



VILLAGE OF RIVERSIDE
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
Minutes of the Regular Meeting
Wednesday, March 23, 2022, 7 pm
Riverside Township Hall, Room 4

I. *Call to Order:* The Regular Meeting of the Village of Riverside Planning and Zoning Commission was held on Wednesday, March 23, 2022. Chairperson Mateo called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

II. *Roll Call:* *Present:* Chairperson Mateo
 Commissioner Brom
 Commissioner Miller
 Commissioner Marhoul
 Commissioner Mathews
 (Via telephone)
 Commissioner Pelletier

Absent: Commissioner Henaghan

Also Present: Village Planner Francisco Jimenez
 Assistant Village Manager Ashley Monroe
 Village Attorney Michael Marris

III. *Approval of Minutes:*

A. Planning & Zoning Commission Regular Meeting and Public Hearing minutes of February 28, 2022

Commissioner Brom made a motion to approve but Commissioner Miller had proposed edits to the minutes and Commissioner Brom rescinded their motion to approve. Revised minutes are to be provided at the next meeting, to include Commissioner Miller's recommended changes and to note that Commissioner Henaghan moved to close the public hearing.

No Action

IV. *Visitors, Petitions, Citizen Requests, and Communications*

None.

V. *Liaison Report:*

- A. Village Board Update – Village Planner Jimenez informed the Planning and Zoning Commission that the Board of Trustees, at their March 17, 2022 meeting, followed the recommendation to approve a variation for a deck five feet (5') from grade and enlargement of the nonconforming deck at 490 Uvedale.
- B. Village Planner Jimenez also informed the Planning and Zoning Commission that the Board of Trustees, at their March 17, 2022 meeting, did not approve the revised fence variation application at 40 Kimbark Rd. following the PZC's recommendation on remand.
- C. Staff also shared an update regarding text amendments on accessory structures and noted that an updated variation application and related materials were being created to make the process more thorough and clear to applicants and to include a timeline involved with a variation.

VI. *Public Hearing and Recommendation*

None.

VII. *Old Business:*

- A. Continuation of discussion on Transit Oriented Development Zoning Code Update

Attorney Marris informed the Commissioners that the proposed TOD changes going through the various meetings will provide the opportunity for the Commission to be thorough with the suggested changes and allow for the amendments to be better tailored to Riverside. Attorney Marris also reminded the Commission that there are a group of standards for the text amendments, but they are not like the variation standards that require all standards to be met. The standards need to be met in a general manner. Commissioner Miller asked if there would be only one opportunity to go through the changes or if there was an opportunity after the initial meetings, but before the public meeting. Attorney Marris responded that the Planning and Zoning Commission would have other opportunities to review and revise any changes to the text amendments.

Assistant Village Manager Monroe explained that at the February 28, 2022 meeting, the Commission reviewed proposed amendments for signs and discussed adoption of a new Transit Oriented Development B-1 overlay district along Harlem Ave. Some of the items discussed pertained to bulk requirements, definitions, and allowed uses in the established zoning districts. The Commissioners then began a page by page review of the draft amendments before them for discussion tonight. Commissioner Miller stated that the Complete Streets approach might limit Riverside in the future if anything changed or if the village disagreed with any of the approaches. Asst. Village Manager Monroe clarified that many municipalities have some version of Complete Streets in their ordinance and it would not be out of place in Riverside. Commission

members clarified the section pertaining to Complete Streets and softened the language in the proposed text amendment.

Commissioner Miller pointed out that there seemed to be some hierarchy with the section pertaining to landscaping and site plan reviews for projects, believing that the residents of Riverside should be the priority before someone that is simply passing through. There was an agreement to change the language to better include all individuals without the need to list a hierarchy. Commissioner Brom agreed that having something all-inclusive is beneficial so as not to exclude any person or group.

Asst. Village Manager Monroe explained that the amendments to Chapter 4, Residential Districts, proposed changes to some terms and the addition of electric charging stations. There was concern among the Commission that some language in the proposed changes was redundant and there was agreement to strike language for clarity. Commissioner Pelletier stated that using relative terms should be limited to make the language less confusing. Commissioner Miller asked why bulk requirements and creating a pedestrian friendly design were intertwined. Both Attorney Marris and Commissioner Marhoul interpreted that section and both stated that the regulations are there to create a more accessible and safe environment.

