

Peoria Heights Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes March 18, 2019

Meeting was called to order at 5:31 PM

The following board members were present: Rick Picl, Elizabeth Khazzam, Tessie Bucklar, Sarah DeVore, Steve Cady, Mike Woo, & Craig Masters.

Meeting Minute Approval from meeting insert date; motion to approve Mike Woo seconded by, Tessie Bucklar

Site Plan Review and variance application by PH Samuel, LLC seeking approval of Site Plan for proposed mixed use commercial/residential building, variance for front yard and corner lot fences and variance for parking requirements for the following described parcels located in the zoning district set forth below:

Pin No.: 14-22-402-005; 1310 E Samuel Ave; B-1 Zoning
14-22-402-006; 1314 E Samuel Ave; B-1 Zoning

Rick explains that the board has been given 3 different options from Katie Kim. Option 1, similar to what we have seen before, Option 2, parking out in front of building at a 45 degree angle, Option 3, using one of the properties across the street to create a parking lot.

Katie explains the changes that they made from our last zoning board meeting. She took notes on the Zoning Boards comments and revisions for what we asked. She met with Rick and Cathy on some revisions, she states that she heard our concerns and wanted to address them

1. Current Zoning Code states, that the building has to be on the lot line or 8 foot back, they had the building 8 ft off the lot line, but due to feedback they knew the board wanted it to brought back more, so they moved building over as far as they could. The building is now 10 feet off the lot line. Katie states that they couldn't move the building more because of handicapped parking spaces on the other side. If it were moved over more she would need to ask for increased parking variance.
2. Transformer location was up front with landscaping, the board asked if it could move to the rear- Katie is now moving into the alley corner, by pulling it to the back it helps to enlarge the turning radius which was another concern the board had.
3. Green space along Samuel- removed patios and created more green space along the front of Samuel
4. Landscape buffer line on the east side- put in a evergreen tree line
5. Front yard and rear corner- kept landscaping around the transformer so it wasn't an eye sore in the alley
6. Increased the number of trees- (3) in the front yard- either blooming or one that would lose its leaves

7. Dumpster location- moved it up to the neighbors garage
8. Also widened the turning radius in the alley
9. Building Use- triggers parking requirement- originally the building was designed with commercial on first floor- based on supply and demand it was switched it to all residential, but has moved back to commercial on first floor. In doing so, it has reduced the number of units of residential from 19 to 16 allowing each resident to have their own parking space, this also reduced the number of parking ADA parking spaces as well; which helped with widening the turning radius in the alley.

Parking requirements is now 32 spaces for the development. The development currently has 25 parking spaces; 14 garage spaces, 6 on the side, 8 spaces along alley, plus the handicapped spaces. How to address commercial spaces? Katie states that “we don’t know what is going in there” so due to the square footage there are 8 spaces required by code. If we pass the variance to allow the diagonal on Samuel, if we allow the parking to be in front of the building, 2 feet of the development property will be used to make the parking spaces. Currently 4 cars could park there and with the diagonal parking 11 spaces could be created. This spaces would be public use and no special requests would be asked of the Village. Katie also states that this option would enhance the drive lane on Samuel; taking it from 12.6 feet to 16.1 feet. Currently the street is 23.9 feet wide, with a car on each side, it gives you a drive line to 12.6 feet. If this proposal is approved it would take the drive lane to 16.1 feet and would help enhance the flow of traffic. The last parking option would be across the street from the development and would be completely private.

Option #1- Allow a variance the reduces the number of spaces required.

Option #2 Allow diagonal parking in the front of development

Option #3 Use of lot across the street, diagonal parking, that would allow 7 spaces, had to adjust the angle due to the Village’s engineer. Making this parking lot would be 100% private.

Katie states that this summarizes all of the changes that were made based on our suggestions and feedback.

Rick asks Katie to remind us the square footage of the commercial space, Katie tells the board that it is 2400 sq. ft.

Katie states that if they go with option #3, it creates a drive that would be coming in on Samuel and doesn’t enhance the walkability. It doesn’t give the view that would be coming up the alley, and also, it would eat up the revenue based on the project and for the Village. In the original plan this property would have a home on it. Similar lots in the village bring in \$1900 a year for property taxes. If a \$300K home is built on that property, the property tax bill could be \$9200. Also, if a home was built there what could a family spend if they were here, eating out, sales taxes, etc. From an economic stand point #3 is not the best option for both parties.

Craig Masters asks, On option 1, how much of your property are you giving up?- Katie Kim states 2-3 feet. Craig continues, so you will be widening the drive line, would there still be no parking there any way? Katie states that the public would be able to still park on the street, taking out the missing parking spot because we can't park where the driveways are, in the future you will be able to.

Craig states, "quite frankly, I not a fan of what you have a at 4500 because if a big vehicle parks there then it's hard to turn, you could bring it in 3 feet farther and there wouldn't be a problem.

Conversation continues about parking options:

Tessie asks, Right now, in terms of the driveways that are going to be removed (if you are going with version 2) on the south side you are creating 1 space, how many driveways do you own? When they move to the back how many parking spaces will be added north and south sides of the street? Katie replies right now with the lot, there is 2 and 3 additional right now without going all the way down the block.

Katie states people don't park as they measure

Mike Woo- how much is left from the curb to the back of the parking space? -19 ft

Beth- I applaud for listening to last meeting and make the changes we asked you to make- Beth states that she would like to go on record to say, *this building is way too tall for the space and option 1 is the best option on what we are being offered.*

Rick states that a Van and SUV's are 19 and 20 feet- Beth says we may need to add signage compact cars only.

