



VILLAGE OF RIVERSIDE, ILLINOIS  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING  
Minutes

I. *Call to Order:* The Regular Meeting of the Village of Riverside Planning and Zoning Commission was held on Wednesday, April 26, 2023. Commissioner Henaghan called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

II. *Roll Call*

Commissioner Marhoul  
Commissioner Miller  
Commissioner Brom  
Commissioner Henaghan

*Absent:* Chairperson Mateo  
Commissioner Mathews  
Commissioner Pelletier

*Also Present:* Village Attorney Marris  
Village Planner Cyran

As Chairperson Mateo was absent, Commissioner Marhoul made a motion to appoint Commissioner Henaghan as temporary Chairperson. Commissioner Brom seconded.

AYES: Commissioners Marhoul, Miller, Brom, and Henaghan.

NAYS: None.

**Motion passed.**

III. *Approval of Minutes:*

A. Planning & Zoning Commission Regular Meeting minutes of March 22, 2023.

Commissioner Marhoul made a motion to approve the meeting minutes. Commissioner Miller seconded the motion.

AYES: Commissioners Marhoul, Miller, Brom, and Henaghan.

NAYS: None.

**Motion passed.**

Planning and Zoning Commission  
Regular Meeting Minutes  
April 26, 2023

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

None.

V. *Liaison Report:*

A. Village Board Update

Planner Cyran reported the Village Board considered the 95 Groveland Ave variation requests on April 6. Regarding the second story structure, the Board voted 6-0 to rely on staff's historical interpretation that the type structure in question was not a deck, that it was allowed by right, and a variation was not required since it is allowed by right. Regarding the front deck structure, the Board voted to deny the variation. However, the Board directed the Planning and Zoning Commission to consider amendments to the Zoning Code for that area of the Village to allow front porches and decks and to then share their thoughts with the Board.

The Village Board considered the Central-Hauser variations during the April 6 and April 20 meetings. On April 6, the Board asked District 96 to revise and resubmit the site plans to address the Board's concerns. The Board considered the revised plans on April 20, and voted to approve the requested variations with the condition that they are based on the revised plans submitted on April 20. The Commission will consider the revised plans during the Commission's special meeting on May 1.

On April 20 the Board voted to approve the text amendments related to the site plan review process, with the amendment that applications for major amendments would go through the same process as applications for new amendments – first to the Planning and Zoning Commission for review and recommendation, and then to the Board for review and a decision.

VI. *Public Hearings and Recommendations:*

VII. *New Business:*

A. Conceptual Review – Proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD) for a Mixed-Use Development at 28 & 30 E Burlington St. Applicant: Lion Development II, LLC

Planner Cyran introduced the project and described the review process for Planned Unit Developments. This application is the first PUD the Village would consider since approving the Planned Unit Development amendments to the Zoning Code in 2021. This project would require a Planned Unit Development application due to the height of the building; the building could not be approved at the proposed height without a Planned Unit Development approval. The applicant also plans to rezone the one parcel in the R1-A District to the B2 District, so that all of the properties would be zoned B2.

The next step in the process is a preliminary site plan review during a public hearing before the Planning and Zoning Commission. However, staff recommends the applicant request a review by the Preservation Commission prior to the public hearing so any significant adjustments that need to be made can be made prior to the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission  
Regular Meeting Minutes  
April 26, 2023

John Madeja with Studio 222 Architects described the project as depicted in the agenda packet. The proposed building is 5 stories with 21 luxury apartment rental units, two of which would be live-work units. Mr. Madeja described the sustainable initiatives being considered for the project, including EV charging stations, a bio swale along the northern property line, permeable pavers for the outdoor parking spaces, energy efficient appliances, an electric HVAC system, and recycled building materials.

Planner Cyran mentioned there are four features of the conceptual site plan that would vary from the Zoning Code:

- The proposed building is 64 feet tall. The maximum height of a building in the B2 District is 48 feet. Buildings that are approved as part of Planned Unit Developments can be up to 66 feet tall.
- The parking aisles are 22 feet wide, which is 2 feet narrower than required.
- The parking spaces are 8 feet, 6 inches wide, which is 6 inches narrower than required.
- The perimeter lot landscaping is 5 feet wide along the northern edge of Lot 4 and there is no perimeter lot landscaping along the southern edge of the parking lot. The Zoning Code requires perimeter landscaping to be at least 10 feet wide.

