



MINUTES
CITY OF ROCHELLE
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

Monday, July 06, 2026 at 6:00 PM

City of Rochelle Council Chambers—420 North 6th Street, Rochelle, IL 61068

- I. **CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.
- II. **ROLL CALL:** Present were Commissioners Bowerman, Charnock, McKibben, Myers, Tenggren and Wolter. Absent: Hickey. Also present were Michelle Pease, Michelle Knight, City Manager Zeke Jackson and City Attorney Dominic Lanzito.
- III. **APPROVE/ACCEPT MINUTES:** Bowerman moved, seconded by Myers, **"I move the minutes of the June 1, 2026 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting as presented be approved."** Ayes: Bowerman, Charnock, McKibben, Myers, Tenggren and Wolter. Nays: None. Motion carried 6-0.
- IV. **PUBLIC COMMENTARY:** None
- V. **COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:** None
- VI. **BUSINESS ITEMS:** Wolter requested public testimony be sworn for those who were speaking.
- PZC-03-26 Petition of Eugene Judge Jr. for a proposed site plan, landscaping, signage, and building plan for a car wash within a PUD zoning district for the property located at 25-18-378-002.** Pease stated that a notice was published in the paper and property owners were notified. Motion made by Charnock, seconded by Myers, **"I move the Planning and Zoning Commission open the Public Hearing regarding the proposed site plan, landscaping, signage and building plan for a car wash within a PUD zoning district for the property located at 25-18-378-002."** Ayes: Bowerman, Charnock, McKibben, Myers, Tenggren and Wolter. Nays: None. Motion carried 6-0. The petitioner is seeking approval of site plan, building elevations, signage plan and landscaping plan for a previously approved special use permit for the development of a car wash within a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Zoning District. The subject property is located at parcel #25-18-378-002. The parcel is a vacant lot, is .91 acres and is located next to 450 Coronado Drive. The petitioner is now seeking approval of the final development plans prior to issuance of building permits and commencement of construction. The Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council previously reviewed and approved a Special Use Permit allowing a car wash facility within the PUD District. The approval recognized the compatibility of the proposed use with the surrounding commercial development and established the framework for future site development. The petitioner has now submitted detailed development plans including: Site Plan, Building Elevations, Signage Plan, Landscaping Plan, Stormwater and engineering information as required. The purpose of the current review is to determine whether the submitted plans are consistent with the approved Special Use Permit, the intent of the PUD District, and applicable provisions of the Rochelle Municipal Code. Petitioner Eugene Judge Jr. was present to answer any questions. Mr. Judge presented visual boards of the proposed building. Motion made by McKibben, seconded by Bowerman, **"I move the Planning and Zoning Commission close the Public Hearing."** Ayes: Bowerman, Charnock, McKibben, Myers, Tenggren and Wolter. Nays: None. Motion carried 6-0.

Findings:

1. Is the proposed use allowed in the proposed zoning district, but only with a special use permit?
Yes: 6 No: _____
2. Is the proposed use detrimental or dangerous to public health?
Yes: _____ No: 6
3. Will the proposed use impair property value in the neighborhood?
Yes: _____ No: 6
4. Will the proposed use impede the normal development of the surrounding properties?
Yes: _____ No: 6
5. Will the proposed use:
 - (a) impair light and air to adjacent property;
 - (b) congest public streets;
 - (c) increase the risk of fire;

- (d) substantially diminish property values within the vicinity; or
- (e) endanger the public health?

Yes: _____ No: 6

Based on the findings above, the Planning and Zoning Commission hereby recommends to the Rochelle City Council that the Petitioner be granted a special use permit for the proposed development at the Subject Property, with the following conditions attached thereto, in addition to the requirements of the Rochelle Municipal Code:

1. Subject to final City staff review and comments on all plans submitted according to Rochelle Municipal Code requirements. Additional information may be requested by City staff.

2. ARTICLE VII. – PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENTS Per Sec. 110-250 – Purpose (a) The development and execution of zoning regulations is based upon the division of the city into districts in which the use of land and buildings and the bulk and location of buildings and structures in relation to the land are substantially uniform.

Motion made by McKibben, seconded by Myers, **“I move the Planning and Zoning Commission recommend to the City Council that it Approve the proposed site plan, landscaping, signage and building plan for a car wash within a PUD zoning district for the property located at 25-18-378-002, based on the report of findings.”** Ayes: Bowerman, Charnock, McKibben, Myers, Tenggren and Wolter. Nays: None. Motion carried 6-0.

