

**VILLAGE OF RIVERSIDE, ILLINOIS  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING**

Wednesday, February 26, 2020 7:00 pm  
Riverside Township Hall, Room 4

1. Call to Order: 7:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call:

Present: Chairperson Mateo  
Commissioner May  
Commissioner Marhoul  
Commissioner Miller

Absent: Commissioner Henaghan  
Commissioner Mathews  
Commissioner Pelletier

Also in attendance: CD Director Abt  
Mgmt. Analyst Bouman  
Village Attorney Marrs  
Trustee Pollock  
Martha Ryan-Toye, Superintendent of Schools, D96  
D96 Consultants from DLA Architects, WT Group and Sam  
Schwartz Engineering

3. Approval of Minutes:

A. Planning & Zoning Commission Regular Meeting and Public Hearing Minutes of January 22, 2020

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Commissioner Marhoul, seconded by Commissioner Miller.

Voice vote. 4 Ayes. 0 Nays.

**Motion passed.**

4. Visitors, Petitions, Citizen Requests, and Communication: None.

5. Liaison Report:

A. Village Board Update:

Director Abt stated the Blythe Park Elementary School Special Use Expansion was approved by the Village Board at the last board meeting.

6. Public Hearings and Recommendations:

A. PZ19-07 86 Southcote, 92 Repton, 443 Loudon – Expansion of and Existing Special Use Permit and several variations – To Allow for a 2-story Classroom Addition to the Existing Elementary School (Ames Elementary) and Parking Lot and Playground Improvements.

1. PUBLIC HEARING to consider an application to expand an existing special use and for several variations from the bulk, permitted encroachment, parking and landscape requirements to allow a 2-story classroom addition to an existing elementary school and associated parking lot and playground improvements in the R1-A Single Family Zoning District. Petitioner:

Riverside School District (D96).

*Chairperson Mateo opened the Public Hearing.*

Attorney Marrs noted that since Commissioner Marhoul had recused himself from the hearing there were only 3 member of the Commission present and therefore no quorum.

Commissioner Miller motioned to continue the hearing to a Special Meeting on March 11, 2020, Commissioner May seconded the motion.

All Commissioners voted in favor.

The Public Hearing is continued until March 11, 2020

*Commissioner Marhoul rejoined the meeting.*

7. Old Business:

- A. Remand to Planning and Zoning Commission of PZ19-08 Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments – Gravel Driveways for further input on gravel driveway issues, including but not limited to allowing decorative pea gravel driveways on non-landmarked homes, listing additional pervious materials for driveways and discussion of the pros and cons of crushed gravel driveways.

Director Abt reported that the Planning and Zoning Commission of the Village of Riverside (“PZC”) held a December 16, 2019 Public Hearing on Text Amendments to the Riverside Zoning Ordinance relative to gravel driveways. Following the public hearing, the PZC submitted Findings of Fact and a Recommendation on the Text Amendments to the Village Board of Trustees. At their January 16, 2020 meeting, the Board of Trustees remanded the matter back to the Planning and Zoning Commission for further consideration of the following issues not originally considered by the PZC:

- Discuss allowing decorative pea gravel driveways for non-landmarked properties
- Discuss listing additional pervious pavement options to reflect the Village’s preference for permeable materials
- Evaluate the pros and cons of allowing crushed gravel driveways.

Additionally the Board of Trustees directed Staff to verify the number of gravel driveways to determine the actual impact of the code change.

Director Abt provided some background on the gravel driveway issues remand, and outlined the Village Board’s request. She also explained that at the Board’s direction, she surveyed the entire community and did find a few additionally affected properties. These were primarily parking pads or garage aprons located adjacent to alleys in the Village. A gravel area between adjacent driveways was also found during the survey. There are a total of 35 gravel driveways/parking pads; Director Abt had previously identified 29 properties and has identified 6 additional properties.

Director Abt went over the pros and cons of gravel driveways. Pros included cost, permeability (for pea gravel only), longevity, and no negative impact on public infrastructure (i.e. streets and sewers) provided it is located on private property, not in the public parkway. Cons included

additional maintenance compared with a traditional paving material, weeds, potholes/ruts, crushed gravel is not permeable, dust, and difficulty with snow removal.

