A regularly scheduled Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting was held on Thursday, July 13, 2017 at 1:00 p.m., City Hall, 419 Fulton Street, Room 400, with Chairperson Richard Russo presiding.

ROLL CALL

The following Zoning Board of Appeals Commissioners were present: Laith Al-Khafaji, Dorian LaSaine, Lon Lyons, Jerry Jackson, Scott Kelsey, Richard Russo, and Nathan Wagner – 7. Absent: None.

Staff Present: Kimberly Smith, Shannon Techie, Madeline Wolf

MINUTES

Commissioner LaSaine moved to approve the minutes for the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on June 8, 2017; seconded, by Commissioner Jackson.

The motion was approved viva voce vote 7 to 0.

REGULAR BUSINESS

CASE NO. ZBA 3033

Hold a Public Hearing on the request of Robert Hall of Miller, Hall & Triggs, LLC for Pamela Mabee, to obtain a variance from the City of Peoria Unified Development Code Section 4.2.4., Building Envelope Standards, to reduce the front yard setback, of a principal structure along Tanglewood Lane, below the required 25 feet (or average of the adjacent) in a Class R-4 (Single-Family Residential) District, for the property located at 4117 N Grand View Drive (Parcel Identification Nos. 14-26-129-006), Peoria, Illinois (Council District 3).

Chairperson Russo noted the petitioner withdrew the request based on the findings of ZBA Case No. 751 from 1958, in which a setback variance was approved.

CASE NO. ZBA 3034

Hold a Public Hearing on the request of Lea Anne Schmidgall, of Habitat for Humanity, to obtain a Variance from the City of Peoria Unified Development Code Section 4.2.4. Building Envelope Standards, to reduce the required front yard setback of a principal structure below the required 30 feet a Class R-6 (Multi-Family Residential) District, for the properties located at 1000 NE Monroe, 1002 NE Monroe, and 508 Evans (Parcel Identification Nos. 18-03-309-001, 18-03-309-002, and 18-03-309-017), Peoria, Illinois (Council District 1).

Senior Urban Planner, Kimberly Smith, Community Development Department, read Case No. ZBA 3034 into the record and presented the request. Ms. Smith provided the Property Characteristics, Requested Variance, and the Development Review Board Recommendation as outlined in the memo.

The Development Review Board recommended APPROVAL of the variance based on the following criteria:

1. Reasonable Return: The house is proposed to be constructed on three combined lots, and has been adapted to the confines of the combined lots as much as possible to meet building codes related to room size requirements, and enable reasonable future use by a family. If a variance cannot be justified in this case; then it may also be difficult for any other type of construction at this lot.

2. Unique Circumstances: In the center of the block, along the side street named Evans, two lots existing and are surrounded by two alleys. This is somewhat unusual, and significantly decreases the ability to construct homes consistent with the neighborhood character in terms of bulk, massing and street orientation.

3. Character: The granting of the proposed variance will allow a new single family home to be constructed in a manner consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood, particularly as related to setback.

LeaAnne Schmidgall, representing Habitat for Humanity, asked for approval for the requested variance as the organization was working to revitalize the area with new construction and home renovations that will match
the character of the street. In response to Commissioner Kelsey’s inquiry, Ms. Schmidgall said construction will begin in 2018.

Gene Lear, representing the petitioner, thanked staff and respectfully requested the commission grant the variance. Mr. Lear referred to and presented a PowerPoint presentation to the commission. Mr. Lear said the hardship was the R-6 District zoning. Surrounding properties were single-family homes and better represent an R-4 District which required a font yard setback of 15 feet versus the front yard setback of 30 feet in an R-6 District. Mr. Lear clarified the alley access to the attached garage was a 14.4 feet front yard setback.

Chairperson Russo opened the Public Hearing at 1:21p.m.

Rodger Sparks, advocate for disabled rights, expressed concern for wheelchair accessibility into the residence.

Ms. Smith responded the property must adhere to building code requirements.

Chairperson Russo closed the Public Hearing at 1:22p.m.

Motion:
Commissioner LaSaine made a motion to approve the request as presented; seconded, by Commissioner Jackson.

Chairperson Russo read the Findings of Fact for a Variance. It was determined by the commission all three criteria were found to be met.

The motion was APPROVED by roll call vote:
Nays: None.

