AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

3. APPROVAL OF MAY 10, 2018 MINUTES

4. REGULAR BUSINESS
   Deliberations will be held at the end of each case after public comment has been closed. No public comment is allowed during deliberations.

   **CASE NO. ZBA 3047**
   Public Hearing on the request of Debra Young of Mid-Illinois Companies to obtain variances from the City of Peoria Unified Development Code, Section 4.3.4 CN and CG District Building Envelope Standards, to reduce the required parking setback line from 15 feet to 0 feet, and Sections 8.2.6 Front Yard Landscaping and 8.2.8 Parking Lot Perimeter Landscaping, to reduce the required landscaping points, for the property located at 905 NE Adams Street (Parcel Identification No. 18-03-359-027), Peoria, Illinois (Council District 1).

5. CITIZENS’ OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE COMMISSION

6. ADJOURNMENT
WELCOME!

If you plan on speaking, please complete a Blue Speaker Form

For each case the following sequence will apply:

1. Chairperson proceeds with swearing in procedures
2. Chairperson announces the case
3. Staff enters case into the record
   a. Staff presents the case
   b. Staff answers questions from the Commission
4. Petitioner presents case and answers questions from the Commission
5. Chairperson opens the meeting to the public
6. Public comments – Chairperson may ask for response/input from staff and petitioner
7. Petitioner presents closing statements
8. Public testimony is closed (No further public comment)
9. Commission deliberates and may consult staff
10. Commission prepares findings, if applicable
11. Commission votes

All comments and questions must be directed to the Commission
A regularly scheduled Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting was held on Thursday, May 10, 2018 at 1:00 p.m., City Hall, 419 Fulton Street, Room 400, with Chairperson Richard Russo presiding and with proper notice having been posted.

**ROLL CALL**

The following Zoning Board of Appeals Commissioners were present: Dorian LaSaine, Lon Lyons, Jerry Jackson, Richard Russo, and Nathan Wagner – 5. Absent: Laith Al-Khafaji – 1.

Staff Present: Leah Allison, Kimberly Smith, and Madeline Wolf

**MINUTES**

Commissioner LaSaine moved to approve the amended minutes for the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on March 8, 2018; seconded by Commissioner Jackson.

The motion was approved viva voce vote 5 to 0.

**REGULAR BUSINESS**

**CASE NO. ZBA 3044**

Public Hearing on the request of Lee Anne Schmidgall of Habitat for Humanity to obtain variances from the City of Peoria Unified Development Code, Section 4.2.4 Building Envelope Standards, to reduce the front yard setback from 30 feet to 14 feet, to reduce the side yard setback from 10 feet to 4 feet, and to reduce the rear yard setback from 25 feet to 7 feet, for the property located at 1031 NE Monroe Street (Parcel Identification No. 18-03-305-035), Peoria, Illinois (Council District 1).

Senior Urban Planner, Leah Allison, Community Development Department, read Case No. ZBA 3044 into the record and presented the request.

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

1. Reasonable Return: The subject property’s ability to yield a reasonable return is diminished without the requested variances. Application of the district setbacks would render the lot as unbuildable.
2. Unique Circumstances: The size of the property is unique as its depth (78.5 feet) is significantly less than the depth (112.5 feet) of other properties on the block.
3. Character: Review of the neighborhood finds other properties with front yard setbacks less than 30 feet, side yard setbacks less than 10 feet, and rear yard setbacks less than 25 feet.

And a condition of approval:

1. Replacement or repair of any deteriorated or non-ADA-compliant sidewalks and curbs along property frontage. This applies for both concrete and brick sidewalk. Sidewalk participation may be available from the City of Peoria at an 80/20% cost share.

Chairperson Russo opened the Public Hearing at 1:10 p.m.

Gene Lear, representing Habitat for Humanity, thanked staff for assistance during the application and review process and agreed with staff’s recommendation and condition.

With no further interest from the public to provide public testimony, Chairperson Russo closed the Public Hearing at approximately 1:11 p.m.