She also explained the standards for a pea gravel driveway to be considered permeable. Director Abt also noted that there are no specific construction standards for gravel driveways in the Building Code, if new gravel driveways were to be allowed, a building code amendment would need to be added with those standards.

Director Abt also noted that the Department of Public Works does not object to allowing gravel driveways on private property where appropriate and properly maintained, but does not support allowing gravel in the parkway for driveway aprons.

A list of additional permeable pavement types were also provided. These included: permeable pavers, pea gravel, permeable concrete, porous asphalt, grasscrete or other similar void structures.

*Chairperson Mateo invited comments from the public.*

Resident Tom Holechek pointed out that as the driveways at Indian Gardens Park and the Scout Cabin are gravel the Village is also out of compliance. He wanted assurances that the Village will be held to the same standards as the residents and he indicated that these changes would only be at a very large cost to the Village.

Resident Richard Albertsen stated that he has had and maintained a gravel driveway for many years. He objects to the provision that requires gravel driveways be replaced within a year of the sale of the property as he feels it is taking away a substantial amount of money for the sale of his home.

Resident Ladd Kulhanek of 99 Groveland feels that requiring the removal gravel driveways will aggravate the lack of parking around his home. He fears that areas used for parking that are now gravel will not be replaced with concrete and therefore the already limited parking will become even more congested as these parking spaces are eliminated. He also feels that instead of concentrating on gravel driveways the Village should be concentrating efforts on flood control.

The Commission discussed the issues remanded by the Village Board. The Commissioners were in agreement with allowing non-landmarked properties to have permeable, decorative pea gravel driveways with the construction and maintenance standards provided by the Village Engineer and currently outlined in the Zoning Ordinance. The Commission was supportive of permeable pavement options. Commissioner May noted that while it is a more environmentally friendly material, it has maintenance issues and in this climate, snow removal is more challenging, however that is someone's choice for their own property. There was reluctance by the Commission to dictate aesthetics and they did not recommend one decorative gravel type over another.

The Commissioners were unanimously in favor of specifically listing more permeable pavement materials. Commissioner Miller suggested including the void structure grids (similar to grasscrete) for the gravel driveways as well.

The Commission did not believe that the additional six properties found had any impact on their present or previous discussion or Findings and Recommendation.

The Commission discussed the pros and cons. Chairperson Mateo noted that the fact that gravel is not petroleum based should be considered a pro. Commissioner Miller was supportive of the Commission's initial recommendation, noting that she was not at that meeting. However she stated given that the Public Works Department has no issues with the existing gravel driveways and that they were not considered permeable, they were no better or worse than concrete or asphalt driveways, and therefore she did not necessarily see a compelling reason to require them to be replaced. She was in favor of allowing existing gravel driveways to be grandfathered provided they are maintained (i.e. weed free, etc.). She was not necessarily supportive of allowing new ones. Commissioner Marhoul similarly was supportive of allowing existing gravel driveways to be grandfathered provided they were maintained. He noted that enforcement will be the key. Commissioner Miller stated that she did not see equitable reasons for forcing replacement if the homeowner does not want to provided they at least properly maintain the gravel.

Commissioner May did not see a compelling reason to change what they previously recommended at the public hearing. Chairperson Mateo agreed.

The Commission recommended forwarding these findings to the Village Board of Trustees.

- B. Continued discussion of Planned Unit Developments and recommendations to Staff and the Village Board.

Director Abt noted that the Commission's feedback from the January meeting was incorporated into the draft text amendment. She briefly went over the changes and requested feedback from the Commission. Commissioner Miller requested clarification on the provision where the application is deemed to be denied if not acted upon within 60 days. Attorney Marrs stated that this can be waived if agreed upon by both parties.

Commission Marhoul expressed concern that accessory dwellings (ie coach houses) could be changed to single family homes under the PUD application without specific language against it being added. Attorney Marrs indicated that he would add language to prevent this.

After reviewing the draft ordinance and other communities' PUD Ordinances, the Commission recommended allowing Planned Unit Developments in the Village and recommended to the Village Board moving forward with the draft ordinance.

8. New Business: None.

9. Information: None.

10. Adjournment: Commissioner May motioned to adjourn. Commissioner Marhoul seconded. All in favor.

**Meeting adjourned at 8:03 p.m.**