

APPROVED MINUTES

VILLAGE OF ANTIOCH PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD – REGULAR MEETING Municipal Building: 874 Main Street, Antioch, IL 60002 July 8, 2021

A. CALL TO ORDER

Chairwoman Henning called the July 8, 2021 regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Board to order at 7:00 pm at the Antioch Municipal Building.

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Planning and Zoning Board led the Pledge of Allegiance.

C. ROLL CALL

Roll call indicated the following members were present: Madigan, McCarty, Carstensen and Turner. Also present were Chairwoman Henning, Attorney Muthleb and Clerk Romine. Members absent: Ryan and Sanfilippo.

D. Announcements and Correspondence

Director Garrigan introduced new members Sherry Madigan and Andrew Turner and welcomed them to the Planning and Zoning Board.

E. Approval of the June 10, 2021 Planning & Zoning Board Meeting Minutes as presented – Member McCarty moved, seconded by Member Carstensen, to approve the June 10, 2021 Planning and Zoning Board Meeting Minutes as presented. Upon roll call, the vote was:

YES: 3: McCarty, Carstensen and Turner.

NO: 0.

ABSTAIN: 1: Madigan.

ABSENT: 2: Ryan and Sanfilippo.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

F. Public Comment

G. Old Business

1. PZB 21-05 – Consideration of a request for a Site Plan Review for the construction of a new 4,500 square foot storage building on the existing site at Red Dot Storage located at 284 Main Street – Director Garrigan reviewed the request for one new storage building at the site. Historically this would be approved administratively, but new processes require a site plan review approval. Director Garrigan presented the location of the existing site and proposed new 4,500 square-foot structure. The applicant will asphalt a portion of the new parking area at the new building, not the entire site. Director Garrigan reviewed the landscaping plan and stated that if there is any outdoor storage proposed, they would be required to incorporate a fabric screening or add additional landscaping to screen the outdoor storage area. The only proposed lighting on the site will be wall-pack light fixtures on the building consistent with what currently exists. The applicant is proposing a metal building, consistent with what is currently there, however the code does not allow for metal buildings. There is a question as to whether the commission is comfortable with a metal building. The overall site will maintain the existing stormwater flow and will not change. Staff is making a favorable recommendation with conditions of compliance with engineer, fire district and prohibition of any outdoor storage east of the proposed building unless they incorporate any additional landscaping or buffering.

Member Madigan asked the applicant if they were comfortable with cement board siding. Mr. Andrew Schott, contractor for the applicant, said he doesn't believe cement board siding will last as long.

APPROVED MINUTES

Member McCarty asked if the silt fence could be extended to provide additional protection. Director Garrigan said a full erosion control plan will have to be submitted a part of preliminary engineering. Member McCarty discussed lighting and asked if there was anyone present from Red Dot. Director Garrigan responded that the engineer Jon Tack had a conflict and was unable to attend this meeting. Member McCarty asked for commitments on a stepped program on asphalt from the owner and a plan to add asphalt in the future to the other buildings. Director Garrigan replied that he cannot speak for the applicant, but it was difficult to get them to do asphalt for the proposed building. Member McCarty asked to add another stipulation that they explore stepped asphalt with staff and bring to the Village Board. Member McCarty also asked that future applicants include isometrics for lighting when it is presented to the Planning and Zoning Board.

Member Carstensen asked for an explanation regarding the fence and screening. Director Garrigan explained that there is a healthy line of mature landscaping, but the area between the landscaping and perimeter fence contains a small buffer, and if the applicant has outdoor storage in that immediate area, staff would request additional buffering. If not, the existing landscaping is sufficient. Member Carstensen would advocate for more landscaping in the gap between the fence and current landscaping.

Member Turner said this is the first piece of property you see coming into town and thinks it's an opportunity for improvement and likes the idea of additional landscaping and additional asphalt. He asked staff for the current standard the Village follows as far as lighting to mitigate light pollution to neighboring properties. Director Garrigan responded that there is a .5 foot candle requirement, which is a low illumination at the property lines. He added that exposed lighting is a violation of the ordinance, and it must incorporate a screen. Member Turner would also like to see design and photometric layouts moving forward.

Chairwoman Henning would like to see additional landscaping in lieu of fabric on the fencing, and would prefer to see metal than cement siding if possible.

Trustee McCarty moved, seconded by Trustee Madigan to approve PZB 21-05; site plan review for Red Dot Storage for a new 4,500 storage building subject to the following stipulations:

1. *Compliance with the requirements of the Village Engineer prior to being scheduled for the Village Board.*
2. *Compliance with the requirements of the Antioch Fire Protection District.*
3. *Prohibition of any outside of storage of vehicles east of the proposed building, unless the required screening providing 100% opacity is incorporated on the subject site.*
4. *Applicant include a stepped program to add asphalt in the future to the other buildings.*
5. *Additional landscaping in the gap between the fence and current landscaping*
6. *Use of metal rather than cement siding if possible.*

Upon roll call, the vote was:

YES: 4: Madigan, McCarty, Carstensen and Turner.

NO: 0.

