

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

Wednesday, January 22, 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 Matthews
Commissioner Miller
Commissioner Pelletier

Absent: Commissioner Henaghan

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

Director Abt introduced Will Bouman to the Commission. She noted that he is the Village's new Management Analyst working in the Community Development Department and would also be serving as a Staff Liaison to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Chairperson Mateo welcomed Mr. Bouman.

3. **Approval of Minutes:**

A. Planning & Zoning Commission Regular Meeting and Public Hearing Minutes of December 16, 2019

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Commissioner May, seconded by Commissioner Mathews.

Voice vote. 6 Ayes. 0 Nays.

Motion passed.

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

5. **Liaison Report:**

A. Village Board Update:

Chairperson Mateo asked Trustee Pollock about the Gravel Driveway Text Amendment. Trustee Pollock deferred to Staff. Director Abt stated the Village Board had remanded the text amendment back to the Planning and Zoning Commission for further discussion of acceptable gravel materials, and for Staff to provide a more accurate count of existing gravel driveways. She stated it would come back before them in February.

6. New Business:

A. Pre-hearing discussion of proposed Ames Elementary School Addition – 86 Southcote Rd. and related zoning items.

Commissioner Marhoul recused himself from the discussion for this item. He noted that he is a member of the D96 Board of Education.

Director Abt stated that D96 is proposing to build an addition to Ames School as part of their long range facility plan to address increased enrollment and other learning needs. This addition will allow the school to alleviate crowding at other schools and address other programmatic needs. In order to build the addition, the school district has purchased two adjacent properties, 92 Repton and 443 Loudon. 92 Repton has already been demolished and 443 Loudon will be demolished in preparation for this project.

They have submitted zoning applications for this addition. Director Abt outlined some of the zoning relief they are requesting

- Expansion of the special use permit for the existing elementary school.
- Variations from the required building setbacks
- Variations from the Building Coverage and Impervious Surface requirements
- Variations from parking lot setback and drive aisle width requirements
- Variations from parking lot landscaping requirements
- Variation to allow a dumpster enclosure in the street yard.
- Variation to allow a fence to exceed 4 ft. in height

Staff believed given the complexity of this project, it would be beneficial for the applicant and the Commission to have a preliminary review of the project so if there are any issues that require some clarification or additional information, there is an opportunity to gather that information for the public hearing. This project will be on the February 26th agenda for a public hearing and recommendation from the Planning and Zoning Commission.

The project includes:

- 2-story addition on the rear of the building
- Reconfiguration and expansion of the existing parking lot
- Creation of playground areas to the east of the school
- Improvements to student drop off on Southcote

Director Abt stated she had provided the Commission with a copy of the Plat of Survey outlining where the original property lines were and where the new property lines with the additional property are for their reference and then outlined some of the existing conditions and proposed conditions for the Commission.

Chairperson Mateo then opened the discussion to the Commissioners.

The Commission had questions about:

- Fencing the play area
- The impervious surface area and whether any thought had been given to more permeable surfaces

- Drainage
- Parking
- Hardship or practical difficulty
- Drop-off plan
- Dumpster location
- Greenspace
- Landscaping
- Lighting

Commissioner Mathews asked about the fencing requirements for the play area and if there was a code that required the play area to be fenced. Mr. Kelley stated there was not a code requirement however the district believed it was an important safety measure. He noted they tried to utilize an open “wrought iron” style fence.

Several Commissioners expressed concern about the amount of impervious surface. They questioned why more permeable surfaces or greenspace had not been incorporated into the plan. Chairperson Mateo noted that this was a big ask from the Village. She stated the Village has been utilizing green infrastructure in their capital projects and has two permeable paver parking lots, Commissioner Miller agreed with Chairperson Mateo. She also had some questions about how drainage was being handled.

Mr. Kelley stated that separating parking and play impacted the amount of greenspace they could provide. The engineer, Mr. Green, stated that there are maintenance issues with permeable materials. He noted they can be challenging to clean. Grasscrete is easier to maintain, but he was not sure an option like grasscrete would be feasible in the play area due to trip hazards, but stated it was not feasible for the parking lot either due to striping issues.

