

**MINUTES OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MEETING HELD ON JUNE 24, 2021
MAIN FLOOR MEETING ROOM OF CITY HALL**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Hartman at 7:32 PM.

Roll call was taken: **Present: Boothman, Gibbs, Goessling, Hagenow, Hartman, Loerch and Poettker**
Absent: none

Chairman Hartman asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes of the May 20, 2021 meeting. Addition of "Motion Fails" was suggested by Chairman Hartman. Minutes approved with changes.

The Chairman asked if there were any citizens to address the Zoning Board of Appeals. There were none.

The Chairman also asked if there were any corrections or deletions to the agenda. There were none.

OLD BUSINESS:

The Chairman asked if there was any old business. There was none.

PETITIONS:

Z-21-06-01 Review and Comment on a Petition by the City of Waterloo, IL for a Special Use Permit to allow for a Public Service Use Facility (Water Tower) to be located at the South East Corner of property owned by the Waterloo VFW at 406 Veteran's Drive. (Parcel No. 07-25-201-001-000)

Mr. Tim Birk of Waterloo, IL and John Wieter of Albers, IL spoke in favor of the new water tower. Mr. Wieter mentioned that the water system is being upgraded. Saying that the current water tower is past its useful life and was done with lead paint which is why they are proposing a new water tower. They considered three locations one of which was the current city hall lot, but determined there wasn't enough room. The fire district property was considered, but the fire department was concerned about their potential expansion options. The VFW property was the third property considered due to the proximity to the existing water lines. Mr. Birk and Mr. Wieter have considered that the VFW property was higher and would be less expensive than the other locations. Mr. Birk mentioned that the VFW membership voted to allow the city to use the property roughly 180-2. The new tank would also allow for a better functionality of flow of the water. The city is in the process of trying to take the use of providing water to the city over from the current provider. This requires a higher storage volume than is currently housed in the ground tanks.

Mr. Gibbs asked what would happen to the old tower. Mr. Birk responded that it has not yet been determined what would happen to the existing tower. The City Council would determine what would happen to the current tower, but the city is getting rent from the companies with receivers on the current tower. The current tank would not be used for holding water.

Mr. Loerch asked where on the fire department property the proposed tank was. Mr. Birk responded that it was a about 50 feet south of the current suggestion of VFW property.

Mr. Gibbs asked how old the main on Veterans Drive was. Mr. Birk responded that it is about 28 years old

Mr. Gibbs also asked about the cost estimates for each location. Mr. Birk provided that verbally

City Hall was about \$3.4 million, Fire Department was about \$3.2 million and VFW was about \$3.1million
There were no other speakers for the petition

The Chairman asked if there were any individuals to speak against the petition.

JoAnn Meier 5249 Deardor Rd, with a realtor office in Waterloo spoke against the petition and provided written documentation. Ms. Meier stated her main purpose for speaking against the petition was because she felt this was very important. She has concerns of this being in a residential area. More importantly and point of frustration is the aesthetic value of where a water tower is located and how that should be seen. Ms. Meier feels that the better location is on the Fire Department property. Ms. Meier stated that the VFW sent a letter to all of the existing members, but only a handful sent their votes back. Ms. Meier said that the members did not have discussion and were upset about the lack of discussion. She stated that the fire district was having a meeting during the Zoning Board meeting which is why no one from the Fire Department was there to clarify the statement from the Fire District. She was told the current statement regarding the use of the Fire Department property was a lie. She was told the fire department called the city to clarify, but were told that the VFW site was the site they were going with. Ms. Meier felt that the neighbors were not aware of the new water tower. Ms. Meier provided minutes from previous City meetings where this was discussed and highlighted the discussions. Ms. Meier stated that the fire district has plenty of room on their property. She feels that from a real estate perspective it will not look right for the residents on the VFW property. Ms. Meier feels that the fire department property is more appropriate than the

VFW because it is a municipal building and a part of the city property. She feels that it will look better on the Fire Department property. Ms. Meier is also upset because she was told the city never went back to the fire department. Mr. Gibbs asked how she would explain that the VFW members did not return the cards, she responded that the members were old and didn't want to fight it. She wanted to be sure that we knew that lack of return meant a yes vote. The member had to return the negative vote for a "no" vote.

Mr. Boothman asked the difference between the two locations. Mr. Birk stated that it is about 60 feet different. Mrs. Meyer stated that looking from the feed mill to the location of the water tower, the better place for it was on the fire department property rather than the VFW property. She feels that it will look better on the Fire Department property than on the VFW property. Discussed the "Special Use" Permit guidelines. Mr. Hartman explained "special use" and the reasons for it. Ms. Meier believes the decision was deliberately hidden. She believes we have the Zoning Board to protect the citizens.

Mr. Gibbs mentioned that most of the petitions are not contested. Asked if Ms. Meier thought that we would have fewer concerned residents if the location is moved. Ms. Meier feels that there are fewer residents that will be impacted by the fire district location.

Mr. Loerch mentioned that we have an existing water tower in a residential area. Ms. Meier mentioned that it was quite old and the current residents chose to live there with the water tower in existence. The current suggested location would not allow the residents to make that decision. Mr. Loerch mentioned that she suggested the water towers in Alton and Chrystal City are seen and asked if she was bothered by those water towers. She said she is not, but those are in locations that they belong.