ABSENT: 2: Ryan and Sanfilippo.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

H. New Business

1. **PZB 21-07 - Consideration of a text amendment to the Form Based Code of Antioch restricting offices/personal services on Main Street** – Clerk Romine administered the oath to those wishing to testify. Director Garrigan noted that this is a public hearing pursuant to state statute.

Director Garrigan discussed the proliferation of non-retail and non-restaurant uses on Main Street between Orchard and Lake Street. He said some members of the Village Board have expressed concerns regarding the number of offices and personal services (uses such as salons, spas) in the downtown area, and the negative impact on creating a vibrant street life and vibrant downtown. The current form-based code does allow offices as a permitted use in the downtown area, currently designated as Village Core, which is the area in question. He presented a map which shows the different uses currently on Main Street. Director Garrigan

APPROVED MINUTES

said existing businesses would be grandfathered and allowed to continue their use, and would be considered legal, non-conforming uses. Any future office or personal service would be required to be located on a second floor without a special use. He said he has heard concerns with the lack of street life and pedestrian activity in the downtown, and one way to improve this is to attract more businesses and niche retail. Another way is to restrict the allowed uses. Director Garrigan said the question before Planning and Zoning Board this evening is if they are currently comfortable with the zoning code, or if they support modifying the code to restrict those uses to second floors of buildings and reserve first floor spaces for retail and restaurant uses. He commented that vibrant downtowns are popular right now and this is an attempt to make Antioch's downtown more dynamic. He further discussed the downtown beautification plan currently in process with the The Lakota Group, and potential to attract more people to help make the downtown more active and vibrant.

Member McCarty discussed what would be best for the Village and how this change affects the property owners. His opinion, in this case, is that the property owner takes precedence. He understands the benefits to the Village, but believes there is another option to improve downtown without negatively affecting property owners. He asked if there could be an incentive provided to businesses instead, that would be better for both the property owner, existing business and the community. He suggested something similar to the façade program to help attract particular businesses to the downtown.

Member Carstensen agreed with Member McCarty and asked what would qualify someone as an office space or service in the future should this be approved. She specifically mentioned consultancy business that may have a retail aspect. She also asked why this portion of Main Street was included in the proposed amendment. Director Garrigan said it was an attempt to keep it very narrow. He believes there is currently a healthy mixture of uses in the Main Street Transition which is working well and does not need changes. This area has a different character and feel than the classic downtown heart of Antioch. Member Carstensen discussed vacancies in downtown and asked if other communities have done something similar. Director Garrigan replied that some communities do require a special use in their downtown.

Member McCarty said services and service-based businesses still bring people to downtown, and those businesses don't limit the number of people and movement.

Member Turner thinks restricting the uses increases asset value and creates foot traffic. He said he is not opposed to service providers coming into downtown, but when 30% are not providing retail shopping or dining experiences, that does stop pedestrian flow. He believes that Antioch has not reached its full potential, and thinks this will help.

Member Madigan commented on current retail spaces and business hours. She said even though we have some of those niche shops in downtown, there are missed opportunities due to varying hours.

Chairwoman Henning stated that if we had the foot traffic, a lot of those existing businesses may be open extended hours. She discussed the Community Vision done by the Village and the survey responses which stated people wanted an active downtown and places to eat. She doesn't feel that we are limiting the building owners because they can still sell to the allowed uses. She further discussed the availability of certain buildings downtown for future retail uses.

Mr. Andy Alijoski, building owner, said his current building falls into the retail group, but he doesn't agree with the board making a decision on what they do with their building, and thinks they are limiting his ability to rent or lease. He agrees with the need for vibrancy, but still needs to rent his building and cover expenses. Mr. Alijoski said he would love to have all retail, but does not agree with restricting building and business owners in order to achieve that goal.

Mr. Scott Eberly, building owner on Toft and Main Street, agrees with Members McCarty and Carstensen and thinks limiting the use here is going to limit what can happen. He thinks there will be a snowball effect of vacant storefronts, and agrees with the idea of incentivizing businesses that bring people

APPROVED MINUTES

into downtown rather than restrict the uses. He does not agree with taking away an owners right to use their building.

Mr. Mark Eberle, plaza owner, thinks the key to achieving this is more people living in the downtown area. He said punishing or disincentivizing the property owners is not the way to go and thinks they should look at multi-family housing in the downtown.

Mr. Mike O'Mara, Village resident, asked why certain properties are not included in the area. Director Garrigan responded that the natural boundary is Orchard to Lake on the west side of Main Street, and Orchard to Park on the east side of Main street.

Mr. Alijoski suggested the board let things flow as they are and time will tell and things will set their course in what will happen.

Director Garrigan said it may be appropriate to table this item and give staff an opportunity to meet with building owners.

Member McCarty moved, seconded by Member Turner to table this item to the August 12, 2021 Planning and Zoning Board Meeting. Upon roll call, the vote was:

YES: 4: Madigan, McCarty, Carstensen and Turner.

NO:

ABSENT:

THE MOTION CARRIED.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further discussion, the Planning and Zoning Board regular meeting adjourned 8:03 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Lori K. Romine, RMC/CMC
Village Clerk