CASE NO. ZBA 3031
Hold a Public Hearing on the request of petitioner Mathew Nelson of Benckendorf & Benckendorf, P.C. (for Floyd and Nellie March of 621 E Embert Place) who is appealing the Zoning Administrator's decision regarding the status of a variance granted in 1986 through ZBA Case 2166 regarding a front yard fence, in a Class R-4 (Single-Family Residential) District for the property located at 3517 N Wisconsin Avenue (Parcel Identification No. 14-28-428-051), Peoria, Illinois (Council District 3).

Senior Urban Planner, Shannon Techie, Community Development Department, read Case No. ZBA 3031 into the record and presented the request. Ms. Techie provided the Property Characteristics, Summary of Appeal, and the Development Review Board Recommendation as outlined in the memo.

The Development Review Board recommended AFFIRMATION of the Zoning Administrator's decision regarding the status of the variance granted through Case No. 2166.

In response to Chairperson Russo’s inquiry, Ms. Techie noted there have been complaints in regard to the fence which have all been closed due to the variance granted through Case No. 2166. Ms. Techie said March 27, 2017 was the first time the Zoning Administrator made an official determination on the granted variance and that determination was appealed through the current case (Case No. ZBA 3031).

Matthew Nelson, attorney representing the petitioners, requested the board declare the variance granted through Case No. 2166 be null and void. Mr. Nelson said the conditions indicate the variance does not run with the land. Mr. Nelson argued the conditions are independent. Mr. Nelson stated it was the subsequent owner's responsibility to learn if the fence was in compliance and if a variance for the height and setback of the fence had been previously granted. Mr. Nelson noted the safety concerns of the current state of the fence as nearby traffic has increased and the current condition of the fence allowed zero visibility for vehicles and pedestrians at the corner of the property.
In response to Commissioner LaSaine’s inquiries, Mr. Nelson did not have statistics of the increased traffic or police reports of traffic accidents in the subject area.

**Floyd March**, petitioner, referred to the image of the current condition of the fence and provided the following examples of the increased traffic; Peoria Christian School enrollment has increased and Wisconsin Avenue was now a three lane road with the addition of a stop light at War Memorial Drive and Wisconsin Avenue. Mr. March’s primary concern was safety.

In response to Commissioner LaSaine’s inquiry, Mr. March said he did not have record as to the reason for the variance request for Case No. ZBA 2166.

**Jessie Ann March**, an interested citizen and relative to the petitioner, expressed safety concerns regarding the current condition of the fence as it reduced vehicle and pedestrian visibility.

Chairperson Russo opened the Public Hearing at 1:49p.m.

**Roger Sparks**, co-owner of 3517 N Wisconsin Avenue, said he thought the fence in the existing state was grandfathered in. Mr. Sparks said he had his property surveyed and the fence was not on the property line. Mr. Sparks distributed Exhibit A to the commission, which was included in the record.

**Monica Jones**, a concerned citizen, expressed safety concerns regarding the placement and openness of the fence. Ms. Jones noted the increase in vehicle traffic in the subject area.

Ms. Techie said staff does not feel as though the second condition was separate from the first condition. Ms. Techie said since the variance was not recorded with the subsequent deed, it would not have been known to subsequent property owners that it was their responsibility to remove the fence.

Commissioner Al-khafaji inquired if the granted variance was recorded with the original deed.

Ms. Techie said the property was transferred in 2005 and the variance was not recorded; therefore, the deeds that followed in 2010 and 2015 did not record the granted variance.

Chairperson Russo inquired about the authority of the Zoning Board of Appeals to impose conditions on the variance as a variance runs with the land.

Ms. Techie noted the legal department provided legal consultation and agreed with the Zoning Administrator’s decision when making the official determination that was outlined in the letter presented before the commission (Page #35 of the July 2017 ZBA Agenda Packet).

Commissioner Kelsey said he considered the variance to be null and void, as the variance was not recorded on the deed, which was a condition of the granting of the variance.

**Senior Attorney, Chrissie Peterson, Legal Department**, said the courts may interpret the fence as a legal non-conforming use, as the fence was installed prior to the requested variance.

Commissioner Lyons expressed concern of the current visibility of the fence compared to the openness at the time of the granted variance.

Ms. Techie referred to how the variance was worded in regards to openness; the primary front yard fence must be less than 70% open in design and to permit a secondary front yard fence greater than 4 feet in height and located on the property line. There was not an openness requirement noted as part of the variance granted for the secondary front yard fence.
In response to Commissioner Al-khafaji’s request for confirmation, Ms. Techie confirmed the commission was responsible for determining if the Zoning Administrator made an accurate determination regarding the status of the variance granted in 1986 regarding the front yard fence.

