr. Casswell are we micromanaging the growth of the business and yes you know every business that starts off in a home ends up when it starts getting bigger it goes to a different location I mean you can't accommodate it the neighbor starts complaining and the headaches start going from business owner and they end up governing themselves so are we micromanaging too much. I would say yes so and we're not and this is a business owner this is not some college kid that its having a party at my house or whatever kind of thing. I'm in favor of these changes that was proposed by the ad hoc committee. Also Mr. Asta brought up this thing about batteries and you know cars and this kind of stuff see I have a different view of home businesses I think farmers are home businesses and having just come from Shipshewana, Indiana where it's pristine type of farms I never saw one machinery out in the yard rusting I never saw you know an old vehicle that they don't use anymore sitting in the field and not you know rusting away as well. So it I think it has to do with the property owner and it's you're micromanaging that property as well so that's why you know these kinds of changes I'm going to leave it to the business owner to make it becomes a nuisance then the neighbor can complain.

Mapes states I was living here 25 years and somebody next to me built this house and they started the garage business I'm not opposed to more businesses but there's simply regulations that you know they can't do what he said you know they're all over I think there's a lot of things that could be regulated but that takes money and time to regulate but I'm not against it but I still think but other people too when these happen.

Huschitt asks Mr. Meeker and Melissa and I put you on the spot just to be clear there would still be somewhat I'm going to say home occupations that perhaps may wouldn't require special use permit for instance we had a special use permit for the lumber cutting firewood business okay.

Meeker states this would not change and that wasn't that wasn't a home occupation

Huschitt states so just to be clear we the code is defining home occupations versus there's still a list of items which are basically excluded from home occupation right I just want to make sure I understood right. So really what we're saying is I mean the recommendations have been spilled out very clearly

and the last sentence is simply saying these must have been businesses which before must maybe either require special use or they weren't defined and now we're saying is these are repair services, vet clinics, design, development, and other related services they are considered by definition home occupations

Meeker states they can be home occupations and what you see there on that final bullet is a number of those are uses that were prohibited previously as home occupations okay but then a couple were added I think and I could be wrong I'd have to go back in the record I think veterinary clinics and the design, development, and other related services which is primarily like architectural design firms that wasn't addressed in any way so those were suggested to be added as well those were in there.

Huschitt states the reason I mentioned it in that there would still be some checks and balances I like your example, I lived a certain place for 30-years and again we talked about zoning some people will say it's prohibiting new growth there's also the other end of the side of the coin it's protecting someone who has a right in a property that's there but because we're not eliminating the code in its entirety we're just adding some clarifications that's what makes me much more comfortable perhaps just saying hey anything can pop up and there's no checks and balances. So, I would be in favor of the recommendations I've presented. I think there's some good thought brought up the unlimited number of employees could be concerned but I guess you know if that becomes a concern we can always revisit that just I do think some words not create nuisance or excessive noise I think that is a topic for another day because we've talked about that before what is excessive noise but that's a topic for another day but I myself in favor of as presented just fyi.

A motion to recommend approval of the proposed amendments to the Jo Daviess County Zoning Regulations (Title 8, Jo Daviess County Code of Ordinances): amend the regulations for "home occupations" as follows was made by Ron Mapes stating the following:

- Permit home occupations to occur within the home on a property and/or within an accessory building; eliminate the maximum number of employees permitted on the property, with no limitation on employees working off-site;
- Allow the sale of ancillary items not made/assembled on the property as part of a home occupation;
- Add language stating that equipment used for the home occupation shall not create a nuisance or excessive noise;
- Eliminate the prohibition of deliveries by tractor-trailer combination trucks for home occupation uses;
- Add the following as permitted home occupations: antiques (retail), automobile and other motor vehicle maintenance and repair services, veterinary clinics, and design, development and other related services.

Seconded by Steve McIntyre.

