

VILLAGE OF HOMEWOOD



MEETING MINUTES

DATE OF MEETING:

June 27, 2024

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

7:00 pm

Village Hall Board Room
2020 Chestnut Street
Homewood, IL 60430

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Sierzega called the meeting to order at 6:58 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

In attendance were Members Bransky, Cap, O'Brien, Johnson, Castaneda, and Chair Sierzega. Member Alfonso was absent. Present from the Village was Director of Economic and Community Development Angela Mesaros (serving as Staff Liaison), and Assistant Director of Economic & Community Development Noah Schumerth. Trustee Mason of the Village Board of Trustees was present. There were two members of the public in attendance in person. The public was able to watch and listen to the meeting via Zoom webinar. There was one audience member present via Zoom.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

Chair Sierzega asked for any proposed changes to the minutes from the May 23, 2024 meeting.

Member O'Brien stated that he had questions about the May 23, 2024 minutes approved at the previous meeting. O'Brien asked why the changes from the meeting were not reflected in the minutes. O'Brien stated that the phrase "ensure the private financial specifics of the business owners" should be replaced with "engage in the private financial specifics of the business owners." O'Brien stated that the word "perfectly" on page 8 of the minutes should be removed.

Member Johnson stated that the meeting minutes are increasing in length and that a shorter summary of minutes should be provided for meetings which are recorded, opting instead for a broad summary of information. Member Johnson stated that it would be in the best interest of staff to provide a summary of information instead of a "word-for-word transcript."

Motion made to approve the minutes as corrected made by Member O'Brien; second by Member Bransky.

AYES: Members Bransky, O'Brien, Castaneda, Chair Sierzega

NAYS: None

ABSTENTIONS: Members Cap, Johnson

ABSENT: Member Alfonso

Chair Sierzega asked for any proposed changes to the minutes from the June 13, 2024 meeting. No changes were requested.

Motion made to approve the minutes by Member Cap; second by Member O'Brien.

Meeting Minutes | June 27, 2024

AYES: Members Bransky, Cap, O'Brien, Johnson, Castaneda, Chair Sierzega

NAYS: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: Member Alfonso

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Chair Sierzega requested comments from the audience on other topics which are not included on the regular business agenda. No members of the audience had any questions.

Staff Liaison Mesaros introduced Trustee Philip Mason as the new Board of Trustees liaison to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Trustee Mason provided an introduction and stated that he is open to assistance in any matters where he is needed.

REGULAR BUSINESS:

CASE 24-15: Text Amendment to allow Indoor Commercial Places of Assembly in M-1 Limited Manufacturing Zoning District; Amend Parking Standards for Places of Assembly Uses

Chair Sierzega introduced the text amendment case. Assistant Director Schumerth was present to present the details of the proposed text amendments.

Schumerth introduced the text amendment. Schumerth provided definitions for each class of place of assembly uses included in the Homewood Zoning Ordinance.

Schumerth explained that indoor commercial places of assembly, at all square footage, are not currently permitted in the M-1 zoning district. Schumerth stated that the Village staff propose the addition of indoor commercial places of assembly at all square footage as a special use in the M-1 district.

Schumerth explained that the proposed amendment was informed by parking standards in other communities and parking recommendations published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). Schumerth introduced examples of indoor commercial places of assembly in nearby communities.

Staff Liaison Mesaros suggested that the Commission discuss the first amendment proposed by Village staff before reviewing the second amendments to parking requirements.

Member Bransky stated that the proposed amendment makes sense. Bransky cited the importance of maintaining a special use approval process for places of assembly uses. Bransky noted that screening place of assembly uses from some commercial uses is also a good idea.

Member O'Brien asked why other requests for indoor commercial places of assembly in the M-1 district have not been considered by the Planning and Zoning Commission. Schumerth noted that many of these proposals are screened out by staff early in the development process. Staff Liaison Mesaros noted that because the use is not permitted, most people do not pursue it further.

Member O'Brien stated that he has no issues with the M-1 zoning district being modified.

Meeting Minutes | June 27, 2024

Member O'Brien asked if the amendment is being considered solely because of the application currently planned to be heard by the Planning and Zoning Commission on July 11. Staff Liaison Mesaros stated that this is partially true, as the amendment had been brought to the attention of staff through the application put forward for review.

