

**PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION  
JANUARY 17, 2023, MEETING MINUTES**

**APPROVED APRIL 4, 2023**

---

**Call to Order:** Chairman Patel called the meeting to order in the Roselle Village Board Room at 7:01 p.m.

**Roll Call:**

Present: Commissioners Boos, Lewis, Patel, Walloch and Wurtz  
Absent: Commissioner Keller-Stein and Stringfellow  
Staff: Community Development Manager Caron Bricks, Village Administrator Jason Bielawski, Assistant Village Administrator Brian Joanis, Village Attorney Michael Castaldo Jr.

**Approval of the Agenda:** A motion was made by Commissioner Boos, seconded by Commissioner Wurtz to approve the agenda. The motion passed (5-0).

**Approval of Minutes:** A motion was made by Commissioner Boos, seconded by Commissioner Wurtz to approve the minutes from November 1, 2022. The motion passed (5-0).

**Consideration of Petitions:**

PZ 22-1105 Village of Roselle Zoning Ordinance Update

Commissioner Wurtz made a motion to open the public hearing for case PZ 22-1105, seconded by Commissioner Boos. The motion passed with a 5-0 vote.

Chairman Patel asked CD Manager Bricks for the staff report. CD Manager Bricks summarized the process of the zoning code update starting in 2019. Members of the P&Z Update Committee include CD Manager Bricks, Village Administrator Bielawski, Mayor Pileski, Trustee Domke, ZBA Member Galante, and P&Z Commissioners Walloch and Wurtz. CD Manager Bricks said that Michael Blue from Teska Associates and David Silverman from Ancel Glink would be going through the code section by section.

Chairman Patel swore in Michael Blue of Teska Associates 627 Grove St. Evanston, IL and David Silverman Ancel Glink 140 South Dearborn St. Chicago, IL. Mr. Blue reviewed the zoning updates.

Mr. Blue began to explain the entire process and an overview of the zoning ordinance. The update process was split into multiple phases the kickoff joint workshop summary, evaluate existing conditions analysis, draft ordinance, and adoption/implementations. Discussed and heard various stakeholders' opinions to determine how sections should be written. The importance of updating include reasons of refining ordinances, update to State Law Authority, clear up definition, incorporate design guidelines from Comprehensive Plan, Modernizing Finding of Fact Standards, Zoning districts, update parking regulations, update notice process, and sign ordinances.

Mr. Silverman and Mr. Blue then began to review the key changes section by section and highlighted the importance of graphics involved in the update.

Section 1: Title, Purpose, Definitions included changes to reflect modern uses/common names for uses, adding graphics to make definition more understandable, tie definitions of land use more closely to land use specified in the permitted land use table, and created additional guide on how to use section one. Mr. Blue then asked the commissioners if there were any questions regarding section one, which there were none.

Section 2: General Provisions included changes to create section of generally applicable regulation, clarify unusual standards, simplify regulation (related to outdoor seating, trash, lighting, home occupations, and yard encroachments), modernization of telecommunication and wind/solar energy regulations, set limit for garage size limit, privacy fences set to 50% of corner side yard setback, and additions of EV charging standards. Chairman Patel then asked how specific the code gets regarding the new revision. Mr. Blue then responded that specifically with the lighting provisions it would be less regulation and requirements in comparison to the current requirements. Mr. Silverman also brought up that they wanted to create sensible simplified regulations in order to make the standards more enforceable. Mr. Blue then asked if there were any questions, to which Commissioner Walloch asked if there was any potential for backlash? Mr. Blue said it was unlikely for the most part the update was not getting stricter. Commissioner Wurtz stated he was on the steering committee and the focus was more on streamlining process and rearrange the code in a sensible way. Mr. Blue focused on how they went through and individualized the code based on the community. He asked if there were any further questions and seeing none they moved on to the next section.

Section 3: Zoning Districts included changes of an added land use table, consolidation into one section, single page district summaries, clarification of R-3 and R-4 zoning, ORI subdistricts were consolidated and consider ADUs (Accessory Dwelling Units) later. Mr. Blue then asked the commissioners if there were any questions regarding section one, which there were none. Mr. Blue then asked the commissioners if there were any questions regarding section one, which there were none.

Section 4: Administration and Enforcement changes were presented by Mr. Silverman, the changes include the consolidation Zoning Board of Appeal and Planning and Zoning Commission, administrative variations up to five percent of standard, notice only requires first class mail by applicant, sign, newspaper notice, secondary SUP findings removed, PUD threshold to one acre from three, PUD minor amendments (start development in one year), and certificate of Zoning Compliance added. Commissioner Boos asked how common the administrative variations were, to which Mr. Silverman remarked they were common to reduce time/expense for small variation (still a notice process and public hearing can be triggered). Commissioner Boos asked about if it could take longer if the administrative variations were to be rejected based on the community input and then come back to needing a public hearing. Mr. Silverman

responded that it is possible, but the intent of this section is for very minor changes that are less controversial. Mr. Boos asked if items were just going to receive a rubber stamp approval from administrative, to which Mr. Silverman remarked that staff must follow very strict standards in this process. Community Development Manager Caron Bricks added that she would have to feel comfortable and put herself on the line in making these determinations, which she can always refer to the commission. Commissioner Boos asked if this additional administrative variation authority would be burdensome to the Zoning Administrator, to which Caron Bricks, Community Development Manager responded she did not believe it would be. Commissioner Wurtz and Caron Bricks Community Development Manager noted examples of small cases that the commission questions why it must come before them. Mr. Blue echoed those examples and demonstrated a more of ease in the process. Mr. Blue indicated that having a predictable and understandable process assist in bringing in economic development.

Section 5: Off-Street Parking & Loading changes include a reuse rule section, parking to become conforming if damage >50%, limitation on parking pads in residential areas, clarifying language, adding regulations (visitor, cross access, land, and bicycle parking), parking standards modernized, and administrative approval for some regulations. Mr. Blue then asked the commissioners if there were any questions regarding section five, which there were none.

Section 6: Landscaping & Tree Preservation changes included updates standard (screening, parking lot, traditional, and review process), landscape review by VB, additional interior landscaping, tree preservation and replacement regulations, and native planting suggestion added. Commissioner Boos expressed concern about strictness to parking regulations and reducing space with landscape. Mr. Blue addressed that this a design question and does not see much of an issue with it.

Section 7: Nonconforming Regulation changes include updates to existing standards, set procedures for nonconforming use of land, structure, and property, and amortization of uses at future date. Mr. Silverman addressed that the additions were in hopes to develop a clear model.

Section 8: Performance Standards included changes to updated/simplified to reflect State and Federal relations by reference. Mr. Blue added that this assist in developing a standard to reduce resident burden and nuisances.

Section 9: Design Standards is a new section that included applied standards from Comprehensive Plan, set design guidelines for business/industrial district, commission review for ground up (new construction, special uses, and other zoning entitlements), and administrative review for exterior renovations.

Section 10: Signs includes changes on reorient regulations toward content neutrality, reorganize sign code, incorporate graphics to make regulation more readily

understandable, incorporate Sign Code into Zoning Ordinance and establish sign districts.

This concluded the review of each individual section, Mr. Blue and Mr. Silverman asked if there were any additional question and comments. Chairman Patel thanked the presenters.

Chairman Patel asked if any public comments were submitted in advance, to which Caron Bricks, Community Development Manager said there were none. Chairman Patel opened the floor to any public comment.

Chairman Patel swore in Anthony Bonavolonta of 845 Butternut Ct. Mr. Bonavolonta remarked that he has been a resident of Roselle since 1965 and read the entire ordinance. He believes that the ordinance was really well present but still has concerns regarding parking that are sitting on someone property, or existing buildings on the property, and aesthetics in the code. Chairman Patel thanked him for presenting his concerns and said that elected officials were in the room and should take those factors into consideration.

Chairman Patel then swore in Cheryl Danner of 789 Golfview Dr. who stated concerns about height restrictions for building and signs.

Commissioner Wurtz made a motion to close the public hearing for case PZ 22-1105, seconded by Commissioner Walloch. The motion passed with a 5-0 vote.

Chairman Patel began the discussion amongst commissioners. Commissioner Wurtz indicated that it was less of rewrite and more of a reorganization of the Zoning Code. Chairman Patel indicate he approves of streamlining the process and making it easier.

Commissioner Boos made a motion to approve the Finding of Facts for public hearing case PZ 22-1105, seconded by Commissioner Wurtz. The motion passed with a 5-0 vote.

Commissioner Wurtz made a motion to make a recommendation for the approval of the Village Board for public hearing case PZ 22-1105, seconded by Commissioner Boos. The motion passed with a 5-0 vote.

**Old Business:** There was no old business discussed.

**New Business:** There was no new business discussed.

**Adjournment:** Commissioner Boos made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Commissioner Wurtz. The motion passed 5-0 and the meeting ended at 8:11 p.m.