



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, August 24, 2022. Chairperson Mateo called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

II. *Roll Call*

Commissioner Miller
Commissioner Pelletier
Commissioner Henaghan
Commissioner Brom
Chairperson Mateo
Commissioner Marhoul – arrived 7:04 p.m.

Absent: Commissioner Mathews

Also Present: Assistant Village Manager Ashley Monroe
Attorney Michael Marris
Village Planner Anne Cyran

III. *Approval of Minutes:*

A. Planning & Zoning Commission Regular Meeting minutes of July 27, 2022.

Commissioner Henaghan made a motion to approve the meeting minutes. Commissioner Brom seconded the motion.

AYES: Commissioners Pelletier, Henaghan, Brom, Mateo

NAYS: None

Commissioner Miller abstained.

Motion passed.

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

None.

V. *Liaison Report:*

A. Village Board Update

Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting
August 24, 2022

Assistant Manager Monroe reported the Village Board of Trustees approved the Ames Elementary School's request for a variation to allow a six-foot tall fence in the street yard. The Village Board also considered Riverside Presbyterian Church's two requests for variations. The Board denied the request to allow the temporary tent for more than 30 consecutive days or 45 total days for the year. The Board deferred a final action on the request to allow a temporary tent in the street yard until there is additional discussion.

AVM Monroe provided an update on the site plan for the parking lot at 28 Lawton Road. The plan was modified to change the parking surface to permeable pavers.

VI. *Public Hearing and Recommendation:*

A. PZ22-10 — Recommend amendments to the Official Zoning Map of the Village relative to the incorporation of a B1 Transit-Oriented Development zoning district.

1. PUBLIC HEARING to consider rezoning the proposed area including properties facing the west side of Harlem Avenue, beginning at the north from 3144 S. Harlem Avenue on the north side of Addison Road to 3422 S. Harlem Avenue, north of Lawton Road from B-1 Commercial Subdistrict within the B-1 Business District (B1-C) to B-1 Transit-Oriented Development Subdistrict within the B-1 Business District (B1-TOD).

Commissioner Marhoul made a motion to open the public hearing. Commissioner Miller seconded the motion.

AYES: Commissioners Miller, Pelletier, Henaghan, Brom, Marhoul, Mateo

NAYS: None

Motion passed.

Commissioner Marhoul made a motion to accept exhibits of public hearing notice and other items into the record. Commissioner Miller seconded the motion.

AYES: Commissioners Marhoul, Miller, Pelletier, Henaghan, Brom, Mateo

NAYS: None

Motion passed.

AVM Monroe presented the draft amendment to the Official Zoning Map relative to establishing a B1 – Transit Oriented Development Subdistrict (B1-TOD). The amendment is related to proposed text amendments to establish the B1-TOD Subdistrict and support development and redevelopment in the B1-TOD Subdistrict by updating appropriate standards. These amendments will promote walkability and transit-oriented development (TOD) in the Riverside Central Business District (CBD) and prepare the Harlem Avenue Corridor within the Village's boundaries for Pace's proposed Pulse rapid transit service.

The B1-TOD Subdistrict includes properties facing the east side of Harlem Avenue, beginning at 3144 South Harlem Avenue, north of Addison Road, to 3422 South Harlem Avenue, north of Lawton Road. The proposed definition of the B1-TOD Subdistrict is, "The B1-TOD Subdistrict is intended as a

Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting
August 24, 2022

transit-supportive mixed use area along the railroad and in close proximity to nearby bus and commuter rail facilities. The mix of uses generally supports multi-family residential, retail, service, office, and other employment-generating uses. Residential uses are permitted above the ground floor only. Uses appropriately transition to surrounding single-family neighborhoods in a pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly environment.”

AVM Monroe reviewed the uses in the B1-TOD Subdistrict that would be permitted, permitted as a special use, or not permitted. The uses proposed for the B1-TOD Subdistrict are very similar to the currently permitted uses in the B1-C and B1-TC Subdistricts.

The proposed text amendments would also establish parking location standards and bulk requirements for the B1-TOD Subdistrict. The bulk requirements are the same as those in the B1-C Subdistrict with the exception that the B1-TOD Subdistrict will allow a maximum building height of 60 feet with no more than five stories, as opposed to a maximum building height of 48 feet with no more than four stories, which is proposed for the B1-C and B1-TC Subdistricts.