Commissioner Kelsey said the conditions were independent; if Condition No. 1 was not met, the variance would become null and void.

Chairperson Russo referred to the language of the condition in the minutes from the 10/23/1986 ZBA meeting that stated, “Condition: Variance to remain in effect only as long as present owner resides in this house and will be null and void if he moves. Also, this condition must be recorded and made a part of the deed.”

Ms. Techie referred to the resolution in the approval letter sent to petitioner (Page #29 of the July 2017 ZBA Agenda Packet).

Chairperson Russo inquired which document the commission was to interpret to govern the decision.

In response to Commissioner Kelsey’s inquiry regarding a timeline, Ms. Techie said a timeline was not mentioned in the record for the case, but Condition No. 2 would have had to occur at the time the property was transferred.

In response to Commissioner Wagner’s inquiry regarding the language on a deed, Ms. Techie said the deed should reflect the variance that was granted.

Chairperson Russo summarized staff’s stance which included the intent of the original variance would go along with particular owner and it was the owner’s obligation to tell the buyer that the variance would cease.

Ms. Techie agreed with Chairperson Russo’s comment and noted the owner did not tell the buyer the variance would cease.

Matthew Nelson, in summation, said it would be the buyer’s responsibility to determine if the fence was in violation of city code. Mr. Nelson said the conditions are independent and if one was not met, the variance should become null and void.

Chairperson Russo requested confirmation which document controlled the variance; the signed document to the petitioner dated October 28, 1986 or the letter from the Zoning Administrator dated March 27, 2017.

Ms. Peterson said the controlling document was the resolution that was adopted in the letter dated October 28, 1986, signed by Chairman Thomas Flanagan.

With no further interest from the public to provide public testimony, Chairperson Russo closed the Public Hearing at 2:15p.m.

**Discussion:**
Commissioner Kelsey said he found Condition Nos. 1 and 2 to be separate.

Commissioner Al-khafaji said he found the variance was granted if both conditions were satisfied; the second condition was not satisfied, therefore, there was no variance.

Commissioner Lyons expressed concern regarding the safety of the fence with the lack of visibility for pedestrians and vehicles.

Chairperson Russo read the Findings of Fact for an Appeal, Appendix A, Section 2.7.5.

It was determined by a 2 to 5 vote that Finding A was FALSE.

True: Lyons, Russo – 2.

It was determined by a 7 to 0 vote that Finding B was TRUE.
False: None.

**Motion:**
Commissioner Kelsey motion to reverse the zoning administrator’s decision regarding the 1986 variation; seconded by Commissioner Lyons.

The motion to reverse the Zoning Administrator’s decision was APPROVED by roll call vote.
Nays: None.

**CITIZENS’ OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE COMMISSION**
There was no interest from the public to provide public testimony at 2:21 p.m.

**ADJOURNMENT**
Commissioner LaSaine moved to adjourn the Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting; seconded by Commissioner Al-khafaji.

The motion was approved unanimously viva voce vote 7 to 0.

The Zoning Board of Appeals meeting adjourned at approximately 2:21 p.m.

____________________
Shannon Techie, Senior Urban Planner

____________________
Madeline Wolf, Development Technician
IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE TENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
PEORIA COUNTY, ILLINOIS

ROGER SPARKS,

Plaintiff,

v.

FLOYD MARCH and NELLIE MARCH,

Defendants.

No. 17-MR-00398

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

Plaintiff, Roger Sparks, by and through his attorneys Miller, Hall & Triggs, LLC, complains of Defendants Floyd March and Nellie March, stating as follows:

COUNT I: DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

1. Plaintiff is an owner of record of the real property located at 3517 North Wisconsin Avenue, Peoria, Illinois (the “Property”).

2. Defendants reside at and are the record owners of the property located at 621 East Embert Place, Peoria, Illinois (the “Adjacent Property”).

3. The Adjacent Property is adjacent to and to the west of the Property.

4. There is a fence on the Property that runs parallel to the boundary between the Property and the Adjacent Property (the “Fence”).

5. Upon information and belief, the Fence has been in its present location since approximately 1972.

6. Defendant Floyd March has repeatedly stated to Plaintiff that the Fence encroaches on the Adjacent Property and has demanded that Plaintiff remove the Fence.
7. On or about August 11, 2016, Plaintiff obtained a plat of survey of the Property, prepared by Austin Engineering Co., Inc. (the “Survey”). A true and correct copy of the Survey is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

8. The Survey depicts the Fence as being located to the east of the boundary line between the Property and the Adjacent Property, and entirely on Plaintiff’s Property.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff ROGER SPARKS prays that this Court enter a declaratory judgment that the Fence is entirely on Plaintiff’s Property, and does not encroach upon the Adjacent Property owned by Defendants, and for any further relief this Court deems just and equitable.