**Discussion:**

Chairperson Russo read the Findings of Fact, Sections 2.6.3.E. Standards for Variations. It was determined by the commission that criteria 1, 2, and 3 were found to be true.
Motion:
Commissioner LaSaine made a motion to approve the request with staff’s condition; seconded by Commissioner Lyons.

The motion was APPROVED by roll call vote 5 to 0.
Nays: None.

CASE NO. ZBA 3045
Hold a Public Hearing on the request of Shane M. Sharp, to obtain a variance from the City of Peoria Unified Development Code, Section 4.2.4., Building Envelope Standards, to allow an increase in the maximum allowable density in the R-6 Multifamily Zoning District, for the property located at 255 NE Randolph (Parcel Identification Number 18-04-329-014), Peoria, Illinois (Council District 2).

Senior Urban Planner, Kimberly Smith, Community Development Department, read Case No. ZBA 3045 into the record and presented the request.

The Development Review Board recommended DENIAL of the variance due to a lack of hardship and failure to meet all of the following criteria:

1. Reasonable Return: Increasing the density to allow additional rental units is not the only factor affecting reasonable return. A number of other factors include debt liabilities and operating costs. Further, the Staff noted that any hardship is self-created, due to the size of the proposed machine.

2. Unique Circumstances: The particular physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the specific property involved do not present a hardship to the owner as related to density. A unique need for the density variance has not been established, as other properties within the neighborhood contain carriage houses, and they are not used for residential rental units. The property, even without the variance, is already nonconforming with 130% greater density that what is allowed by strict application of the Code. Finally, the practical difficulty (in this case wanting to rent 230% more units than what is allowed per Code) may not be created by any persons presently having interest in the property. Note this practical difficulty is created by the current owner, as it was transferred and purchased with written knowledge that the property was only permitted for 9 units. Further, the transfer certificate for the previous purchase also stated 9 units, not 13.

3. Character: The surrounding neighborhood contains a mix of multi-family and single family uses. Unless property converted and maintained to meet building and fire codes, occupancy of the carriage house by four additional families could substantially increase the danger of fire. Additionally, the 230% over what is permitted impacts the surrounding neighborhood with a 230% increase in related items such as trash containers, vehicles, and general service traffic.

Ms. Smith read the testimony from Fulvio Zerla that was received prior to the meeting. Fulvio Zerla, a concerned citizen, expressed his opposition of the request due to concerns regarding parking for the additional residents.

Commissioner LaSaine inquired other carriage houses in use for residential purposes in the area, if thirteen units had previously been approved at this property, the life safety concerns listed under criteria 3, and confirmed the request would not increase the footprint of the building.

Commissioner Lyons inquired the nonconforming status for 259 NE Randolph Avenue.

Chairperson Russo opened the Public Hearing at 1:32p.m.

Jack Teplitz, owner of 240 NE Randolph and attorney representing the petitioner, spoke in favor of the request. Mr. Teplitz noted the carriage house did not currently have approval for the four units and requested the ZBA grant the request to establish the nonconforming use for the four units in the carriage house. Mr. Teplitz reviewed Exhibit A to support criteria 1. Mr. Teplitz respectfully requested the videos be entered in the record (link: https://photos.app.goo.gl/LhGN5hx7Zs5Fc3Sz5).
Shane Sharp, petitioner, provided commentary of the videos which included a walk through each of the existing four units of the carriage house. Mr. Sharp confirmed he was renovating existing units and there would be no building footprint expansion.

John Wall, contractor, verified he prepared the estimates for the renovation of the property and confirmed the accuracy of the costs presented in Exhibit A.

Jack Teplitz, in closing, cross examined Mr. Shane Sharp who confirmed if the density variance was not granted, it would be difficult to generate revenue and the carriage house would not have value as a garage. Mr. Teplitz reviewed the hardships as presented in the memo.

Commissioner LaSaine questioned if the petitioner would provide adequate parking to accommodate additional four units. LaSaine questioned the number of vehicles the property currently accommodated. Mr. Teplitz responded that parking would not be an issue.

In response to Commissioner Lyons’ inquiry regarding the costs presented in Exhibit A, Mr. Wall reviewed the costs associated with a renovation and said a demolition estimate was not provided to Mr. Sharp. Mr. Teplitz said demolition of the carriage house was not in discussion at this time.