The board tells Katie that we hope she puts in mature trees and not little trees.

Discuss takes place on what kind of trees she will use.

Tessie asks, "is the plan for the street for the utilities to be buried?" Katie replies, all utilities will be underground they will have to be creative with existing property. They will all be buried when the infrastructure is complete. I prefer #2, I don't mind the diagonal parking in front of a commercial property but on the opposite side you have 3 family homes, its seems off. To look out and see the back of cars. We are gaining some parking spots and some of the parking spots will increase when the parking to the back. It will also increase the green space. Also, with the issue with the size of the building, if there were trees in the front that would mature it would help soften the front with the mass of the building.

Diagonal parking could be added later if you did plant trees, we could see how it goes.

Comments from the audience:

Lee Harper 1311 E Samuel-Tells the board that if we pass this Site Plan we are destroying his property- He states that the parking spaces, won't be public parking and that they will be used for the building. He states that he has no parking and the street parking will be taken up but the building, congesting the street. Heights already has small homes-would everyone on the board buy a home at this value without parking? He continues that this is a private project that is taking public tax payer land. Consider my property I've been here since 1990.

Don Gorman 1320 E Samuel- Thank you to Craig for bringing up the side elevation- any elevation changes would impact my property. Hard work by the board, but site development is very important.

Jill Mites 3914 N. Grandview Dr. watched the first building torn down, we lost mature trees, is there any plan to keep mature trees. Beth tells Jill, everyone on this board is in agreeance about trees and going forward we would like developers to tag certain trees to preserve them

Randy Farris 1317 E Duryea- concern is alley he has no driveway, cant park in front of his house now, but does have a two car garage. Rand is concerned about alley as that is his only way for him to park. Randy has been in his home for 18 years, and states, "I don't have problem with big building going up, just want to make sure I will be able to get in and out." Tessie states that the garages are 24 feet in and parking spot will be behind it.

Katie states that the fence is similar to before, but moved a bit due to the new side yard setback.

The board decides to vote on all 3 options.

Mark tells the board that he is okay with us passing two options. After process of elimination we narrow it down to Option 1 & Option 2.

Fact and findings for Option 1

1. yes

2. options 1

4 yes 3 no

Details of infrastructure will be part of the building process and the permit and inspections- we can't consider that today-can't decide based on issues that comes later

3. Yes

4. NA-

5. Yes

6. NA

7. Yes

Mark recommend conditions and switch to a yes

Motion to approve with a property drainage plan By Sarah, seconded by Beth. Rick Pick and Tessie Bucklar Vote Nay- Beth, Sarah, Steve, Mike- Voted Yay

Fact and findings #2

1.yes

2. split 4/4 yes/no TB- condition that large trees between sidewalk and streets

3. Yes

4.N/a Drainage Plan

5. yes

6.NA

7.Yes

Motion for Options 2, by Tessie and seconded by Beth- with trees and drainage. 4/3 vote

Fence Variance/Parking

Craig asks the board to look at code 10-9-7; waving 8 spaces for commercial on both options.

Fence will be 3 feet with 4 ft pillars

1. Yes

2.Yes

3. Yes

4. Yes

5.Yes

6.Yes

Motion to wave parking and front yard fence- Mike made the motion, Steve 2nd the motion 6-1

Ordinance No. 2019-1585; An ordinance Amending Title 10 of the Village Code of the Village of Peoria Heights for the Purpose of Adding a New Chapter 12 Providing Zoning Regulations for Solar Energy Systems.

Questions asked by the board:

How tall are ground ones?-8 ft

How reflective are they?- They aren't, they are designed to absorb it. 18 mins of the year there could maybe a substantial glare. Where the ground panels are located you won't be able to be seen from the road.

Would the south neighbors get a glare? The neighbors shouldn't get a glare. If they do, it would be very subdued. The panels are set at 30 degree angle making the very top is at 8 ft. If we have a requirement that there is a 8 ft fence, they would not be seen? No

How much noise do they generate?- No more than a transformer.

Are there safety concerns for storage? We have nothing in this ordinance of storage, is it a safety issue? - any installation will have to comply with the electrical code.

Rick explains the ordinance.

10-12-4 (a) change to 8 feet.

Discussion on fencing

Always- telling us that this will supply there entire facility

Back to ordinance- Craig doesn't understand the fence- rick explains what the purpose of the fence- CM- you shouldn't be promoting this and not be putting a

fence- Mark- site plan can adjust the fencing. Discussion on changing the screening- to making it under special use. Gives the zoning board and board of trustees, a little more control over appropriate screening based on the site. Also adding a provision, that under site plan review we would need to know the underlying ground coverage.

Motion to approve Mike Craig seconds the motion - All I's

Site plan

Only way to access is through their parking lot, leaving grass underneath them, how many trees are coming out, about 6-8. Could you add trees somewhere else? Tb replacement of trees that we are losing. Development land? LISTEN

Site Plan Review/Special Use

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. NA
7. NA
8. Yes

Motion to approve Sarah and seconded mike - all in favor.

Modifying certain requirements for residential uses. Title 10, chapter 7b and chapter 7c

Mark out of character with surrounds, due to building heights.

Discussion on current height and how it would look with new ordinance.

In section d, 44 ft to change height

Make a motion-Sarah- Tessie seconded All Is

Meeting adjourned 8:06