Mr. Green also went over the drainage for the project explaining that there are three watersheds on the property; the northwest, the southwest and the southeast. He stated that there will be a gravel detention area under the new parking lot that will hold storm water and slowly release to the Loudon sewer, in the southwest area they are adding a landscape island which is reducing that runoff area by 18%. In the southeast, they are picking up storm water to another gravel underground detention area. He explained that currently the site drains towards the low area of Repton, the play area will have a small curb to divert stormwater to a catch basin which will go to the detention area. This should decrease the runoff to the adjacent properties and reduce the amount of ponding that occurs during large storm events.

Commissioner May encouraged the Petitioners to take the extra step to go to permeable pavers. Commissioner Miller asked for an explanation of what the stormwater reductions mean.

Mr. Green stated that they are reducing the rate at which water leaves the site. The parking lot is only providing a 1% reduction, however the northwest side is providing an 18% reduction and the play area a 13% reduction. Mr. Green also stated that there might be some cost effective solutions to incorporate more permeable materials, for example utilizing permeable pavers at low spots.

Chairperson Mateo asked why they needed landscaping variances. Mr. Kelley stated that they

were trying to provide the required parking and in order to accomplish that, it limited how much landscaping they could provide. He explained that they tried to provide the required area if not in exactly the form specified by code with one island for each 5 parking spaces. He noted the site is constrained and so they had to encroach into the required landscape perimeter with the parking lot. The proposed parking lot provides for a safer traffic pattern.

Chairperson Mateo also asked why they needed the fence variation, what was the hardship or practical difficulty? Mr. Kelley stated that they were trying to provide some architectural significance with the posts to blend with the building and the residential neighborhood aesthetic. Chair Mateo noted those were aesthetic situations and not hardships. She reminded them that there are standards for variations that the Commission has to find in order to recommend approval of any variation. She advised them to review and provide answers for each variation being requested.

Mr. Kelley explained that they were trying to balance meeting the school and district's needs while being a good neighbor and improving the site.

Commissioner Mathews asked for some clarification about drop off in the rear and why all drop off could not occur in the parking lot. Ms. Disney-Haufe, the Petitioner's Traffic Engineer, explained that they only planned to have the early-learner drop off in the rear utilizing the parking lot. There was significantly less queue associated with this drop off. She also noted that the queue for elementary drop-off was about 98 cars which could not be accommodated on the site, therefore they determined to keep the elementary drop-off at the curb in front of the school. She noted they are proposing to widen the sidewalk at the curb and lengthen the drop off area to accommodate more cars. They are relocating a crosswalk to make it safer for both pedestrians and motorists as well as utilizing cones to bookend the curbside areas for drop off and have a Traffic Control person at Southcote and Repton. Commissioner Mathews stated that the plan sounded logical.

Commissioner May asked about the location of the trash enclosure and why it could not be placed in a side yard closer to the building. He questioned where the hardship was. Mr. Kelley stated that access would happen from the parking lot, they looked at different turn studies and the proposed location was the closest spot they could locate the trash enclosure while working with the traffic flows, taking into consideration proximity to the playground on the other side of the building. He noted that the enclosure was approximately 80 feet from Loudon and therefore was far away from the adjacent residence but still technically located in the Loudon street yard.

Commissioner Miller noted that she sees the hardship for the parking lot and asked if they had considered an opaque fence. She noted that for the commercial districts an opaque fence meets the screening requirements. She also had some questions about the lighting.

Mr. Kelley stated that for new lighting there would be two new light poles and new wall packs. He noted they have a dimming function. The light poles were 14 ft. tall and the lights would have full cut-offs.

Chairperson Mateo asked if the trees are on the neighbor's property or the school's. She also asked if the fencing was staying. Mr. Kelley stated they were on private property and would be

staying. Commissioner May suggested they look into the fencing further and removing the chainlink fencing if possible. Commissioner Miller asked about the fencing on the east side. It was noted that the fencing would be stopping before the parking lot on the east side however there was landscape screening on that side.

There were no further comments from the Commission. The Commissioners thanked the Petitioners for bringing this before them early, noting it was very helpful.

Commissioner Marhoul rejoined the meeting.

7. Old Business:

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

Director Abt provided an overview of the PZC Planned Unit Development (PUD) discussion from November meeting. Riverside does not currently have PUD regulations but many neighboring communities do have PUD regulation. The Village Board stated that they would like PZC commission input, especially in light of the ongoing zoning code update process. She noted that Attorney Marrs provided the commission with a draft PUD ordinance that draws from neighboring communities while incorporating Riverside-specific items like landscaping and historic preservation.