COUNT II: TRESPASS

9. Plaintiff restates and incorporates by reference the allegations in Paragraphs 1 – 8 of Count I of this Complaint as if fully stated in this Count II.

10. Portions of Defendants’ driveway, fence, and flower beds encroach onto the Property.

11. Upon information and belief, the encroachment of the driveway onto the Property is the result of a widening or relocation of the driveway when the driveway was replaced by Defendants in 2014.

12. The portion of the Defendants’ driveway that encroaches onto the Property abuts the concrete footings securing the Fence posts, causing the footings and posts to shift and rendering repairs to the Fence posts difficult or impossible without disturbing the driveway encroachment.

13. Defendants failed to take reasonable precautions to properly ascertain the boundary line between the Property and Adjacent Property before replacing and widening or relocating the driveway in 2014, or to otherwise prevent interference with the Fence.
14. Defendants have intentionally interfered with Plaintiff’s exclusive possession and use of the Fence in the following ways:

   a. Defendant Floyd March has repeatedly leaned, kicked, and pushed against the Fence panels and Fence posts, with the intent to move or lean the Fence away from his driveway.

   b. In March of 2016, a car backing out of Defendants’ driveway struck the Fence.

   c. Upon information and belief, on or about July 5, 2016, a white car entering or exiting Defendants’ driveway struck the Fence, causing damage to the Fence post at the southwest corner of the Fence.

   d. Defendants have repeatedly struck the Fence with their car doors while entering and exiting cars on their driveway.

   e. Defendant Floyd March has propped or leaned wooden boards along the bottom of the Fence along his driveway, in such a manner as to put pressure against the Fence posts and panels.

15. Defendants’ acts have caused damage to the Fence posts, panels, and aluminum slats, and have interfered with Plaintiff’s ability to maintain and repair his fence.

16. Defendants’ actions were intentional, and accompanied by aggravating circumstances including willfulness, wantonness, and malice, which warrants punitive damages.

   WHEREFORE, Plaintiff ROGER SPARKS respectfully prays that this Court enter judgment in his favor and against Defendants FLOYD MARCH and NELLIE MARCH awarding money damages in an amount to be ascertained and proved at trial, plus monetary damages continuing and accumulating after the filing of this Complaint and prior to entry of Judgment,
together with punitive damages and his costs of suit, and for any other relief as this Court deems just and equitable.

**COUNT III: INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

17. Plaintiff restates and incorporates by reference the allegations of Paragraphs 1 – 16 of this Complaint as though fully stated in this Count III.

18. Defendants’ trespasses onto the Property have been repeated in nature and are likely to continue, and any amounts recoverable for such repeated trespasses would be disproportionate to the expense of continuing to litigate each instance of the continuing trespass.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff ROGER SPARKS respectfully prays that this Court enter permanent injunctive relief as follows:

A. Requiring that Defendants remove all encroachments onto Plaintiff’s Property;

B. Enjoining Defendants from trespassing onto Plaintiff’s Property, or interfering or intermeddling with Plaintiff’s Fence or Plaintiff’s efforts to maintain and repair the Fence; and

C. Any further relief the Court deems just and equitable.

Respectfully submitted,

ROGER SPARKS, Plaintiff

By: Katherine L. Swise, ARDC #6304116
Miller, Hall & Triggs, LLC
416 Main Street, Suite 1125
Peoria, IL 61602
(309) 671-9600
katherine.swise@mhtlaw.com
RULE 222 AFFIDAVIT

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 222(b) and under penalties as provided by law pursuant to Section 1-109 of the Code of Civil Procedure, the undersigned certifies that she is an attorney and authorized agent for the Plaintiff and, as such, is authorized to execute this Affidavit. She further certifies that the total money damages sought by Plaintiffs in the foregoing Complaint, exclusive of interest and costs, do not exceed $50,000.00.