Susan Floerke 321 N. Library, Waterloo, IL spoke against the petition. She said that some of the property owners in the area would not be in favor of this despite the City receiving the cards. Ms. Floerke stated that there are more residents impacted than just the adjacent property owners. Mr. Hartman stated that it was in the paper for the notification, but Ms. Floerke said that many are older and/or do not get the paper to be able to speak.

Bernadette Dougherty, 317 N. Library, Waterloo IL spoke against the petition and from what she understands the water tower will be in her backyard. She is questioning the ball field that the Catholic School owns. Mr. Wieters noted that they did consider that location, but that the Catholic Church is difficult to deal with and Gibault was not interested in having that done. Ms. Dougherty had several questions that were answered by Mr. Wieter or Chairman Hartman

When construction will begin? Mr. Wieter responded roughly a year or two from now

Will the residents vote on it after a Zoning Board Vote? Mr. Hartman responded, no it would not

What she would see from her back yard? Mr. Weiter responded that they are leaving the trees on each side and the base will be fluted concrete of the tower.

Ms. Dougherty also feels that other residents were not aware and would have concerns. She feels it impacts more than just the adjacent property owners.

Laura Griffin, 302 N. Moore, Waterloo IL also spoke against the petition and has similar concerns as others who spoke against the petition. She has concerns about depreciating house values. Ms. Griffin suggested that some other empty fields on N. Moore and by the Annex Building should be used. Mr. Birk responded that those locations would be more expensive to add more piping because it is further from the ground storage tank and the 16 inch water line. Ms. Griffin asked about putting the new tower in the current location. Mr. Krebel provided the photo showing the areal view of the new water tower being too large for the space available by City Hall.

Ms. Dougherty asked how property values would be impacted. Mr. Krebel provided the information he had gotten from an appraiser, which was that there was potentially a 10% impact, but a market like today would likely have very little impact.

Ms. Poettker asked what color the concrete fluting would be. Mr. Wieter said the mayor had suggested green, but it was still under discussion. The logo will likely be on two sides so you can see it from both directions on Route 3. The City Council will likely decide on the final color of the fluting.

Ms. Dougherty asked if there would be any lights. Mr. Wieter said there would be a security light by the door.

Stan Darter 636 Timberline Drive, Waterloo, IL and Life member of the VFW said the VFW is open to adding trees to the west of the tower as a buffer for the residents.

Mr. Hartman mentioned that it could be suggested in the special use to add trees.

June 24, 2021 Zoning Board of Appeals Mins. – Cont.

Mr. Goessling asked about the location of the ground storage, if that was placed for the location to the current tower. Mr. Goessling asked why the ground storage was put in this location further out of town to allow more flexibility when building a water tower. Mr. Goessling asked if the Fire Department property is out of the question. Mr. Birk responded that it is not out of the question, but it is still under negotiation that he is not privy to disclose.

Mr. Loerch asked why no one near the current water tower was at the meeting to discuss the impact.

Ms. Meier responded that the notice in the paper was not enough to allow people to comment.

Ms. Dougherty asked why there are still negotiations with the fire department. Mr. Birk responded that the VFW is the location the city wants to go.

Ms. Floerke mentioned that the decision was made in executive session and the residents could not comment on that.

Mr. Hartman responded that when finances are discussed the city has to go into executive session (purchasing property, personnel, etc).

Ms. Meier asked why the city did not go back to the fire department to negotiate rather than considering the VFW property. Mr. Krebel responded that he spoke with Fire Chief Shive and he did not bring up the water tower. Ms. Meier said she spoke with him after Mr. Krebel did. Mr. Birk responded that the city felt that they went with the entity that is the best decision for the city. Ms. Meier expressed her concerns again about aesthetics and that it would mesh better on the fire department property.

Mr. Loerch asked Ms. Meier about the conversation with Chief Shive. Ms. Meyer said Chief Shive said that he thought they were in negotiations and that the statement by the city was a lie. Mr. Birk mentioned that Chief Shive would support it on their property, but their board was not fully supportive of it.

Mr. Haganow asked for clarity on the difference the aesthetics were between the VFW and the Firehouse space. Ms. Meier suggested that the water tower was a municipal building that would fit better with the fire district.

Mr. Gibbs mentioned that the VFW site with the trees around it rather than the fire department property without trees may be less obstructive for the residents

Mr. Gibbs motioned that the petition was approved with the stipulation that trees remain as much as possible on the East side and that trees be planted on the West side to mitigate the concerns about aesthetics. Mr. Loerch seconded.

Chairman Hartman asked if there was any further discussion. There was none

Approve: Gibbs, Loerch, Boothman, Haganow, Hartman, Goessling, Poettker

Reject

Motion Passes

NEW BUSINESS:

The Chairman asked if there was any new business. There was none.

COMMENTS:

The Chairman asked if there were any comments. Mr. Krebel mentioned that Planning Commission changed their next meeting to Tuesday July 20th so we need to plan our meeting accordingly. We're planning for our meeting on Wednesday July 21st at Waterloo High School. Mr. Krebel mentioned that he'll do more research for the packets for next meeting. Mr. Haganow mentioned that he had done some research also. Mr. Krebel mentioned that the NARR requirements had barriers as part of the condition. It will be brought up as a topic or condition for that meeting.

Any questions should be sent directly to Mr. Krebel.

Motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:47PM was made by Mr. Loerch and seconded by Mr. Boothman.

**Respectfully Submitted,
Lauren Poettker**