Chairperson Mateo noted the Planning and Zoning Commission has been reviewing the proposed amendments since January.

Staff did not receive written correspondence in support or against the application, but did receive a phone call from the owner of a business in Berwyn who expressed concerns about the availability of parking.

Chairperson Mateo clarified that financial institutions with drive-through facilities would be a special use, not a permitted use.

There was no one in the audience to provide a comment.

Commissioner Marhoul made a motion to close Public Hearing and Commissioner Miller seconded the motion.

AYES: Commissioners Marhoul, Miller, Pelletier, Henaghan, Brom, Mateo

NAYS: None

Motion passed.

Commissioner Miller motioned to recommend the zoning map amendment as proposed. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Marhoul. With a motion on the table, Chairperson Mateo reviewed the standards for zoning map amendments in Section 10-2-2-1 of the Zoning Code.

The Commissioners concluded that all applicable standards were met.

- The amendment is harmonious with the existing uses and nearby properties.
- The intent of the amendment is to help enhance bicycle and pedestrian opportunities and reduce vehicle use.
- The amendment will create new development opportunities through the bulk requirements being increased.

Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting
August 24, 2022

- The area subject to the amendment is suitable.
- The community is agnostic, based on the lack of comments received.
- The amendment is part of the village plans.
- The intent of the amendment is to improve the lifestyle and livelihood of the citizens of the village.
- Though the amendment will create legal nonconformities, the number will not be significant.
- The intent of the amendment is to increase the trend of redevelopment in the area.
- Public facilities in the subject area are currently available or can easily be provided, especially considering the relatively limited scope of the rezoning, the nature of the properties, and the size of the lots.

AYES: Commissioners Marhoul, Miller, Pelletier, Henaghan, Brom, Mateo

NAYS: None

Motion passed.

VII. New Business:

A. Review proposed 2023 Meeting Calendar.

The proposed November meeting date is the day before Thanksgiving, and the proposed December meeting date is two days after Christmas. The Commissioners agreed they would like to move the meeting dates further away from the holidays, as they have in the past. The Commission asked staff to review the calendar and propose alternative dates for those meetings during the next Commission meeting.

VIII. Old Business:

A. Discussion on Transit-Oriented Development Zoning Code Updates related to Sign Code.

AVM Monroe noted the Commission reviewed the updates to the sign code previously and there have been very few changes to the code in the past few months. This item was on the Commission's July agenda but the Commission deferred the discussion to the next meeting. While the Village Board does not require a formal recommendation from the Commission for changes to sections of the code outside of Title 10, Zoning, it would be helpful to hear comments and feedback from the Commission on the proposed changes to the sign code.

Commissioner Miller reviewed the definition of Natural Grade (Section 4-3-3, Definitions), which is proposed to be added to the code, and Section 4-3-7(A)2, Sign Height, which would require sign height to be measured as the vertical distance from the average natural grade at the foot of the sign to the highest point. The proposed definition of Natural Grade does not have an application and seems to be inconsistent with the provision on sign height in Section 4-3-7(A)2. The provision on sign height is preferable to the definition of Natural Grade.

Chairperson Mateo reviewed the consultant's comment on the definition of Natural Grade. The consultant noted the definition clarifies how to determine the natural grade, which is used to establish the allowable height of a sign.

Commissioner Marhoul noted there are a set of drawings on page 15 of the memo which are

Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting
August 24, 2022

helpful. Commissioner Miller said the text should refer to the drawings and Chairperson Mateo said one of the comments she provided to AVM Monroe is to make sure all figures have titles.

Regarding sign height, the consultant wrote, “Needs to clarify standards that tie sign height to the original grade of the property, not post-construction grade that may include berms or other changes that raise the grade of the property.” Commissioner Marhoul stated the drawings indicate that a berm that was built later does not come into defining a sign height. Commissioner Heneghan agreed the drawings are clearer in explaining intent and perhaps the definition of Natural Grade should be modified to incorporate the text within the drawings.

Commissioner Miller suggested striking the definition of Natural Grade, since the definition is only in the sign code and the drawings are more helpful. Commissioners Marhoul and Heneghan agreed. Attorney Marrs asked if the part of the definition that refers to “less than 75 feet” is captured in the drawing. Commissioner Brom expressed concern about getting rid of the definition of Natural Grade and instead relying on diagrams.