Katherine L. Swise
CASE SUMMARY: KNOWN S CITED FOR LITTERING

I RESPONDED TO 621 E EMBERT AND SPOKE WITH FLOYD MARCH ABOUT AN ONGOING PROBLEM WITH HIS NEIGHBOR ROGER SPARKS. MARCH STATED THAT SPARKS MOWS HIS LAWN WITH A RIDING MOWER AND BLOWS THE GRASS CLIPPINGS ONTO HIS DRIVEWAY. MARCH STATED

I OBSERVED GRASS CLIPPINGS ON MARCH'S DRIVEWAY. I OBSERVED THAT MARCH'S DRIVEWAY BORDERS SPARKS' YARD AND THAT THERE IS A FENCE THAT RUNS THE LENGTH OF SPARKS' BACKYARD BETWEEN SPARKS' YARD AND MARCH'S DRIVEWAY. THERE IS A GAP BETWEEN THE BOTTOM OF THE FENCE AND THE GRASS. THERE IS NO YARD ON MARCH'S SIDE OF THE FENCE. MARCH STATED THAT HE WANTED TO SIGN A COMPLAINT AGAINST SPARKS FOR LITTERING. I HAD MARCH SIGN A MOVN THAT I COMPLETED FOR SPARKS FOR LITTERING.

WHILE SPEAKING WITH MARCH I OBSERVED SPARKS GOING BACK AND FORTH ON THE SIDEWALK IN FRONT OF HIS HOUSE. SPARKS WOULD ALSO STOP ON THE CORNER OF WISCONSIN AND EMBERT AND LOOK AT ME. WHEN I APPROACHED SPARKS I ASKED HIM IF HE KNEW WHY I WAS THERE AND HE STATED THAT HE DID NOT. SPARKS APPEARED TO BE AGITATED AND IMMEDIATELY STARTED TO YELL AND COMPLAIN ABOUT MARCH AND HOW MARCH'S SON HAD RUN OVER HIS FENCE PREVIOUSLY AND HOW MARCH IS HARASSING HIM.

I EXPLAINED MARCH'S COMPLAINT ABOUT THE GRASS CLIPPINGS TO SPARKS. SPARKS SPONTANEOUSLY STATED THAT HE DID NOT BLOW THE GRASS CLIPPINGS ONTO MARCH'S DRIVEWAY. HE STATED THAT HE BLOWS THE CLIPPINGS THE OPPOSITE DIRECTION OF THE DRIVEWAY AND INTO HIS OWN YARD. HE STATED THAT THE WIND BLEW THE GRASS CLIPPINGS ONTO MARCH'S DRIVEWAY. I OBSERVED THAT THERE WAS A VERY LIGHT WIND BLOWING AT THE TIME AND RECALLED THAT THERE HAD NOT BEEN MUCH OF A BREEZE ALL DAY.

I ASKED SPARKS IF HE CUT THE GRASS TODAY. HE STATED THAT HE USED HIS RIDING MOWER TO CUT THE GRASS TODAY. I ISSUED SPARKS MOVN # A140998 FOR LITTERING. AT 1346 HRS I CHECKED THE WEATHERBUG APP WHICH SHOWED THE CURRENT WIND WAS WNW AT 4 MPH. IT ALSO SHOWED GUST OF WNW 8 MPH AND AVERAGE AT NW 2 MPH. IT INDICATED THAT THIS WAS CONSIDERED "CALM."

CASE CLOSED.
CASE SUMMARY:
DAMAGED FENCE FOUND BY OWNER.

DISPATCHED TO THE LISTED ADDRESS IN REGARDS TO DAMAGED PROPERTY.

UPON ARRIVAL ROGER SPARKS SAID HE FOUND HIS FENCE POST BENT. THE FENCE IS ON THE LINE OF HIS NEIGHBORS DRIVEWAY AND THE STREET. SPARKS BELIEVED IT WAS HIT BY A VEHICLE BUT DID NOT KNOW WHEN.

THERE IS NO SUSPECT INFORMATION AT THIS TIME.

CASE SUSPENDED.

CONFIDENTIAL
TO ADDRESSEE ONLY
IN THE LISTED DATE AND TIME I WAS DISPATCHED TO 3517 N WISCONSIN ON TROUBLE WITH A NEIGHBOR.

SPOKE WITH SPARKS WHO STATED THE FOLLOWING IN SUMMARY.

SPARKS STATED THAT HE HAS HAD TROUBLE WITH MARCH WHO LIVES DIRECTLY BEHIND HIM IN THE PAST. SPARKS STATED THAT THERE IS A FENCE THAT DIVIDES THE TWO PROPERTIES AND HIS OWN PROPERTY ACTUALLY EXTENDS PAST THE FENCE ON MARCH'S SIDE. SPARKS STATED THAT HE PUT UP A TARP OVER HIS FENCE TO STOP GRASS FROM GOING ONTO MARCH'S PROPERTY WHEN HE MOWS IT. SPARKS STATED THAT THIS WAS ONE OF THE PAST ISSUES THAT THEY HAVE GONE TO COURT FOR.