PZC-04-26 Petition of Rochelle Community Hospital for a proposed rezone to R-4 and a variance to construct a building as an ancillary use to the hospital for the property located at 900 N. 3rd Street. Pease stated that a notice was published in the paper and property owners were notified. Motion made by Myers, seconded by Bowerman, **“I move the Planning and Zoning Commission open the Public Hearing regarding the proposed rezone to R-4 and a variance to construct a building as an ancillary use to the hospital for the property located at 900 N. 3rd Street.”** Ayes: Bowerman, Charnock, McKibben, Myers, Tenggren and Wolter. Nays: None. Motion carried 6-0. The petitioner is seeking rezoning of the property located at 900 N. 3rd Street to R-4 High Density Residential District; and a variance to permit the construction of an ancillary hospital support facility and associated parking improvements.

The subject property is located at 900 N. 3rd Street and was formerly a nursing home facility. The property was recently acquired by the Rochelle Community Hospital Association to accommodate future operational needs and support services associated with the hospital. The petitioner proposes to construct a building that will serve as an ancillary use to the hospital campus. The proposed facility will provide: Administrative office space, meeting and training rooms, garage and maintenance facilities, employee support functions and an employee parking lot. The proposed development is intended to support hospital operations while alleviating space constraints on the existing hospital campus. The petitioner requests that the property be rezoned to R-4 High Density Residential District. The hospital campus located immediately across the street is currently zoned R-4. Rezoning the subject property to R-4 would create consistency between the two properties and allow the site to function as an integrated part of the hospital campus. The petitioner has identified the following hardship: (1) The existing hospital campus is substantially developed and constrained by surrounding development. (2) The hospital is effectively landlocked and has limited opportunities for expansion on its current campus. (3) The acquisition of the property at 900 N. 3rd Street provides one of the few available opportunities to accommodate necessary growth and support functions required for continued hospital operations. (4) Relocating administrative offices, meeting space, maintenance operations, and employee parking to the subject property will allow the hospital to better utilize its existing campus for patient care and medical services.

Sec. 110-29. – Variances.

(a) Intent and purpose. A variance is a grant of relief to a property owner from the literal requirements of the zoning ordinance, where literal enforcement would cause undue hardship. Additionally, a variance is intended to provide relief where the requirements of the zoning ordinance render the land difficult to use because of some unique physical attribute of the property itself, or some other factor unique to the property for which the variance is requested. A variance is not intended merely to remove an inconvenience or financial burden that the requirements of the zoning ordinance may impose on a property owner in general. A variance is not intended to allow the establishment of a use that is not otherwise allowed in a zoning district or that would change the zoning district classification of any or all of the affected property, and should not be granted where a special use permit or an amendment to the official zoning map would be more appropriate.

(f) Standards for granting a variance. The planning and zoning commission shall not recommend, and the city council shall not grant, a variance from the regulations of the zoning ordinance unless it makes findings based on evidence presented to it in each specific case that:

- (1) The variance is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning ordinance;
- (2) The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances (65 ILCS 5/11-13-4) and thus strict enforcement of the zoning ordinance would result in practical difficulties, or impose exceptional hardships, due to the special and unusual conditions that are not generally found on other properties in the same zoning district;
- (3) The property cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted only under the conditions allowed by the zoning ordinance; and
- (4) The variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality, and will not be a substantial detriment to adjacent property.

(g) Burden of proof. In each case of a requested variance, the applicant must satisfy the proof that the proposed variance meets the standards of subsection (f) of this section, even if there is no testimony or other evidence opposing or rebutting the requested variance. Kacey Chadwick, Attorney representing Rochelle Community Hospital explained the intent of the rezone and variance. Mrs. Chadwick explained the existing structure will be demolished and the intent for the façade of the new building is to blend with the current hospital as well as the residential area in which it resides. Commissioner Tenggren asked about the garage/maintenance portion of the building. Chadwick stated that the garage/maintenance portion is no longer in the plans for the new building. Motion made by Bowerman, seconded by Charnock, **“I move the Planning and Zoning Commission close the Public Hearing.”** Ayes: Bowerman, Charnock, McKibben, Myers, Tenggren and Wolter. Nays: None. Motion carried 6-0.

Findings: (Variance)

1. Is the proposed variance in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning ordinance?
Yes: 6 No: _____
2. The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances and thus strict enforcement of the zoning ordinance would result in practical difficulties, or impose exceptional hardships, due to the special and unusual conditions that are not generally found on other properties in the same zoning district?
Yes: 6 No: _____
3. The property cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted only under the conditions allowed by the zoning ordinance?
Yes: 6 No: _____
4. Is the proposed variance detrimental or dangerous to public health?
Yes: _____ No: 6
5. Will the proposed variance impair property value in the neighborhood?
Yes: _____ No: 6
6. Will the proposed variance impede the normal development of the surrounding properties?
Yes: _____ No: 6
7. Will the proposed variance:
(a) impair light and air to adjacent property;
(b) congest public streets;
(c) increase the risk of fire;
(d) substantially diminish property values within the vicinity; or
(e) endanger the public health?
Yes: _____ No: 6

Based on the findings above, the Planning and Zoning Commission hereby recommends to the Rochelle City Council that the Petitioner be granted a variance for the Subject Property, without conditions other than the other applicable requirements of the Rochelle Municipal Code.