The Commissioners asked questions about and made comments on the following topics:

- The materials proposed for the exterior of the building which includes manufactured or cast stone, full depth brick, and fiber cement. The ground floor windows would be aluminum and the residential windows would be vinyl or composite.
- The colors of the materials.
- That the windows would be high efficiency.
- How the proposed number of parking spaces was determined.
- The windows on the ground floor would be clear.
- The reasoning behind not pursuing a LEED certification.
- Whether a shared exit or driveway was considered for the west side of the site.
- How the architect approached designing the building.
- That access to the fifth floor terrace will be limited to the top floor tenants.
- How the building could be designed to make it appear closer in scale to the smaller buildings nearby.
- That there are no awnings over the sidewalks on the ground floor.
- How the live work units would operate.
- The elements of the project that would be a community amenity. Mr. Madeja said the amenities included the benches in front of the building, the shared EV charging station behind the building which would be shared by the residents, and the rain garden.
- The proposed Illinois Energy Stretch Code.
- That most of the windows will be operable.
- How the amount of window coverage was determined and the effect of the number of windows on energy efficiency.
- The lighting for the parking areas behind the building, which hasn't been selected yet.

**Planning and Zoning Commission**  
**Regular Meeting Minutes**  
**April 26, 2023**

Commissioner Henaghan stated the building would be very prominent. She asked the Commissioners if they had any thoughts about the building being five stories. Commissioner Miller stated that, while she didn't have concerns about the building being five stories, the building lacked details such as traditional masonry elements. Commissioner Brom said she was concerned about the building's height and couldn't identify a community benefit provided by the building having a fifth floor.

Considering the purpose of a PUD, Commissioner Marhoul noted the bio swale in the back of the property would help manage stormwater and add green space to the property. Regarding public and private open spaces, Commissioner Marhoul said allowing all of residents to access the terrace would be appropriate. Commissioner Miller said it wasn't clear what public benefits this development would provide that another development wouldn't provide. Pat Leone, the property owner, mentioned the green space in front of the building. Commissioner Henaghan noted that the Commission will want the landscape plan submitted with the preliminary site plan to make the most of the green space.

Commissioner Henaghan asked if the Commissioners had any concerns about the other areas of relief being sought from the zoning standards. Commissioner Marhoul said he supported the dimensions proposed in the plan, and Commissioners Miller and Brom agreed.

Commissioner Marhoul suggested exploring the possibility of shifting the building to the west and making an agreement with St. Mary's for egress to reduce the amount of pavement on the site. Mr. Leone noted that the easement for the property owned by the Archdiocese of Chicago has been removed.

Commissioner Miller asked if any consideration was given to a green roof or some other type of amenity such as garden space. Mr. Madeja said they would discuss it. She also asked if any consideration was given to having parking under the building. Mr. Leone said there wasn't enough room for ramps for a parking structure.

After asking if the applicant had any questions for the Commission, the Commission concluded the discussion on the conceptual site plan.

**B. Discussion Regarding Front Yard Porches and Decks in Groveland/Lincoln/Kimbark Area**

Planner Cyran explained that this issue was raised during the consideration of the variation for 95 Groveland Avenue. The Zoning Code prohibits decks in street yards and it prohibits new porches within 20 feet of the street lot line. When they discussed the variation request, the Village Board directed the Planning and Zoning Commission to consider amendments to the Zoning Ordinance regarding the area of the Village excluded from Olmsted's General Plan to allow greater flexibility in constructing front yard porches or decks and to share their thoughts with the Board.

The Commission's discussion and comments included the following:

Planning and Zoning Commission  
Regular Meeting Minutes  
April 26, 2023

- Houses and buildings on Groveland Avenue with porches would need to be individually assessed to determine whether they are conforming or legally non-conforming.
- The previous decision on porches and the 20-foot setback was very clear, and it was noted during the Board meeting that the variability of setbacks is important to the Village's Landmark designation.
- Carving out areas or creating distinctions based on Olmsted's plan would not be desirable for Village cohesion.
- While the origin of the 20-foot setback wasn't clear, it was determined at the time of the Board's discussion that it was a reasonable distance.
- The distance between the property line and the public sidewalk varies on Groveland Avenue.
- The stoop on 91 Groveland Avenue and the front porch and stairs at 111 Groveland Avenue appear to achieve what the owner of 95 Groveland Avenue requested and they aren't objectionable.
- The properties in this area and perhaps along Burlington and Quincy are different in size than a lot of other properties in the R1-A and R1-AA Districts.
- During the Board's discussion five years ago, it was suggested the 20-foot setback be revisited after the results could be assessed. This may be an appropriate time to consider whether it makes sense to give leeway to some properties that are smaller in square footage and already located closer to the sidewalk.
- Some exceptions could be made for some lots with unique characteristics.
- Decks should not be permitted in front yards.