SPARKS STATED THAT THERE ARE BOARDS AT THE BOTTOM OF THE FENCE TO STOP DEBRIS FROM GOING ON HIS PROPERTY. HE STATED THAT THE FENCE BLEW OVER THE BOARDS AND HE BELIEVES THAT MARCH WAS TRYING TO MOVE THE BOARDS BACK OVER TO THE OTHER SIDE OF THE ENCE TODAY.

SHOULD BE NOTED THAT IT HAS BEEN RAINING ALL DAY TODAY WITH HEAVY FLOODING AND STRONG WINDS.

SPARKS STATED THAT HE WOULD MOVE THE BOTTOM OF THE FENCE BACK OVER TO THE OTHER SIDE OF THE BOARDS WHEN THE WEATHER CLEARED UP. I TOLD HIM THAT I WOULD GO AND TELL MARCH THAT I WOULDN'T EXPECT ANYBODY TO BE OUT IN THIS WEATHER TODAY AND THAT HE COULD WAIT UNTIL IT CLEARED UP.

THEN WENT NEXT DOOR AND SPOKE WITH FLOYD'S SON. HE STATED THAT IS FATHER WAS NOT HERE. I EXPLAINED TO HIM THAT SPARKS STATED THAT HE WOULD FIX THE BOARDS AND THE ENCE WHEN THE WEATHER CLEARED UP. HE STATED THAT HE WOULD PASS THAT ALONG TO HIS FATHER.

SPARKS REQUESTED A POLICE REPORT AS THEY ARE STILL GOING TO COURT WITH MARCH OVER THE PROPERTY LINE.
MUNICIPAL ORDINANCE VIOLATION NOTICE

NAME: SPIDES, W. W.

ADDRESS: 35419 NW 5TH AVENUE

CITY: PEORIA
STATE: IL
ZIP: 61524
PHONE: 999-9999

SEX: M
RACE: W
BIRTHDATE: 2/10/80
HTG: 5'10" WGT: 260
EYES: B
HAIR: C

DRI. LIC. NO: 16-79395-6049
STATE: W.

VEHICLE MAKE: 
MODEL: 
YEAR: 
PLATE: 

THE UNDERSigned OFFICER CHARGES THAT ON 
__/__/__ AT __:__ AM.

THE DEFENDANT DID IN THE CITY OF PEORIA, COUNTY OF PEORIA, STATE OF ILLINOIS, ON OR ABOUT

LOCATION (STREET ADDRESS): 4021 E. LIBERTY

ESTABLISHMENT NAME: 
LICENSE #:

COMMIT THE FOLLOWING CITY OF PEORIA ORDINANCE VIOLATION:

- 37 SALE OF ALCOHOL TO NON-AGE PERSON $500
- 34(A) POSSESSION/CONSUMPTION OF ALCOHOL BY NON-AGE PERSON $375
- 36 USE OF FALSE ID MISREPRESENTATION OF AGE $375
- 8-9 PRESENCE OF NON-AGE PERSON ON LICENSED PREMISES $375
- 3-17 CARRYING OPEN LIQUOR FROM PREMISES $375
- 20-48 ILLEGAL POSSESSION/CONSUMPTION OF LIQUOR UPON PUBLIC WAY $200
- 20-101 PRESENCE ON PREMISES WHERE MINORS POSSESS OR CONSUME ALCOHOL $250
- 18-802 SALE OF CIGARETTE PRODUCTS TO A MINOR $500
- 16-615 SALE OF SINGLE CIGARETTE TO A MINOR $500
- 20-42 POSSESSION OF TOBACCO BY A MINOR $250

OTHER VIOLATION (DESCRIBE):

SEC. #: 13-44

The undersigned officer states that the above information is true and correct to the best of his/her knowledge, information or belief, and further states he/she served the defendant a copy of this complaint.

OFFICER'S SIGNATURE: 

BADGE #: 16-1923

PRE-COURT AMOUNT: $500

DEFENDANT COURT APPEARANCE DATE: THURSDAY 9/15/16 AT 1:30 P.M.

COURTROOM 210

CALL CITY LEGAL AT (309) 494-8590 IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS.