

Planning & Zoning Meeting

May 4, 2026

1. Call Meeting to Order

The meeting was called to order in accordance with the Illinois Open Meetings Act, 5 ILCS 120 by Maria Lewis, chairwoman at 7:00pm. Roll call; Walt Mahaffay, Brad Littleton, Amanda Burns, Cody Krug, Maria Lewis. Also, in attendance were, Trustee Bill Mincey, Kyle Watson, building official and Matt Fritz, village administrator. Absent; Jill Breneman and Jason Peters.

2. Approval of Minutes

The board reviewed the minutes from the April 20, 2026 regular meeting. No corrections were noted.

Motion to approve the minutes was made by Littleton, seconded by Krug. Burns Abstained. Motion carried with all other members voting yes.

3. Public Comment

Lewis opened the floor for public comment from anyone not on the agenda.

Thomas Goetz, 2170 Hideaway Court (Gooselake) expressed concern regarding potential data center development in the area, citing a list of alleged impacts including noise, low-frequency vibration, aquifer depletion, light pollution, groundwater degradation, and effects on livestock and children. He noted the proximity of such a facility to a school and shared his personal concerns as a 100% disabled veteran with PTSD. He requested greater transparency from the board and submitted a written document for the record. Lewis thanked Mr. Goetz and clarified that no data center currently exists in Coal City, directing him to forward any information to Matt Fritz, village administrator.

Donna Petty, 1070 Crystal Lane, Diamond, IL, stated she was in agreement with Goetz's comments.

Janet Van Duyne, of 460 West Daisy Place, expressed concern about the loss of Coal City's small-town character. She specifically referenced noise impacts and questioned the wisdom of siting a data center near the Maple Street senior citizen housing being built, noting that senior residents would not want to endure continuous noise.

The public comment period was then closed.

4. ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS — Vernon Ray Hauschild and David & Debra Hauschild — Map Amendment for Annexation – 253 Acres

i. Presentation of Amendment

Fritz presented the petition on behalf of the owners. The subject property is approximately 253 acres located on the south side of Reed Road, stretching from the Union Pacific railroad tracks eastward to Berta Road, across from Hoffman Transportation. Upon annexation, the property would automatically be classified RS-1; however, the petitioners requested that it instead be zoned Agricultural to allow the land to continue its current use. The primary motivation for annexation is inclusion in an upcoming TIF district amendment. No imminent development is planned.

Deputy Clerk, Linda Sula swore in David Hauschild.

Hauschild stated that Fritz summed up what they were requesting and had no more to add.

ii. Public Comment

Goetz asked for clarification of the annexation. Lewis explained the Hauschilds wanted the same benefits of water/sewer and police as the rest of Coal City and to be included in the TIF District that we have within the community. Goetz asked whether the property was connected to the site for the proposed data center. Fritz confirmed it was farther east and not the same parcel as discussed at a previous public meeting in February. Petty asked whether the property could eventually be used for industrial purposes. Lewis noted the TIF district inclusion was the primary long-term benefit for the petitioners. Trustee Mincey asked Hauschild if they had any plans or anything in the works other than wanting to maintain the property as agricultural. Hauschild stated there were no plans as of now.

iii. Board Consideration

The board reviewed the four criteria required under Table 26 for zoning amendment approval to include:

- Compatible with use or zoning of environment
- Supported by trend of development
- Consistent with the comprehensive plan objectives
- Furthers public interest

Goetz asked in the future could this property be a business and could it go into a data center. Lewis indicated that the corridor along Reed Road near I-55 would be a good venue for large commercial uses such as big-box retail. Currently, the village does not have anything in the plans and nothing has been proposed to that area even though the village has tried to get a Sam's or Cosco to come down here it just has not happened. Goetz asked if it would be possible to eliminate the possibility of a Data Center to go there and stated he would prefer a solar farm or retail there. Lewis explained that a business would come to the village and if it meets with our Comprehensive Plan and what our zoning classifications are the board would have to decide if all the criteria has been met. If it has all been met they would qualify to move forward for their proposed use. Goetz recapped the reason for annexation was for police protection, water, sewer rights. Lewis explained the biggest advantage for Hauschilds is the TIF District and advised Goetz if he would like further information on the TIF he should speak with Fritz as it is an advantage for positioning their land in the future.

iv. Action

Motion to continue the matter to the June 1 regular meeting at 7:00 PM, at which time the public hearing shall be continued and the Village Attorney shall prepare findings of fact for a positive recommendation, was made by Mahaffay, seconded by Burns. The motion was carried with a unanimous roll call vote.

