

**UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

Thursday, October 21, 2021 6:30pm
Council Chambers
800 Game Farm Road, Yorkville, Il

NOTE: In accordance with Public Act 101-0640 and Gubernatorial Disaster Proclamation issued by Governor Pritzker pursuant to the powers vested in the Governor under the Illinois Emergency Management Agency Act, the United City of Yorkville is encouraging social distancing by allowing remote attendance to the UDO Advisory Committee meeting due to the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic.

Meeting Called to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:31pm by Chairman Chris Funkhouser and a quorum was established.

Roll Call & Establishment of Quorum

Chris Funkhouser, Chairman/Alderman
Daniel Transier, Alderman/remote attendance
David Schultz, Engineer-HR Green
Deborah Horaz, PZC Committee Member/remote attendance
Jeff Olson, PZC Chairman

Others Present:

Krysti Barksdale-Noble, Community Development Director
Jason Engberg, Senior Planner
Jackie Wells, Project Manager, *Houseal Lavigne*
Ruben Shell, *Houseal Lavigne*

Previous Meeting Minutes April 21, 2020

The minutes were approved as presented.

Citizens Comments None

1. Reintroduction to the Project & New Process Timeline

Project Manager Jackie Wells re-introduced herself and also Ruben Shell who was present to help gather feedback. Ms. Wells noted the project began in 2019 and had been on pause in 2020 due to the pandemic. She said the committee would review the UDO process and see what has changed thus far.

2. Consultant Houseal Lavigne Review of Materials

a. Presentation and Discussion Chapter 3 and Chapter 4

Ms. Wells said Chapters 3 and 4 will be reviewed and key consensus points will be discussed. She briefly explained the UDO 8-step process for the project, discussed the Diagnostic Memo and preliminary recommendations.

Following were the discussion points for each of the topics.

Chapter 3 Non-Conformities Analysis

1. Ms. Wells said it was found there were several non-conformities in lot area.
2. New minimums were tested to bring the lots into conformity in the R-1 district. They recommended a pocket of smaller R-1 be rezoned to the R-2 district.

Key Consensus Point

Recommend R-2 to be 8,000 sq. ft. lot and 60 ft. width or should new district be created to accommodate smaller lot?

1. Recommend adding classification.
2. New category would add flexibility and be easier for developers. Marker development and Grande Reserve good examples of varying sized lots.
3. Committee desires to keep town character and there is demand for smaller lots for young families or seniors, less maintenance.
4. What are benefits or drawbacks of combining districts?
5. Discussion about manufacturing, estate and office districts.
6. Ms. Noble indicated city has expressed interest in more intense land use, asks for committee feedback.
7. M-1 and M-2 will be left as separate districts.

Chapter 3 District Standards

1. Establishment of zoning districts, overlay districts, bulk & dimensional standards, yard structures, special uses, not many changes.
2. For bulk and dimensional standards, Ms. Wells proposes a maximum density standard use for new subdivisions, should be replaced with lot size per dwelling unit.
3. Propose transitional standards be included in landscaping standards.
4. Propose elimination of maximum height for religious institutional structures and consolidate into new public institutional district.

Key Consensus Point:

Do bulk regulations mitigate negative effects of more potential density?

1. Mr. Funkhouser said he is not in favor of just square feet, but wants density as well.
2. Ms. Wells said minimum lot size per dwelling unit could be reduced by half especially for in-fill developments.
3. Consensus to keep density for multi-family per acre and keep minimum lot area for dwelling unit for attached style housing for R-3 or R-4.

Chapter 3 Permitted and Special Uses

1. Ms. Wells proposes new uses including permanent ADW (Accessory Dwelling Unit) secondary dwelling unit, smaller detached or attached to principal dwelling unit. Another new use— medical and adult use cannabis.
2. Mr. Engberg said staff also discussed massage establishments, consensus was to make special use.
3. Ms. Barksdale-Noble said there is some interest to allow pawn dealers in manufacturing district, some want to sell firearms, Mr. Transier does not favor. Pawn shops do not currently sell guns.
4. Shooting ranges must be stand-alone in stores and have specific conditions.
5. Discussion of permitted yard setbacks and obstructions particularly porches/balconies.

Committee agrees only open-air porches should be allowed a larger encroachment (5 feet) into front yard.

6. Mr. Schultz asks for discussion on landscaping overflow, need subset to discuss overland flow routes in side yards where it resists obstruction. Footnote to be added here, a whole section will be added.