Commissioner Marhoul suggested defining Natural Grade as the pre-construction average ground elevation of the lot on which the sign is located. Commissioner Heneghan suggested the portion of the definition referring to signs located not less than 75 feet from the right-of-way would be more applicable to a large shopping center, but not to properties in Riverside.

Attorney Marrs asked if, in the text of the captions, it would be clarifying to add after post-construction final grade, “of the lot on which the sign is located.” The Commissioners agreed that it would.

Chairperson Mateo asked about the first sentence about measuring sign height in Section 4-3-7(A)2. Commissioner Marhoul suggested eliminating the words “at the foot of the sign” because in this case the average natural grade has nothing to do with the sign itself; it has to do with the lot. Commissioners Marhoul and Miller discussed sign locations and the average natural grades of commercial properties in Riverside.

Chairperson Mateo asked if everyone agreed that the first illustration is not relevant to Riverside.

Regarding the suggestion to remove “at the foot of the sign” from the first sentence in Section 4-3-7(A)2, Commissioner Brom asked if sign heights should be measured based on the area around the sign or the average elevation of the entire lot. Commissioner Miller said the measurement should be based on the sign’s location, but the code is unclear about what “at the foot of the sign” means. Commissioner Marhoul stated it would be easier to use the average natural grade of the entire lot. Commissioner Miller stated it would be more difficult because you would have to do a survey of an entire lot just to put up a sign.

AVM Monroe provided the definition of grade from the zoning code and suggested it could be used in the sign code. Commissioner Miller said the word “finished” sounds like post-construction which would allow someone to build a berm and install a sign on it. Commissioner

Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting
August 24, 2022

Pelletier suggested using the phrase “natural grade at the sign post.”

Commissioner Henaghan said the first two diagrams show the difference between whether the sign is higher or lower than the centerline of the road. Since the centerline of the road is no longer part of the discussion, neither of the two diagrams are necessary. Commissioner Marhoul agreed that the bottom two diagrams are sufficient.

Commissioner Miller asked if the language in the diagrams should refer to pre- and post-construction elevations. Commissioner Marhoul said the measurement has to be pre-construction so someone cannot build a berm and put a sign on top of it. Commissioner Miller suggested using the term “pre-installation” instead of “pre-construction” to differentiate between sign installation and site construction.

The Commissioners agreed the first and second diagrams should be removed and the third and fourth should remain.

Attorney Marrs confirmed they are keeping the phrase “at the foot of the sign” in the first sentence in Section 4-3-7(A)2 and adding “at the foot of the sign” in the third diagram which would make the text, “Any post-construction changes in grade that result in the final grade at the foot of the sign being higher than the pre-construction grade shall not be included in determining the sign height. The height of signs shall be determined by the pre-construction natural grade.”

Commissioner Miller asked if a number is missing in front of “Box and Cabinet signs” in Section 4-3-5, Prohibited Signs. AVM Monroe confirmed that phrase will be numbered in the revised document.

Regarding electronic reader board signs for the Metra station and potential Pace Pulse bus stops in Sections 4-3-15(A)1 and 4-3-15(B)2, Commissioner Miller suggested the phrase “one exception is” should be replaced since it suggests there are other exceptions. Instead, the phrases “doesn’t apply to” or “excepted from this paragraph are” could be used. Commissioner Henaghan agreed.

Chairperson Mateo asked if staff agreed with the recommended timeframes in Section 4-3-11(B)5, Discontinuance of Use of Nonconforming Sign. AVM Monroe said the struggle to remove old signage is challenging. Having a timeframe for addressing these signs is helpful and the timeframe is reasonable.

Chairperson Mateo said her interpretation is Section 4-3-11(B)5.a says after 30 days something needs to be done and Section 4-3-11(B)5.b says it to be done in six months; these requirements appear to be in conflict. Staff and the Commissioners discussed the intent of the proposed language. Village Planner Cyran suggested allowing staff to have discretion in determining a reasonable timeframe for removing nonconforming signs. Chairperson Mateo said having something explicit would help staff in dealing with business owners.

Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting
August 24, 2022

Chairperson Mateo suggested removing Section 4-3-11(B)5.b since the first paragraph requires removing nonconforming signs. Commissioner Henaghan agreed.