The motion carried by roll call vote. Ayes – Steve McIntyre, Ron Mapes, Peter Huschitt, Gary Diedrick, Don Hill. Ayes: 5. Nays – None. Nays: 0. Absent: 0.

Signs

SECTION III

TITLE 8, CHAPTER 4, SUPPLEMENTAL REGULATIONS & TITLE 8, CHAPTER 7, DEFINITIONS: The following amendments were recommended.

- In instances where a business or service advertised or identified by a non-conforming sign ceases to exist, the following notice shall be provided: the sign owner shall be provided written notice (via certified mail) that the sign must be repaired/replaced/removed within 180-days following receipt of the written notice as the non-conforming sign is considered “abandoned” for non-use. In the event that the business advertised on the sign is for sale, the Zoning Administrator may grant a reasonable extension of time for the sign to be brought into conformance with this section.
- A new sign type is created: Local Business, Off-Premise Signs, permitted subject to the following standards: 1. Double-faced signs permitted, limited to no greater than 32 square feet/sign face with an overall height above the adjacent grade of no greater than 20 feet to the top of the sign; 2. No more than one local business off-premise sign structure shall be situated on a property; sign structures may advertise more than one business as long as all other criteria of this section are met; 3. Local Business Off-Premise signs may be erected no closer than one (1) mile from any other off-premise sign, including traditional billboards. In determining compliance with this standard, signs on both sides of the highway corridor shall be considered; and 4. The sign shall be continually maintained in good condition.
- Add definition for Local Business, Off-Premise Signs as follows: Sign, Off-Premise Local Business: A sign for a business that is physically located within the boundaries of Jo Daviess County that is placed on a property other than the location of the business, intended to promote local business enterprises in the County.

Potential Concerns to Consider:

A primary issue with respect to permitting Local, Off-Premise Signs is that the recommendation made by the Ad Hoc Zoning Ordinance Subcommittee would permit such signs anywhere in Jo Daviess County; given limited staffing and the vast area covered by the County, this provision would be difficult to administer effectively. Additionally, a proliferation of signage along transportation corridors, unless tightly regulated, could detract from the scenic transportation corridors in the County. At the Ad Hoc Zoning Ordinance Subcommittee meeting where this topic was discussed, staff’s original recommendation was to limit such signs to the primary highway corridors: US Highway

MINUTES – PC/ZBA

June 17, 2026 (Continued Hearing RE: Text Amendments)

20, IL Route 78, and IL Route 35 given that these roadways experience the greatest traffic levels and are where such signs may be of the most assistance to visitors to the area while still promoting patronage of local businesses; placement of such signs would only be permitted no closer than onemile between signs.

Public Testimony Opened

Mike Dittmar, 117 West Main, Elizabeth

I support this, I think it's just housekeeping I think that's just an easy one. The second one is I was contacted and I think the county board was too by two local businesses one was Shawn Saunders's business out of Warren and the other one was Michelle Magee in Stockton and what and they asked for this because they want to bring business to their places because Michelle's they're both off highway 20 and Michelle literally said that she said I need to get those people in my store so in my shop. So I think this was really well thought out local businesses only I think that's huge only one sign and the one mile spacing I definitely think this can be done. I know in the past we've said that we don't want to look like the Wisconsin Dells, I've been up to Wisconsin Dells at some of their school actually their big school and I like their low taxes and their nice school so I really support this. I don't want signs either, I think this is a really well written ordinance that just limits it to the local businesses that we all want to support help so please consider passing this. Thank you.

John Creighton, 14203 E Greenvale Road, Lena

Just to follow up on what Mike had said and everything he said is true but the genesis of the complaint that we're trying to address here with these two business owners is that they received and I'm not going you know disrespect Bill and his staff here because his job is to administer the rules that are in front of them. So that's is what it is, but he was these sign owners were given instructions to remove their signs after they had been in a state of disrepair for many years and they had rebuilt and repaired the signs to new condition and in my mind that is both arbitrary and capricious and that is why we addressed this issue and made the recommendations that we did. I think this really is that simple. Thank you.