Attorney Marrs stated that to his knowledge, Riverside is the only neighboring community that does not have a PUD ordinance. He noted that, while not all of the communities with PUD ordinances have used them, they have them on hand should the need arise. The PUD ordinance provides both communities and developers with flexibility. He discussed elements of neighboring PUD ordinances that can, but do not need to be, included, such as requiring minimum lot sizes. He also discussed some examples from Hinsdale and River Forest where PUD ordinances have been utilized.

Attorney Marrs discussed the draft ordinance provided to the Commission, describing it as a framework for further discussion. Most ordinances begin with a purpose section that states its goals and objectives. He highlighted how the "Exceptions From District Regulations" section provides communities with tools for granting projects multiple variations from the underlying zoning in exchange for additional requirements on the development. He used the Ames School discussion as an example where a PUD ordinance may be of use.

Attorney Marrs further explained that PUD processes can provide flexibility because the process itself is very detailed. The PUD process follows:

- Pre-application consultation with staff (which can include an initial presentation with the board for feedback)
- Optional Concept Plan Consultation
- Preliminary Plan – more detailed presentation of site plans
- Final Plan – carries forward the feedback incorporated during preliminary plan step

There are approval standards specific to PUD process, but the process itself is classified as a special use process by the state. There are provisions for amending PUD plans after the process

has been approved.

Chairperson Mateo stated that she had asked Staff to share nearby PUD ordinances with the commissioners. Attorney Marrs suggests that the commission talk about the draft ordinance in the packet and look over the nearby PUD ordinances provided by chairperson Mateo before the next meeting.

Chairperson Mateo asked how public benefit is determined and “how much” can be asked for from developers.

Attorney Marrs responded that the determination of public benefit is an opportunity for creativity in the development process. He mentioned the fence and impervious surface discussions from the earlier Ames School discussion, as examples. Chairperson Mateo stated that some nearby communities include additional items in their public benefits sections and wondered what level of specificity is ideal in the text. Attorney Marrs suggested that certain desires can be placed in the purpose or exceptions section to “telegraph” intent without necessarily creating standards for individual items. Chairperson Mateo suggested future discussion on whether to include language that specifically addresses how public benefit is determined.

Commissioner Marhoul noted that as currently written, PUD’s would be allowed in any zoning district, and asked whether the board wants to allow them in R-1 districts. Attorney Marrs agreed that the PUD process is “not really appropriate” for a single-family home. Commissioner Marhoul suggested that the language in question be “tightened up.” Director Abt responded that Ames School is zoned R-1A, so limiting the process to non-R-1 districts would remove a PUD as an option in the future for similar projects. Commissioner Marhoul then suggested adjusting the wording to restrict “single-family homes” from the PUD process instead of by zoning district. Chairperson Mateo asked if others were in favor of clarifying that the PUD process is not to be use for single-family homes. Many verbally agree.

Chairperson Mateo suggested adding a standalone statement affirming Riverside’s landmark status in the purpose section and a provision for adaptive reuse of existing buildings. The commission concurred.

Commissioner Miller asked about enforcement as it applies to PUD developments. Attorney Marrs stated that if public improvements are happening, bonds will still be in force and final approval will still be contingent on the development meeting the criteria agreed upon during the PUD process.

Chairperson Mateo stated the there is no reason to rush this process, but also does not see reason to “slow walk” the proposed PUD ordinance process. Chairperson Matteo noted that there are other sites where this process would be useful. Commissioner Marhoul agreed, suggesting the properties at Burlington and Harlem as potential sites for redevelopment.

Attorney Marrs stated that he would incorporate their comments into the draft ordinance for further discussion at the next meeting and the agenda can leave it open for them to make a possible recommendation to the Village Board. There was a question about whether it would be a public hearing. Director Abt stated that the Board wanted feedback from the Commission before

they decided to move forward with a text amendment. If the Board agrees to move forward with PUDs then the draft ordinance would come back before the Commission for a public hearing.

8. Information: None.
9. Adjournment: Chairperson Matteo motioned to adjourn. Commissioner Marhoul seconded. All in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 9:17 p.m.