Member O'Brien asked if the parking amendment was being considered because of requests made by the application currently under review. Schumerth noted that this was brought forward due to the need to review parking for any modification to allow new uses, and previous conversations with the Planning and Zoning Commission about the need to revisit parking for the place of assembly uses. Staff Liaison Mesaros confirmed that the parking amendment was not related to the specifics of the case being considered on July 11.

Member O'Brien asked how Homewood will handle increases in the required width for parking stalls in the new zoning ordinance compared to the old zoning ordinance since this will put pressure on existing uses as lots are rebuilt. O'Brien asked about the impact of the reduction of parking spaces caused by new size regulations. Mesaros noted that unless full site redevelopment occurred, the lot would be considered a legal non-conforming structure and would not need to adjust parking space size.

Member O'Brien asked if the parking space dimension requirements should be revisited. Member Johnson noted that the ordinance cannot be a perfect standard that will be driven by necessity as new cases come for review by the Planning and Zoning Commission. Johnson stated that we may need to consider the changes to dimensions as cases demand it. O'Brien said that it will need to be revisited in the future. Schumerth stated that staff can begin to look at the changes in the new ordinance and how businesses and redevelopment projects might be impacted.

Schumerth presented the second proposed amendment to adjust parking requirements for all *place of assembly* uses. Schumerth noted that under the current code, the requirement for places of assembly is 1 parking space per 300 square feet.

Schumerth presented the new requirement of 1 parking space per 250 square feet or 1 space per 4 fixed seats. Schumerth noted that schools are currently not clearly defined in Homewood's parking requirements table, and introduced requirements of 1 space per 250 square feet plus 1 space per 10 students at elementary and junior high schools, and 1 space per 4 students at high schools.

Schumerth explained the proposed amendment, citing changes in place of assembly parking requirements between the old zoning ordinance and the new code adopted in 2023.

Member Bransky asked for clarification that the Village was seeking to mitigate drops in required spaces with the new requirements. Schumerth noted that this was correct, and that the Village sought to increase parking requirements without placing highly stringent parking requirements.

Member Bransky asked if the proposal will make development more difficult. Schumerth stated that to trigger requirements, the modification of the lot would have to be significant or a new use would have to be proposed. Schumerth said it would cause an increase in required parking more in alignment with the trips generally seen for many places of assembly, even if site fit does become more difficult on some sites.

Mesaros clarified that any change in land use or change in intensity of use would trigger new parking requirements in most instances. Mesaros noted that the zoning ordinance does not require new parking to be added for pre-existing buildings from before the zoning ordinance unless the land use changes.

Mesaros also noted that the presentation should say “or” between the two place of assembly parking requirements (1 space per 250 square feet OR 1 space per 4 fixed seats), not “plus” as written in a table in the presentation. Schumerth noted the need for the correction.

Member Cap stated that he agreed largely with need to consider peak uses in the parking calculations, but had concerns about the categorization of “secondary” spaces not being separately considered for parking requirements. “Secondary spaces” may also have separate demand that adds to peak use traffic at the use. Cap used an example of a place of worship with a school and a gym social hall, with both additional spaces increasing the level of parking demand on the site at a given “peak” hour because they could be used coincidentally. Cap noted that with the example of a place of worship illustrated in the report, the peak demand should actually be higher because of the presence of other “secondary” spaces that may have coincidental uses. Member Cap said that a different conclusion was drawn by staff than the conclusion that “secondary spaces” should increase parking requirements and be considered as contributors to “peak demand.”

Member Johnson asked if it was the job of staff to determine peak demand levels for uses based on how buildings and spaces are used.

Member Cap asked what the odds are that a potential “peak demand” level is ever reached by a particular use, and stated that it depends on the situation. Member Cap referenced a case involving a parking variance at 810 Maple as an example of an applicant measuring “peak demand” and illustrating how a building or space actually being used. Member Cap stated that he differs with staff in thinking about peak parking demand calculations at some place of assembly uses, stating that the premise is correct but that staff did not go far enough to consider the implications of how “secondary spaces” are additive to demand.

Cap clarified that the disagreement is over how to add up “peak uses,” which shouldn’t be considered as “primary or secondary” but should be added individually. Member Bransky mentioned that it could be helpful to see aggregate tables illustrating how different accessory spaces are used to find “peak demand” for a use.

