



VILLAGE OF RIVERSIDE  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING  
Minutes

I. *Call to Order:* The Regular Meeting of the Village of Riverside Preservation Commission was held on Thursday, August 11, 2022. Chairperson Pipal called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

II. *Roll Call:*

*Present:* Chairperson Charles Pipal  
Commissioner Sander Kaplan  
Commissioner Matthew Seymour  
Commissioner Thomas Walsh

*Absent:* Commissioner Kapil Khanna  
Commissioner Michael Leary  
Commissioner Gint Lietuvninkas

*Also Present:* Assistant Village Manager Ashley Monroe

III. *Approval of the Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes*

A. Minutes of the June 9, 2022, Preservation Commission Meeting  
Commissioner Walsh made a motion. Commissioner Seymour seconded the motion.

AYES: Walsh, Kaplan, Pipal, Seymour

NAYS: None

Motion passed 4-0.

IV. *Public Comment:* None.

V. *Certificate of Appropriateness:*

5.1 - 190 Nuttall – Roof tile replacement.

Chairperson Pipal explained that the work proposed in the administratively approved CoA is direct replacement of roofing for storm repair. Commissioner Walsh made a motion. Commissioner Kaplan seconded the motion. Motion approved, 4-0.

5.2 - 201 Scottswood Road – Addition of fencing.

Victoria Jueds, the new resident, described the proposed work, including wrought iron

where it is visible to the street yard and wood privacy fencing in areas to the rear of the property. Commissioners noted that this is an exterior improvement and typically that the fencing in the rear yard is usually not an issue, visually. Commissioner Kaplan made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness request. Commissioner Seymour seconded the motion. Motion approved, 4-0. Commissioners held non-consequential conversation related to the architectural features of the property at 201 Scottswood.

5.3 - 27 Riverside Road – Installation of wall-mounted cameras.

Commissioners agreed that the cameras were innocuous and could even be installed or removed with a screwdriver. At least one of the cameras is proposed to go on the rear of the building, which is not visible from the street. Commissioner Walsh made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness request. Commissioner Seymour seconded the motion. Motion approved, 4-0.

VI. *Old Business:* None.

VII. *New Business:*

7.1 Presentation and Commission feedback on Transit-Oriented Development Zoning Code Update

Staff reviewed the proposed text changes. Commissioner Kaplan noted that he would like the Preservation Commission to review the electric vehicle charging stations as a hardscape permit. Chairperson Pipal agreed with this comment and noted that the locations that make the most sense are places that already have close proximity to existing electric connectivity.

Related to a minimum building height, Commissioners asked clarifying questions to ensure that only R3 and R4 residential districts are establishing a minimum height of 24 feet. Staff explained that R1-A, R1-AA, and R-2 remain unchanged. Chairperson Pipal and Commissioner Kaplan agreed that it was probably okay to make the change, since many of the multi-family buildings are close to that height, if not taller than that, in the R-3 and R-4 districts.

Chairperson Pipal expressed concern over the proposed maximum building height. He said to be careful, because going from 35 feet maximum to 48 feet in height, is adding over 12 feet. He asked if the Village wants four-story buildings. Staff suggested that the proposed increase may have been related to a progression of scale. Chairperson Pipal said unless there is really a desire to have at least a four-story building, the Village should be cautious in allowing that height by right. Chairperson Pipal said that a survey could be done to see if the existing buildings are already 3 stories or 4 stories. If they're mainly 3 stories already, then the change to 4 stories is out of scale. Commissioner Kaplan commented, and Chairperson Pipal agreed, that building code requires an elevator at four or more stories. It doesn't really matter if the building is three stories or four stories, because going to four stories would add large cost to the building construction.

Chairperson Pipal suggested that the Village avoid using the term “encourage” in proposed text amendments related to landscape design standards. He referenced the changes made to zoning in the B2 district that resulted in little change with the use of the term “encourage” because the ideas weren’t required. He said instead either require sustainable design practices by eliminating use of certain materials or designs, or, be prepared to use a carrot incentive to get developers to use those techniques. Without any teeth, Commissioners were not certain that those practices would be used.

Related to bicycle parking, Chairperson Pipal recommended using a term “where feasible” or “where practical,” especially in downtown locations where there is not room to install bike parking. Requiring downtown businesses that have zero lot lines to install bicycle parking would not work. The phrasing of the currently proposed code should be revisited. Commissioner Kaplan noted that LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) principles incorporate bicycle storage areas, which might be an option for some properties.

Chairperson Pipal asked questions about why fencing needs to be on the property line or be set three feet off of the property line. Although the placement of fencing was not determined to be a recommended change, staff said that they would entertain looking at the provision with the Planner to see if there are changes that could make zoning interpretations related to fencing easier to enforce.