5. PRESENTATION 1- Matthew Fincher-Variance for Shed & Gazebo–930 E. Short

Matthew Fincher, owner of the property at 930 E. Short Street, presented a request for variances to allow an 8×8 shed in the interior side yard with a zero-foot setback from the lot line, and a 10×12 gazebo located within the other interior side yard with less than the required separation from the primary structure. Staff noted that both structures are proposed in locations that do not conform to code — the shed is placed in the interior side yard, which is not permitted, and the gazebo does not meet the required 10-foot separation from the house.

Mr. Fincher explained that an addition to the rear of the home substantially reduced available yard space, leaving the interior side yard as the only practical location. He also noted that an existing double gate limits repositioning options, and that the utility easement running through the rear yard creates concerns about relocating the shed repeatedly for maintenance access. The board acknowledged the constraints imposed by the unusual lot shape and the home addition.

This matter is scheduled for public hearing at the May 18, 2026 regular meeting.

6. PRESENTATION 2- Matthew Dimonte-Variance to Allow Fence within the Front Yard – 85 W. Willow

Matthew Dimonte, owner of the property at 85 W. Willow, presented a request for a variance to replace an existing 4-foot decorative fence with a 6-foot privacy fence within the corner side yard. Because the front door of the home faces Willow Street to the north, the legal front yard is defined differently from the typical orientation. The petitioner's stated purpose is to allow his dogs to roam freely within the yard.

Discussion touched on sight-line concerns at the alley exit adjacent to the property, with the board suggesting the placement of a stop sign at the alley to address traffic safety, making fence height a non-issue from that standpoint. The board reviewed the aerial map showing the existing fence location relative to the property lines and found no substantive objection to the general concept.

This matter is scheduled for public hearing at the May 18, 2026 regular meeting.

7. PRESENTATION 3 — Sam Burnoski (Kozy Resters, LLC) — Map Amendment Lot 4, 5 & 6, Third Avenue Pin#06-35-409-007

Samuel Burnoski of Kozy Resters, LLC presented a proposal to construct two single-family detached homes on the combined parcel at 345 and 355 N. Third Avenue, currently zoned RM-2. The lots, with 91 feet of frontage and 182 feet of depth (approximately 16,562 sq. ft. total), would be subdivided into two parcels of approximately 8,281 sq. ft. each — below the 9,520 sq. ft. minimum required in RM-2, but close to the 7,300 sq. ft. minimum required in RS-3.

Burnoski initially sought a map amendment to RS-3 to facilitate the subdivision, noting that the surrounding neighborhood is predominantly single-family and largely zoned RS-3. He stated that two detached single-family homes would better match neighborhood character than a duplex, which would be a permitted use under RM-2.

The board engaged in extended discussion about whether a map amendment to RS-3 or a variance approach within the existing RM-2 zoning would be more appropriate. Lewis raised concerns that rezoning a small parcel to RS-3 within a broader RM-2 area could constitute spot zoning. Board

members noted that variances would be required under either zoning classification due to deficient lot width (91 feet divided by two yields approximately 45.5 feet per lot, below the 60-foot minimum in RS-3 and the 40-foot minimum in RM-2, though RM-2 carries a larger minimum lot area). Garage dimensions were also identified as a potential variance issue.

The board reached a consensus to leave the zoning as RM-2 and pursue the necessary variances rather than pursue a map amendment, which would introduce a spot-zoning concern. Fritz noted that a city-owned alley parcel to the south, approximately 16.5 feet wide, could be vacated by the Village Board and split with the adjacent neighbor — which Fritz indicated was a long-standing request from that neighbor — potentially providing additional lot area and resolving some dimensional deficiencies. The vacation of the alley can be approved by ordinance at the Village Board level without a public hearing.

The petitioner was directed to return with architectural plans showing the proposed house placement, setbacks, and garage dimensions. Lewis also requested that the petitioner consult Watson regarding drainage conditions in the area, as the street-level grades near the proposed driveway locations were identified as a potential concern.

This matter is scheduled for public hearing at the May 18, 2026 regular meeting.

8. Adjourn

There being no further business before the board, a motion to adjourn was made and seconded. The meeting was adjourned.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Linda Sula". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Linda Sula, Deputy Clerk