Schumerth stated that ITE manuals assume that most users of “secondary” areas are also users of a “primary” area, with the use of “primary areas” providing a good measurement for overall demand. Schumerth used an example of church attendees going to Sunday school as an example of how primary spaces can act as a method of roughly calculating peak parking demand. Member Cap said that that use case changes depending on a number of factors, and that as a religious educator he believes that many different spaces are additive to peak parking demand for a us.

Member Johnson asked if the code should capture all of these concerns around peak parking demand or if they should be considered on a case-by-case basis by the Planning and Zoning Commission. Staff Liaison Mesaros noted that there is a “case-by-case” analysis by staff before it comes to Planning and Zoning Commission, and not all cases are heard by the Commission.

Member Johnson asked what the role of the Planning and Zoning Commission is in cases where a new use or site plan will not be reviewed by the Commission. Schumerth stated that the Commission plays a role by providing recommendations for code which staff uses to review proposals.

Member Bransky noted that since the amendment does not convert all place of assembly uses to special uses, it is important to write code language in a manner which allows for a consideration of what parking demand is really going to be at individual sites.

Member Cap said that in situations where there are potentially multiple concurrent uses, there needs to be a review by someone (Commission or staff) which can apply estimates of parking demand to those different concurrent uses occurring at any place of assembly use. Bransky said there needs to be an element of the code which allows for a review of individual uses proposed to occur on a site, or it needs to be tracked by staff.

Mesaros noted that she has maintained charts for demand of different uses in shared buildings, such as multi-tenant buildings. Mesaros noted the new code is easier to administer than the old code.

Member Cap encouraged staff and members of the Commission to remain alert of potential additional uses and activities on a site which may increase peak demand and use of a site.

Member O'Brien expressed appreciation of the "OR" language proposed, but noted that if you have multiple buildings on a site, all should be considered in the parking requirement because activities may happen in all four buildings.

Schumerth provided justification for the amendment as proposed and why the "OR" language was proposed with an emphasis on main assembly spaces. Schumerth responded to concerns around "peak" uses and affirmed that each use case with assembly uses is very different and planning needs to consider that. Schumerth noted that some responsibility for providing appropriate parking lies with the use itself, not the Village, as parking for the highest peak demand can lead to unproductive uses of land.

Member Johnson said that staff is providing appropriate consideration of different factors around peak demand at different uses, and that the code amendment does not place the Village in a position where they are unable to adapt to different uses and consider how to appropriately park each individual site.

Schumerth also noted that the amendment sets a minimum; uses may be provide additional parking and staff can encourage the provision of additional parking.

Member O'Brien noted that the "OR" language must be transferred over to the final recommendation and motion to take action on the item, replacing the "+" included in the language as written.

Mesaros noted separate motions were required for each amendment.

Member O'Brien asked if the Findings of Fact needed to be recommended for approval and incorporation into the record with both amendments, and if they would apply to both amendments. Mesaros confirmed and noted that the findings of fact could be approved along with both motions to

cover both recommendations. Mesaros noted both amendments, if both recommended for approval, would be included in one ordinance.

Member O'Brien asked for the Findings of Fact should be amended to reflect that the 2023 zoning ordinance update was adopted on January 10, 2023; not January 11, 2023.

Member Bransky also noted that the table number 44-05-02 in the recommendation should be amended to Table 44-05-01. Member O'Brien stated that both instances of this incorrect table number needed to be corrected.

Member Cap made a motion to approve an amendment to Table 44-03-04 to allow the addition of indoor commercial place of assembly as a special use in the M-1 zoning district with language as amended; seconded by Member O'Brien.

AYES: Members Bransky, Cap, O'Brien, Johnson, Castaneda, Chair Sierzega

NAYS: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: Member Alfonso

Member Bransky made a motion to approve the amendment to Table 44-05-01 to require new parking requirements for all place of assembly uses with language as amended; seconded by Member Cap.

AYES: Members Bransky, Cap, O'Brien, Johnson, Castaneda, Chair Sierzega

NAYS: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: Member Alfonso

OLD BUSINESS:

None.

NEW BUSINESS:

None.

ADJOURN:

Member O'Brien made a motion to adjourn; seconded by Member Castaneda. The meeting adjourned at 8:06pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Noah Schumerth

Assistant Director of Economic and Community Development