Attorney Marris said there is still an exception under Section 4-3-11(B)5, before the change of adding “a continuous period of 30 days,” that if your business identity changed you had to change your sign, but now so long as it’s changing within a 30-day period, you don’t have to. Attorney Marris asked if that is the intent, or if the intent is to require a sign to come into conformance within 90 days or some other time period. AVM Monroe said her preference would be to allow an amount of time greater than 30 days but less than six months.

Village Planner Cyran suggested the language state the expectation is that nonconforming signs will be removed within 30 days of the closure of the related business. The code could allow staff to grant one or more 30-day extensions if the owner provides evidence they are working with a contractor to remove the sign, but those extensions are not to exceed six months. The Commissioners agreed.

Attorney Marris asked if Section 4-3-11(B)5 allows someone going from one business use to another within 30 days to keep a nonconforming sign or if you change your business use you have 30 days to get a new sign. Commissioner Pelletier said Section 4-3-11(B)6 says that you can’t change anything on a nonconforming sign. Attorney Marris said the phrase, “for a continuous period of 30 days” in Section 4-3-11(B)5 needs to be stricken and the section needs to be revised to reflect the requirement that the sign must be removed within 30 days.

AVM Monroe clarified that in Section 4-3-11(B)5 the new insertion “for a continuous period of 30 days” would be eliminated. In Section 4-3-11(B)5.a, language would be added to allow the Zoning Administrator to grant one or more 30 day extensions. In Section 4-3-11(B)5.b, the language would be clarified that the sign must be removed within six months. The Commissioners agreed.

Regarding Table 1: B2 Zoning District Sign Standards, Chairperson Mateo recalled the consultant advised against having pole signs in the B1 District because they aren’t transit or pedestrian-friendly. She asked if we want to allow these types of signs in B2. Chairperson Mateo mentioned Jeff’s Auto as an example of a pole sign in the B2 District; if the business sold, would the pole sign need to come down? Attorney Marris recalled that Salon D’Amore received a variation for their pole sign years ago. Commissioner Miller noted that pole signs could be replaced with monument signs.

Regarding Table 2: B1 Zoning District Sign Standards, the sign standards for B1-C, B1-TC, and B1-TOD don’t match and Chairperson Mateo asked if they should. For example, in B1-C, the wall sign maximum height has been changed to “Cornice line or second floor window line, whichever is lower.” In B1-TC and B1-TOD, it’s “top of building.” Do we want all of these standards to match or is there a reason to do B1-C and not the other two?

Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting
August 24, 2022

Commissioner Henaghan said if we're looking at the pedestrian-friendly, transit-oriented development district, we would want it to mimic the cornice line or second floor language. Commissioner Pelletier said she couldn't think of a reason why they would be different.

Chairperson Mateo reviewed the sizes allowed for monument signs. In the B1-C Subdistrict, they can be 32 sq. ft., whereas in the B1-TC and B1-TOD Subdistricts, they are limited to 24 sq. ft. Commissioner Miller suggested monument signs in the B1-TOD Subdistrict be slightly larger so they're more visible on a busy street. Commissioner Pelletier said 24 sq. ft. seems a little small. The Commissioners agreed the size of the monument signs in the B1-TOD Subdistrict should be 32 sq. ft. to match the B1-C Subdistrict, while B1-TC remains 24 sq. ft.

Commissioner Miller asked AVM Monroe if any business owners have complained about being allowed to have a larger sign than what is allowed by the code. AVM Monroe reported the questions she's received have been regarding the number wall signs permitted and whether they can add a digital component. The last few replacement monument signs have been about 22 sq. ft. Allowing slightly a larger monument sign, especially if more than one tenant is incorporated, would allow more options in those zoning districts.

Chairperson Mateo referred to Figure 8, Window Signs, and asked if the consultant could update the graphic. AVM Monroe confirmed she would.

The Commissioners agreed they would recommend these sign code changes to the Board of Trustees. AVM Monroe stated the Board of Trustees will review the code changes and staff will provide an update to the Commission.

IX. *Information:* Next Meeting is September 28, 2022.

X. *Adjournment:* Motion to adjourn by Marhoul, second by Brom.
AYES: Marhoul, Miller, Pelletier, Henaghan, Brom, and Chairperson Mateo.

NAYS: None

Motion passed.

Meeting adjourned at 8:12 p.m.