Mel Gratton

I'll be real brief on this I would hope that you know everybody has a cell phone today that you use the capabilities and it helps you find places if you'd like to go someplace you don't know where it's located you put it in. I don't think we have a need for as many signs. There's a type of sign and this was discussed many years ago when we were talking signage and that is the TOD sign the Tourist Oriented Destination that's that blue sign with the white on it and those can't cost I looked it up it's actually there is a cost to it it's two hundred dollars initially to apply for it and then it's seventy dollars a year is what they cost. But the advantage of them is that they're uniform, they're visible people are

MINUTES – PC/ZBA

June 17, 2026 (Continued Hearing RE: Text Amendments)

used to you know utilizing them because they they're used I think nation and why you see them everyone so I would strongly suggest that you look at that as an option for this and I think it enhances the scenic values that we have to limit these whatever types of signs that they are you know to a minimum and I want to remind all of you also that every zoning ordinance and every comprehensive plan we have had wants to limit these in those scenic corridors areas and the scenic corridors are the main roads for the county so that has been in place for forever that was in the very first ordinance that was one of the things that people initially asked for to limit signs in the scenic corridors so that's all I have. Thank you.

Carol Schwerdtfeger

I don't know if it's changed since we own the northwest land company on highway 20 the last time I was up to date on it I know that US 20 was through Jo Daviess County at least the western half of it was considered a scenic highway and they were limiting the ability of signs other than like in the like going through Stockton you know on the highway that it had low speeds that was different but out in the area where we had our office they I know we had to get a permit and they do limit them on and also I think since 84 was declared the Great River Road. I'm pretty sure they have some state limitations on it but other than that I think it's all in favor of supporting local business.

Mike Dittmar

If I can tell you the value of big signs I rent for our pumpkin patch we rent us a Lamar sign for September and October only and it's eight hundred dollars a month and that's sixteen hundred dollars for a small business that's a lot of advertising money. If one of these the two the record the people that I brought up wanted to rent a sign of Lamar to get and I spend the money because it works it works we ask our visitors all the time and it's you see it you know those are two small businesses could they afford ten thousand dollars a year for their advertising business to get people to their small businesses. No way so an off-premise sign is a huge benefit to them it's a huge benefit to our local businesses. Thanks.

John Schultz, 27 W Arrowhead Drive, Galena

Mr. Gratton basically is saying we should have uniform signs throughout the county. I'm opposed to that because if you have an opportunity to have a unique sign it might draw more customers to your business rather than looking at a blue and white sign I just think that I'm in favor of freedom. Thank you.

Tracy Diestelmeier

I just as I looked at and I couldn't misunderstand but I think the change is going to turn it from is two feet in any direction four square feet is that what the old and now we're turning it the recommendation is to then make it 32 square-feet.

Meeker states 32 square feet is this it's already in our sign regulations that's not a new standard it's just consistent with our existing standards.

What I thought the old one what we were deleting or changing said like two feet in any direction and that's why I said maybe I'm incorrect.

Huschitt asks is that under home occupations. You're right it's under home occupations and I don't know if this applies to that.

Meeker states that this does not relate to that.

Well I would just make a plea and I think minds are already made up but I would make a plea not to have us like Wisconsin Dells I traveled to Minneapolis this last weekend and I could tell when I hit a county that had no restrictions and I had no interest in anything that was beyond the sign after sign every mile another sign I don't want Jo Daviess County to do that. Thank you.

Public Testimony Closed

McIntyre so let's first of all we will address number three the discontinuance. This was very unenforceable the way it was written I think as far as yeah it was 180 days to be removed but I know a lot of abandoned sites that have not been removed so I think this is trying just to clean up the ordinance a little bit just to give it a little bit more teeth in trying to make sure that these signs that have been abandoned get either removed or fixed and I think that's what number three is I think it's well written every time I read it it's okay I understand that makes sense to me so that one I think is fine. When you talk about the off-premise signs not signs like not like at old northwest where that was at the premise this has to do with off-premise signs and I do have a concern about additional you know multiple signs all over the place and everything else I'm trying to feel how much 32 square feet is four by eight four by eight it's a plywood and you're going 55 to 60 miles an hour down the road are you going to be able to see that sign very clearly unless they really designed it really well. So I don't know but I know that we do need off-premise signs and Mel, I used to own the airport north of Apple Canyon Lake and we did put a blue sign there to let people know that there was an airport runway just down that road and no one saw it absolutely no one saw it and so most people are going 60 miles an hour down the road exactly or and I and I am one that uses this a lot so I it is something but those businesses that do need an off-premise sign they do need an off-premise and especially those ones that are out way out in the middle of nowhere. And for the people that don't use their cell phones to prove directional use and that kind of stuff so I think this is well written as well and to not have a gazillion of them like you do when you go to the dells you have one sign then the next sign, the next sign and it's exactly the exact same business, this has to do with the one mile away off-premise so it does have separation between the two signs, yes that's what I mean yeah but you go up to the dells and there's sign after sign after sign of the same business, right. I'm sick of it so I think that does have

MINUTES – PC/ZBA

June 17, 2026 (Continued Hearing RE: Text Amendments)

some teeth to it that one mile is a good rule as well so I'm not concerned about that. So, I think I would be in favor of both of those.

Mapes states difficult one because the one I agree was about the sign the date to the sign remove the signs I think that's well written and should be in place. Signage is the reason that zoning came into this county that's one of the reasons because there were billboards all over the place because I remember Paul booked the whole county, but precisely that's you know we eliminated it that's good his on-premise signs I think are fine but today's age I don't like to see signage put up all over the place. Again, today's age people look at their phones and look at the car thing they got the address they don't wait you know. I'd like to leave that those particular sites alone like they are.

Hill states I guess that's my concern you're limited to a mile but when you're going 60 miles an hour you see a sign every minute and I don't want to see. I mean I'm traveling to Dubuque last week I was looking at how wonderful it is not to have all these signs in Jo Daviess County. And I'm just worried every mile like so you get a lot of signs in Jo Daviess County. If you have one every mile that's my only concern otherwise, I don't know how you change that. I am concerned about the one mile limit.

Huschitt states I just you know as far as Mr. Hill's comment again you know when the motion is made it's either going to be yes or no and then in the discussion it could perhaps say we would like to see. I'm just making a suggestion if that's what you felt you could say we would like to see the verbiage the word one mile struck and have two or three whatever if you think there's a longer buffer. I just want to make that housekeeping suggestion.

Huschitt states I love Jo Daviess County, I love the scenery I myself I hear a lot of I agree that businesses should have the opportunity advertise so there's a part of me that says can we say that can perhaps the distance of the signs be closer that they can only be within two miles of an established municipality. So, if you're whatever town you're driving through Stockton you can drive a mile or two west on 20 you get past two miles of Stockton this rule doesn't apply. You get within two miles east of Elizabeth you could start seeing some signs you get two miles west of Elizabeth you're going to see some signs, two miles outside Elizabeth there's no sign. Because there's a part of me where is that accomplishing both things, the concerns that we don't want to see signs everywhere but we want to give a local business the opportunity to advertise their business. Because to me too if you're driving 55 to 65 miles an hour on Route 20, are you going to see a sign that's five miles in the country going 65. If you're outside of Stockton for instance you're still going to be within a 45-mile hour speed limit so I like the idea of giving our local businesses the opportunity to advertise with a sign. I'm a business owner myself the billboards are very expensive but I do like that opportunity to advertise locally. This may be me being a little too nostalgic but there's sometimes too I'll see a sign and it just like for instance the Stockton you know laundromat it's a young man who went to our school and he's doing really well. So, my point of it is I'm encouraging the use of the signs I just wonder too I'm concerned about are they going to pop up everywhere and as a solution perhaps in the motion would be to limit to within two miles of the municipality, the city limit of a municipality which I think makes more sense

because the speed limit is usually controlled. Within that frame the signs are going to be more readily visible and then you get out into the proverbial country you're not going to see all these signs everywhere. What the distance within that mile or two I don't know if we want to try to say that it can't obviously be a mile you know what I mean I can't say you know we go sign within a mile and then only have a mile between. I don't know if we you know is 100 yards reasonable, I'm not sure. But anyway, that was a suggestion. I have I like the ability I really like how number on is written. The enforcement I do like the ability for the businesses to use a local off-premise sign but I am too concerned as other people have said in the crowd as well as other people, I am concerned what is this going to look like and that's a solution that I think would accomplish both but those were my comments.

Hill states I think I agree with you that would ease my troubles a lot. I'm just thinking of when I'm coming over here you see the mud run sign and Woodbine you know that's within a mile of Woodbine but it's right there and that's the only one, I can remember seeing between Stockton and Woodbine and then there's a couple between there and Elizabeth. But that would ease my mind a lot if we could do something like it could be 100 yards within a mile of, I mean any other.

Mapes states, I agree with you there is some signs in Woodbine that are for Stockton so okay but I think that's a good idea though I don't know how you make it in the motion.

Meeker states you can't modify the recommendation it's either yay or nay but add your additional comments on what you would suggest.

Diedrick states I'd like to take it one step further. You mentioned that within so much distance of a municipality, I'm thinking you know that could be all right, but if you're talking to a rural business with an off-premise sign, I would like to think that you know you could maybe say within so miles of the business versus the municipality. You know to give people a heads up that you know you're coming up on that business and that sign is there. You know you look at a number somewhere down the line of so this proximity to the business versus the municipality.

McIntyre states being a world traveler sometimes I see a sign and it sparks my interest when you're traveling by. So when you use your phone you actually know what you want to try and find, but sometimes the sign sparks you to have interest in that business and you end up going there as a tourist. So I agree with offering the signs, but as you stated within so many miles, but now you're penalizing Warren, Apple River. They can't grab anybody from Highway 20 to get up that way. Every time I mean from the Jo Daviess County tourists association the visitors bureau, one of the biggest struggles they have is getting the people that go to the destination of Galena to go out into the other areas and off-premise signs are absolutely that it's to drive people from Highway 20 out into the country to support those rural businesses that are struggling. So that to me is why this was put in. So, if we don't say yay, we're actually penalizing those businesses that are all in the small communities that need our help to drive that business drive that customer to the business. That's what I look at it.

Huschitt states just what I understand your point so again and I'm not trying to put you on the spot I mean again so the all the off-premise business sign to me means like that the sign could be anywhere off their premise.

McIntyre states not within so many miles of it because I mean it takes 15 miles to get up to Apple River or Warren from parts of Highway 20. So that's kind of tough. But I appreciate your thinking because I have struggled with that too. I don't want to see a sign that's going to be 50 miles from it's like those bucky signs right 150 miles until the next Bucee's you know okay. Something that's within the county and we're dealing with the county so that's why.

Diedrick states I don't see where signage that Jo Daviess County is going to be the Wisconsin Dells of the Illinois. I just don't see that the signage is a real issue here and as recommended by the ad hoc committee I would be totally pleased with going with what they recommend.

A motion to recommend approval of the proposed amendments to the Jo Daviess County Zoning Regulations (Title 8, Jo Daviess County Code of Ordinances) was made by Gary Diedrick: amend the Sign Regulations as follows:

1. Add language that when a non-conforming sign ceases to exist, a written notice shall be provided via certified mail that provides the sign owner 180-days following receipt of the notice to repair/replace/remove the sign within 180-days of receipt of the written notice; the Zoning Administrator may grant a reasonable extension of time for the sign to be brought into conformance;
2. Create a new category of signage identified as "local business, off-premise sign", defined as a business that is physically located within the boundaries of Jo Daviess County that is placed on a property other than the location of the business, intended to promote local business enterprises in the County; subject to the following restrictions: double-faced signs permitted, limited to no greater than 32 square feet/sign face with an overall height above the adjacent grade of no greater than 20 feet to the top of the sign; no more than one local business off-premise sign structure shall be situated on a property; sign structures may advertise more than one business as long as all other criteria of this section are met; local business, off-premise signs may be erected no closer than one (1) mile from any other off-premise sign, including traditional billboards (in determining compliance with this standard, signs on both sides of the highway corridor shall be considered; and the sign shall be continually maintained in good condition

Seconded by Steve McIntyre.

MINUTES – PC/ZBA

June 17, 2026 (Continued Hearing RE: Text Amendments)

Discussion:

Hill asks if we are going to modify anything like the one mile.

McIntyre states we can make a comment to the County Board to look at that.

McIntyre comments that he would like to see discussed about the number of off-premise signs for a particular business as well as how far away they are from a municipality. I like the idea of having the distance so many miles from a municipality.

Hill states I like what you had in mind as far as being within the distance of the municipality of mile and a half to two miles, whatever, really no further than that.

The motion carried by roll call vote. Ayes – Ron Mapes, Peter Huschitt, Gary Diedrick, Don Hill, Steve McIntyre. Ayes: 5. Nays – None. Nays: 0. Absent: 0.

VI. New Business (None)

None

VII. Citizens' Comments (Matters not otherwise on the Agenda)

Diane Gallagher

Thank you Mr. Chairman I just want to thank you so much for the service that you're providing with the zoning board. And I think we have to remember that because of your broader experience as a zoning board and knowledge of the county issues, just like our economic development group has very much experience in looking at some of the growth issues they want to help with and our Comprehensive Plan did talk about the changing population, the decrease in the young families and how important economic growth will be for the future. And I think we probably got the cart a little bit before the horse when you started the project because we haven't defined our problems and maybe that's because we're so proud of how good the county works but there are problems that are going to occur in the future if we don't look at some ways to step around those. So thank you for your service and help us in any way you can to acquaint the public with some issues that maybe they won't experience because they're in their retirement years but our young families are experiencing now and any potential families we have will go elsewhere. Thank you very much that's all.

Carol Schwerdtfeger

Number one just echoing Diane's comments these agenda packets that your committee prepares and the professional, orderly, patient, polite way you run all of your hearings is truly appreciated and you

don't see it all that often. And I want you to support your efforts totally because I've learned there's a movement of foot on the part of a few of the board members to overrule your unanimous recommendation regarding the 40-acre rule. I just wanted to go on record and as encouraging the county board as a whole to support the recommendation when especially when it's unanimous vote on the part of this committee when you recommend to the board. In my understanding if they didn't it would be the first time regarding a text amendment that that happened. And I don't think there'd be enough support to get it passed but I just wanted to go on record encouraging the county board to accept the professional recommendation because you guys are all trained in the field experienced in the field you know what works and what doesn't and like someone else said you know if it ain't broke don't fix it. We appreciate your system that you have perfected with in regard to that rural development. In addition to that I wanted to address the affordable housing concerns because initially a lot of people came to that first hearing thinking, the realtors particularly that was that came and sat next to us because they thought we were going to be there to back that too. And then the other night even when we met with Mike Dittmar, Daisha Boehm, and Jacob Ambrosia, we thought maybe we're going to hear more about the affordable housing thing, I came well researched and well prepared with ideas for them and I think that that would be a wonderful topic for the or a different ad hoc committee to work on because there are so many in fact I did a quick summary of what there is because we all share the same goals and because the development of rural residential properties is a net loss to the county per the City of Galena review in the initial agenda packet it reads the fiscal impacts of rural residential development is a net cost it goes on to say the cost of community service studies consistently show rural residential development is the fiscal liability requiring a dollar and two cents to two dollars and eleven cents in services for every one dollar generated in tax revenue. Because there are currently between 369 and 419 active residential listings for sale in Jo Daviess County and because on land.com alone there are currently 52 rural properties ranging in size from 1.01 acres to 156 acres with home prices starting at 149.9 a little home on 1.18 acre.