Chapter 4 Use Standards:

1. Ms. Wells reviewed new standards. Primary entrance to face street for residential use.
2. Mr. Olson recommends not encouraging garage on side, lots may be too narrow.
3. Minimum requirement would be 1-car garage.
4. Mr. Funkhouser states corner units have potential and suggests possible side load to help break up monotonous view, can push garage back and drop front yard setback. Ms. Horaz said to make it separate category, should have curb appeal and make front look nice. Put garage in back?
5. To avoid too many distinct categories, Ms. Wells suggests compromise of maintaining setback through garage and allow porch/front of home to be closer to right-of-way.
6. Mr. Funkhouser suggests having common drive, duplexes need different category?

Key Consensus Point

Should similar standards for garages apply to single-family detached development?

1. Mr. Engberg said PUD's have specific requirements. Should same standards be applied to single-family homes similar to duplexes to create aesthetics?
2. Staff has concerns with monotonous community.
3. Other comments: want diversity, flexibility, built-in incentives, menu of alternatives.

Chapter 4 Residential Uses

1. Standards for multi-family require front entrance facing street, requires parking to be in rear of building.
2. Committee members: use alleys as option, would help diversity of product, make alleys private, they are a place for people to work on cars, chat with neighbors.

Chapter 4 Multi-Family Dwelling Units:

1. Look at standards to improve aesthetics—primary entrance oriented towards perimeter streets, discourage primary entrance oriented to parking lot. Recommend parking be integrated, visually concealed from public right-of-way, define open spaces/amenities. If car is in parking lot, do residents have to go around building for their entry?
2. Restrict number of building entrances, but maintain rear entrance.
3. If primary facade faces open space, primary entrance should not be located there. Focus on what is presented publicly, need to distinguish definitions for primary facade intent.

Chapter 4 Standards for Townhouses

1. Main entrance should face primary street or could be courthouse style (turned in towards each other).
2. Require minimum 1 or more parking spaces in attached or detached garage. Attached garage on side or rear, 6 townhouses in a cluster, list siding requirements.
3. Committee suggests using language “encourage”, rather use “shall”.
4. Some townhouses could be built longer and more narrow on properties where builders “have to

make it work”. Revisit maximum of 6—depending on size/length of building—to be architecturally friendly.

Chapter 4 Lodging Use Standards /Short Term Rentals

1. Unit must be primary residence of owner, restrict the short term rental time to 3 days and maximum for the calendar year at 30 days. Goal is to prevent “party houses”.
2. Are rules needed for short term rentals?
3. In 2018 standards were compiled to permit the rentals and there were only 3 units.
4. Committee decided standards are not needed, possibly address another time.

Chapter 4 Vehicle-Related Use Standards

1. Chapter designated for sales/rental of vehicles with landscaping in perimeter zone. Landscaping required to be clustered to maintain views.
2. Zone requirements to be presented at next committee meeting.

Chapter 4 Industrial Use Standards/Artisan Manufacturing

1. Low impact manufacturing limited to 10,000 square feet, no outdoor storage with possible retail sales or residential unit. Permitted in business districts.

Chapter 4 Accessory Use Standards, Building & Structures

1. To be located minimum 10 feet from primary building with restrictions.
2. Com Ed asks easements to be in front, permanent structures not allowed in easements.

Chapter 4 Accessory Use Dwelling Units

1. Purpose is for mother-in-law suites, suggest only 1 per lot and proportionate to lot.
2. Locate in rear of property, one entrance on front facade, one driveway, no tandem parking, similar to primary structure.
3. Cannot have separate garage or driveway, single curb cut, exception for corner lot, look at flexibility.

Chapter 4 Revised Standards Accessory RV, Trailer, Boat Parking

1. Accessory must not be permanently affixed to ground, must be on grooved hard surface, only 1 per lot, some screening of vehicle.
2. Rules surrounding vehicles have not been enforced, mostly monitored with windshield inspections/reactionary enforcement.
3. Rules are needed so they can be cited when violations occur.

3. Committee Comments and Questions None

4. Project Schedule, Next Steps and Future Meeting Dates

The staff has reviewed Chapters 5 and 6 and provided comments to *Houseal Lavigne*. Ms. Wells will ascertain how much budget remains and the next meeting was set for Thursday, November 18th at 6:30pm.

Adjournment:

There was no further business and the meeting adjourned at 8:31pm

Minutes respectfully submitted by Marlys Young, Minute Taker