There were requests for staff to do the following research:

- Survey randomized blocks on Quincy and Burlington, Groveland Avenue, and one side each of Kimbark and Lincoln.
- Review the research and meeting minutes from the 2017 discussion on front porches.
- Research whether carving out exceptions for certain areas of the Village would affect the Village's Landmark status.
- Determine what difference in setback would result if front porches are allowed in the street setback on some properties.

Planner Cyran asked if it would be acceptable to allow a 5-foot-wide front porch or deck for all properties, regardless of the distance between the front of the house and the front property line. Commissioner Marhoul said that could be acceptable if the porch didn't encroach further into the street yard than any other existing structure on that street and if the associated stairs didn't encroach into the street yard. Commissioner Miller suggested that could be acceptable as long as addition of the porch wouldn't exceed the impervious surface limit for that property.

Commissioner Brom suggested the allowance for a porch could be limited to single-family homes in that area. She also suggested the variation standards for this area could be modified so

Planning and Zoning Commission  
Regular Meeting Minutes  
April 26, 2023

the requirement to prove hardship could be waived. Attorney Marris noted the variation standards are based on state law and therefore cannot be waived.

Attorney Marris suggested that porches in the street yard could be considered a special use. The Commissioners agreed the idea was worth exploring. Planner Cyran noted the second standard for a Special Use is, "The proposed use will comply with all applicable regulations in the district in which the use is to be located." She asked Attorney Marris if the Zoning Code would need to be amended to allow new porches to encroach beyond the current 20-foot limitation if they met certain standards, such as prohibiting the associated stairs from encroaching in the street yard.

Planner Cyran asked the Commissioners if there is consensus on the criteria that might be required for a special use, specifically if decks would be prohibited from encroaching into the street yard at all and if stairs must be required to be located on the sides of the porch instead of encroaching into the street yard. Commissioner Marhoul said he wanted to limit the encroachment to porches but didn't want to limit homeowners' architectural creativity in finding a way to incorporate stairs that doesn't add to the encroachment. Commissioner Henaghan suggested one of the criteria could be that the porch and stairs are designed in such a way as to minimize the encroachment in the street yard.

Regarding decks versus porches, Commissioner Miller stated the structure should appear to be substantial and part of the house and that decks shouldn't be in front of houses. She said porches could have a roof or be uncovered, as long as they appear to be part of the house.

Commissioner Henaghan asked the Commissioners to send their comments to Planner Cyran and concluded the discussion.

*VIII. Old Business:*

A. PZ 23-0001 – Site Plan Review – Central-Hauser Parking Lot & Site Improvements

This matter was continued to a special meeting on Monday, May 1, 2023. There was no consideration of this matter.

B. Examination of Impervious Surface Standards

Planner Cyran introduced the draft work plan, which is meant to be updated throughout the process. She noted that Chairperson Mateo had noted the Commission previously discussed adding incentives for reducing stormwater runoff to the Zoning Code and adding downspout separation as a goal for existing developments. These will be added to the work plan.

Planner Cyran reviewed the elements of the draft work plan, and noted she would collaborate with professional engineers, related agencies, other communities, industry professionals, members of the Commission, and anyone who has expertise or interest in the topic.

Planning and Zoning Commission  
Regular Meeting Minutes  
April 26, 2023

Commissioner Henaghan said the work plan addresses her two main concerns: how to incentivize the use of permeable surfaces and how permeable surfaces are calculated, particularly considering they are frequently not maintained. Commissioner Marhoul said rain gardens should be defined, including a minimum and maximum size, and there should be associated performance and maintenance standards.

Commissioner Henaghan suggested using the Naturally Resilient Communities website as a resource. Commissioner Miller mentioned that the Village's Municipal Code refers to the 2006 edition of the International Property Maintenance Code, which seems outdated. She noted the Municipal Code states drainage from roofs may not discharge directly onto adjacent properties. She suggested we clarify how far from an adjacent property a downspout should be located and how elevations and sloping affect neighboring properties. Commissioner Marhoul asked if grading plans require the owner or contractor to verify that stormwater runoff will not be directed onto neighboring properties.

Attorney Marrs note that many communities use the 2006 edition of the International Property Maintenance Code.

*VIII. Information:*

- IX. Adjournment:* Motion to adjourn by Commissioner Marhoul, seconded by Commissioner Miller.  
AYES: Commissioners Marhoul, Miller, Brom, and Henaghan.  
NAYS: None  
**Motion passed.**

Meeting adjourned at 9:12 p.m.