Findings: (Rezone)

1. Is the proposed zoning consistent with surrounding properties?
Yes: 6 No: _____
Explanation: _____
2. Is the proposed zoning detrimental or dangerous to public health?
Yes: _____ No: 6
Explanation: _____
3. Will the proposed zoning impair property value in the neighborhood?
Yes: _____ No: 6
Explanation: _____

4. Will the proposed zoning impede the normal development of the surrounding properties?

Yes: _____ No: 6

Explanation: _____

5. Will the proposed zoning:

- (a) impair light and air to adjacent property;
- (b) congest public streets;
- (c) increase the risk of fire;
- (d) substantially diminish property values within the vicinity; or
- (e) endanger the public health?

Yes: _____ No: 6

Based on the findings above, the Planning and Zoning Commission hereby recommends to the Rochelle City Council that the Petitioner be granted zoning for the proposed use at the Subject Property, without conditions other than the other applicable requirements of the Rochelle Municipal Code.

Motion made by Bowerman, seconded by Charnock, **“I move the Planning and Zoning Commission recommend to the City Council that it Approve the proposed rezone to R-4 and a variance to construct a building as an ancillary use to the hospital for the property located at 900 N. 3rd Street, based on the report of findings.”**

Ayes: Bowerman, Charnock, McKibben, Myers, Tenggren and Wolter. Nays: None. Motion carried 6-0.

PZC-05-26 Petition of the City of Rochelle for a proposed Text Amendment to Section 110-545 (Residential, security and farm fences). Pease stated that a notice was published in the paper and property owners were notified. Motion made by Myers, seconded by Bowerman, **“I move the Planning and Zoning Commission open the Public Hearing regarding the proposed Text Amendment to Section 110-545 (Residential, security and farm fences).”**

Ayes: Bowerman, Charnock, McKibben, Myers, Tenggren and Wolter. Nays: None. Motion carried 6-0. The City of Rochelle is proposing a text amendment to Chapter 110 (Zoning), Article V (Districts), Division 2 (Residential Districts), Section 110-545 (Residential, Security and Farm Fences) to allow the installation of safety netting barriers on residential properties that directly abut the golf course. The proposed amendment recognizes that golf safety netting systems are unique structures designed for a specific protective purpose and differ substantially from conventional residential fencing. The amendment establishes a regulatory framework that allows such installations while maintaining appropriate design, safety and maintenance standards. The text amendment would:

- * Allow safety netting barriers only on residential properties directly contiguous to a golf course.
 - * Limit installation to the rear property line shared with the golf course.
 - * Require a permit from the City Building Official prior to installation or modification.
 - * Establish a maximum allowable height of twenty (20) feet.
 - * Require durable, weather-resistant materials and non-reflective, dark-colored netting designed to minimize visual impacts.
 - * Require installation in accordance with manufacturer specifications.
 - * Require ongoing maintenance by the property owner.
 - * Provide enforcement authority should the structure become damaged, hazardous, unsightly, or fail to serve its intended purpose. Resident Silva Jose Manuel Gomez, 112 Shirley Avenue, stated he did not understand the purpose of the fence; however he was provided clarification that the fence was not required by homeowners, it will be allowed, if they choose to install one, with a building permit. Commissioner Charnock shared concern regarding neighbors views being obstructed; however public notices were sent out and there were no responses. Motion made by Myers, seconded by Tenggren, **“I move the Planning and Zoning Commission close the Public Hearing.”**
- Ayes: Bowerman, Charnock, McKibben, Myers, Tenggren and Wolter. Nays: None. Motion carried 6-0.

Findings:

1. Is the proposed amendment consistent with the comprehensive plan?

Yes: 6 No: _____

2. Will the proposed amendment adversely affect public health, safety or general welfare?

Yes: _____ No: 6

3. Is the proposed amendment necessary because of changed or changing social values, new planning concepts, or other social, technological, or economic conditions in the areas affected?

Yes: _____ No: 6

Motion made by Myers, seconded by Tenggren, **“I move the Planning and Zoning Commission recommend to the City Council that it Approve the proposed text amendment to Section 110-545 (Residential, security and farm fences), based on the report of findings.”** Ayes: Bowerman, Charnock, McKibben, Myers, Tenggren and Wolter. Nays: None. Motion carried 6-0.

VII. DISCUSSION ITEMS: None

VIII. ADJOURNMENT: Motion made by McKibben, seconded by Charnock, **“I move to adjourn the regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission of July 6, 2026.”** Motion carried by voice vote 6-0. The Planning and Zoning Commission adjourned at 6:46 p.m.

Michelle Knight
Community Development Specialist