Commissioners asked staff to define the location of the proposed TOD sub-district. Commissioners debated the merits of requiring property owners and business owners to obtain special use approval to use ground floor spaces for offices. Chairperson Pipal thinks the idea to create active pedestrian space is laudable, but that it is onerous to ask a landlord who has not found a renter for a particular type of use to go through the process of receiving approval for a special use, especially if the commercial space has been vacant for more than a couple of months.

Commissioners suggested that a solution could be an incentive for particular uses or even a penalty for other uses. If the location has been vacant for over six months or a year, they questioned whether that is a sufficient amount of time before a landlord should request a special use. Chairperson Pipal said the Village should want people in buildings, without regard to a particular use. Commissioners generally agreed that listing the particular types of uses that are allowed could help, if that is the agreed upon goal, rather than waiting for an approval process.

Chairperson Pipal also said the proposed process of getting tenants into a building is clunky, leaving some landlords and tenants in limbo while the Village determines whether to allow a use. He gave an example of a vacant space posting a sign, coming to an agreement, and then letting the tenant move in. With an additional zoning step, this process would not be typical and puts into question whether the landlord needs to tell the tenant they might not be able to move in until this approval is done.

Regarding office uses on ground floors, staff gave an example of a telemarketing office. Although that business is definitely commercial in nature, it does not perhaps generate

foot traffic as a shop might. At the same time, the employees of that office need to eat, get their dry cleaning, etc., which creates some foot traffic.

Staff said they needed to confer with the Village Attorney related to whether the note on active and inactive uses needs to stay in the code as proposed or if the conversation at Planning and Zoning Commission and Preservation Commission meetings would remove it. Chairperson Pipal and Commissioner Walsh further commented that the market already dictates the location of offices or other uses, noting that businesses that do not require foot traffic are likely not paying a premium to be on the ground floor.

Chairperson Pipal clarified whether the 60 foot height limit applied to B2. Staff clarified that in proposed changes it pertains to B1-C. Chairperson Pipal asked whether the Village wants five-story buildings; none of the Commissioners responded with comment. He was not in favor of or comfortable with five-story buildings, even if on Harlem, recognizing that he is aware of the purpose of the TOD and creating density. Commissioner Walsh asked how tall Village Center is and the response was four stories. Commissioners noted that the approval for that building was already a fight and that it is a big building. Chairperson Pipal also noted that the Transitional zone was increased from three stories to four stories. For areas that abut residential homes, he doesn't think this strategy makes sense, if the purpose of (Transitional Commercial) is to ease into neighborhoods. He is not anti-development but does not think the height increases make sense.

Commissioner Walsh asked whether residents that had done hardscape work on Akenside had permission to put materials in the right-of-way. Staff responded that they did not and were apologetic for their error. They are working with staff on appropriate next steps.

Commissioner Kaplan revisited Chairperson Pipal's comments on the proposed TOD zoning district area, citing the map and confirmed the area of proposed zoning changes. They confirmed the extents of the B1-TC zoning area and B1-TOD area. Chairperson Pipal suggested walking the stretch of buildings in the area to see if it feels right to change the maximum heights of buildings in those areas.

Chairperson Pipal acknowledged the hard work that has been done on these recommendations. Staff responded that the Commission had provided valuable information and conversation. Staff also said that the Planning and Zoning Commission plans to revisit the Special Use and review processes that will address other elements of design and site features. AVM Monroe explained that additional layers of review will be required to allow development to go forward. Chairperson Pipal felt that if the Village puts something into a text amendment, the text amendment informs developers that they can do it. Commissioner Walsh said that if someone wants something not in the code, allow them to ask for it.

Commissioner Kaplan said that it may be almost catering to the larger condo types that have popped up in Brookfield and in LaGrange along Ogden, and Commissioners questioned whether that is in fact what Riverside wants. Concern was expressed related to the redevelopment of the Village Center. Commissioners emphasized the enormity of a 60

foot building in comparison to the Water Tower and speculated on the height of the buildings in LaGrange for comparison. Chairperson Pipal suggested even floating a helium balloon up 60 feet, to show people exactly how tall that would be and to see if there is comfort with that height. Staff noted that it is challenging and costly to put very tall buildings on small lots, and more often than not, more land needs to be assembled in order to get the scale to make the development work. A question was raised about whether the new development in Brookfield would be a height comparison. Conversation related to proposed text amendments concluded.

*VIII. Informational Items:*

Staff let Commissioners know that the State Historic Preservation Office approved the cultural clearance for Quincy Streetscape.

*IX. Presentations of Petitions, Communications and Citizen Requests:*

None.

*X. Adjournment*

Chairperson Pipal entertained a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Seymour moved the motion and Commissioner Walsh seconded.

AYES: Walsh, Kaplan, Pipal, Seymour

NAYS: None.

Chairperson Pipal declared the meeting adjourned at 8:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

---

Ashley Monroe, Assistant Village Manager

---

Date Approved