Huschitt states I think we're getting a little mixed here so some of what you're talking about sounds like to me what we would have talked about at the May 27th meeting, which we're not opening up we can't talk about that I would suggest due to the lateness of the hour perhaps if you have some suggestions for affordable housing, you're welcome to share that at a future meeting here at the county board. But I'm getting a little bit of some of these facts and figures were shared on May 27th and we opened with we are not here to talk about what we've already talked about in the last meeting on May 27.

Okay, pardon me it's always been my philosophy where there's a problem to offer a solution and I would be happy to be involved with such to do a survey and just see how many right how many already surveyed plots are available so we don't have to tear up more.

LaDon Trost

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you so much for being here tonight. In 2016 I retired from law enforcement after spending 46 years on the job and that same year I decided I'm going to run for the county board because I love this county. My family's lived here all their lives and it's just a beautiful place to live. A couple weeks ago for example, my wife and I pulled the corvette out of the garage and went for a little ride and we rode for about 135 miles never left Jo Daviess County. It's a beautiful place to be at. I've been this is my second term as chairman of the county board, my term is over in November. I'm counting the days. Almost every county board meeting prior to me being a chairperson and also as chairperson we talked about the problems the board felt with it was with the with zoning and most of the time it was the 40-acre rule of course, but there were other things too that came up and the board felt that there needed to be the zoning need to be more business friendly shall we say. So, I decided that we put together an ad hoc zoning committee, it was hard putting a good committee together. We had I think we ended up with a with a great committee, Cory Cassens was I signed as chairperson and he was just great at that job. did a great job. When I say that things we need to look into our business population in this county. A few months ago, I did a pop study and one of the studies was on population of the county residents. I checked my authority which was the reserve bank in St. Louis they keep track of everything and I found out in the seven county areas since the census every single county in the seven districts in northern Illinois has decreased in population except for one, that was Jo Daviess County. Our population increased and I also did a study on school populations and I checked what populations in schools with Dubuque and Jackson County in Iowa and Lafayette and Grant in Wisconsin, their school populations have all increased but every single school population in Jo Daviess County has decreased. So, what does that study tell you. That study tells you that our population of young people is leaving this county with their families but more retired people are moving in. That can be overall of a problem and that was one of the reasons that I wanted to put this committee together. The only comment that I make is that I wish that members of the population of the county would have come to some of these ad hoc meetings. They were always published and as were the agendas were announced prior to it but not one person ever showed up, not one in the whole county. I really thank you tonight for what you did. You studied over this and I think you made some good choices and I thank you very much for working on. Thank you.

John Schultz

La Don pretty much stole my thunder on the ad hoc committee. It was they ran for about a year and a half, it was publicized. I attended all but I think the first meeting and almost every time if not every time I was the only person not on the committee who was in attendance. So the people that complained about not being able to participate it was their own fault. And I'm not happy about that participate or not complain.

Mike Dittmar

I just want to say thank you guys.

VIII. Reports and Comments (Commission Members and Staff)

Huschitt states we have our regular meeting next week. I will be gone for the regular Zoning Board of Appeals meeting on June 24th.

IX. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by Don Hill and seconded by Ron Mapes.

The motion carried by roll call vote. Ayes – Peter Huschitt, Gary Diedrick, Don Hill, Steve McIntyre, Ron Mapes. Ayes: 5. Nays – None. Nays: 0. Absent: 0.

**The next REGULAR meeting of the Planning Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals will be held on
Wednesday, June 24, 2026**

DRAFT