Discussion regarding assisted and independent living facilities revolved around reasons for assisted facilities allowed as special uses in residential districts and a potential rise in the need to construct living facilities. Asst. Village Manager Monroe explained that the need for a special use might arise due to the unique nature of these buildings and all that is required. Commissioner Marhoul suggested that assisted living facilities not be allowed in the R1 district. There was concern among the Commissioners with small community residences bringing an influx of traffic, but it was clarified that residents at community residences may not traditionally be of a population that owns a vehicle. Attorney Marris also informed the Commission that a special use does not prohibit the permitting of a project, but that it takes the application and ensures that a more in-depth review process takes place.

The Commission suggested splitting the assisted and independent living uses be defined as small or large and to designate them into respective residential districts depending on the intensity of the use of the district. It was suggested that other communities be looked at to understand how other communities regulate zoning for community and older adult housing. There was agreement between the Commissioners in restricting assisted living facilities to some zoning districts in the village and also allowing them as a special use. There was agreement among the Commissioners in better defining assisted living and then agreeing on how to handle those facilities, separate from the TOD amendments.

Commissioners agreed that there needs to be a difference between private electric vehicle charging stations and those that are intended for a business use, and recommended that the portion regarding residential districts be eliminated and those stations in business districts should be reviewed and revised. Asst. Village Manager Monroe brought up multi-unit buildings and that residents in those residentially zoned districts may also own electric vehicles but not be permitted charging locations. Commissioner Miller stated that charging stations that are proposed in business

districts are already regulated and that those stations in residential districts would be excluded. Commissioner Marhoul also clarified that chargers installed in residential districts would be regulated by the existing building code.

Asst. Village Manager Monroe introduced the proposal for minimum building heights and asked the Commission if there were any comments or concerns. Chairperson Mateo had a small edit regarding language. Some Commissioners believed that the language in a footnote which stated that there would be a greater level of review for some projects should be removed so as not to project preference for some uses or others. Commissioner Pelletier stated that the language regarding exterior lighting can be stricter to better mitigate light pollution. The Commission was concerned about light regulations on private property and indicated a preference to strengthen language regarding exterior lighting, including shielding to prevent upward projection, to better mitigate light pollution and regulate or prohibit lighting that is not for safety or practical reasons.

While discussing temporary and permanent structures in business districts and street yards, there was discussion about definitions for “temporary” and for “permanent” and a desire to define a timeframe when something is considered a temporary structure and how to better regulate these structures. Some Commissioners disagreed with the portion of the ordinance that spoke to permanent and temporary structures, as they believed that some businesses would be hampered by zoning allowances. Asst. Village Manager Monroe also clarified that the village may not allow permanent structures due to snow management, visibility concerns, or other operational considerations. The Commission also asked for clarification regarding grade and how to best define it when considering something like a fence. Commissioner Marhoul believed it is best to have a consistent definition for grade to better review permits for fences or other matters. Commissioners discussed the idea of allowing taller fences, up to 8’ (eight feet) in height for properties that abut a public alley or businesses that are near a railroad track.

The Commission believed it was best to remove language regarding landscaped berms and have those applications go through a variation process. There was more discussion regarding definitions and how to best define temporary structures and how to avoid creating non-conformities. Commissioner Marhoul suggested the idea of going back to older definitions that were considered in the past so as to avoid creating any non-conformities.

The Commission accepted the recommendation to add clarifying language into the ordinance regarding the width of existing driveways and those that do not fall within the required setback. Commissioner Miller suggested clarifying language regarding co-working spaces to better reflect that how they are used.

The final discussion related to appendices. Commissioner Miller believed that the special use table was to be changed, but was not aware that anything was actually changed. Asst. Village Manager Monroe stated that she would check in with the TOD committee to gain clarification. Attorney Marrs suggested that since there is a large amount of material that is being covered, a public hearing is not advisable on every item, as there are still tweaks that⁴ will need to be worked out by the Planning and

Zoning Commission, Staff and the consultants. The Commissioners indicated that with the changes they had indicated, at least some of the amendments were ready for public hearing.

- B. Continuation of pervious and impervious surface discussion
Chairperson Mateo tabled the ongoing discussion regarding impervious surfaces to the April 27th, 2022 meeting.

VIII. New Business:

IX. Information:

X. Adjournment

Commissioner Marhoul made a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Brom seconded.

AYES: Commissioners Marhoul, Miller, Brom, Mathews, Pelletier, Mateo.

NAYES: None.

Chairperson Mateo declared the meeting adjourned at 10:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Village Planner, Francisco Jimenez

Date Approved