Commissioner Wagner expressed concern for the renovation of the units without appropriate approval for the use of the units in the carriage house. Discussion ensued regarding the work currently being conducted at the carriage house.

With no further interest from the public to provide public testimony, Chairperson Russo closed the Public Hearing at approximately 2:21 p.m.

After discussion ensued regarding building and life safety codes, Chairperson Russo requested a five minute recess for city staff to speak to the petitioner at 2:29 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 2:39 p.m. It was decided to proceed with the request and address the building and life safety code concerns when the petitioner applies for a building permit.

In response to Chairperson Russo’s inquiry regarding off-street parking, Ms. Smith said the parking for the nine units in the main building was considered grandfathered. Ms. Smith added parking for the carriage house units would require compliance.

Discussion:
Chairperson Russo read the Findings of Fact, Sections 2.6.3.E. Standards for Variations. It was determined by the commission that criteria 1 was found to be false and criteria 2 and 3 were found to be true.

Motion:
Commissioner Wagner made a motion to DENY the density variance; seconded by Commissioner Lyons.

The motion was APPROVED to DENY the variance by roll call vote.
Yeas: LaSaine, Lyons, Jackson, Russo, and Wagner~ 5.
Nays: None.

CITIZENS’ OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE COMMISSION
There was no interest from the public to address the Zoning Board of Appeals at 2:45 p.m.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS
Chairperson:
Commissioner Jackson moved to reelect Richard Russo as the Chairperson of the Zoning Board of Appeals; seconded by Commissioner LaSaine.

The reelection of Richard Russo as Chairperson was approved viva voce vote 5 to 0.
Vice Chairperson:
Commissioner Wagner moved to elect Lon Lyons as the Vice Chairperson of the Zoning Board of Appeals; seconded by Commissioner LaSaine.

The election for Lon Lyons as Vice Chairperson was approved viva voce vote 5 to 0.

ADJOURNMENT
Commissioner Lyons moved to adjourn the Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting; seconded by Commissioner Jackson.

The motion was approved unanimously viva voce vote 5 to 0.

The Zoning Board of Appeals meeting adjourned at approximately 2:46 p.m.

X Madeline Wolf
Development Technician
## 255 NE Randolph Ave.
### Costs
*(with 4 Units in Carriage House)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Price</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage House</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Renovation</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appliances &amp; Fixtures</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Costs with Carriage House</strong></td>
<td><strong>342,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
255 NE Randolph Ave.
Costs
(with 4 Units in Carriage House)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rental Income:</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Annually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Efficiency Units</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2-Bedroom Unit</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1-Bedroom Units</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$15,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less 10% Vacancy

Net Operating Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses:</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Annually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Utilities</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Taxes</td>
<td>$367</td>
<td>$4,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Fees (7% of Rent)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc including Rental Registration</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Expenses</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$30,831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Cash Flow

$45,309

Return on Investment

13.23%
255 NE Randolph Ave.
Costs
(with No Units in Carriage House)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Price</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion of Carriage House to Garage</td>
<td>160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation of House</td>
<td>130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appliances &amp; Fixtures</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$450,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 255 NE Randolph Ave.
### Costs
(with No Units in Carriage House)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Annually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rental Income:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Efficiency Units</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2-Bedroom Unit</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less 10% Vacancy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Operating Income</strong></td>
<td>$57,000</td>
<td>$51,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  |             |             |
| **Expenses:**     |             |             |
| Utilities:        |             |             |
| Heating           | $250        | $3,000      |
| Water             | (100)       | (1,200)     |
| **Total Utilities** |             | $4,200      |
| Real Estate Taxes | (367)       | (4,401)     |
| Insurance         | (400)       | (4,800)     |
| Maintenance       |             | (5,700)     |
| Garbage           | (70)        | (840)       |
| Management Fees (7% of Rent) | (3,591)     |             |
| Misc including Rental Registration | (1,000)     |             |
| **Net Expenses**  | $24,532     |             |
| **Net Cash Flow** | $26,768     |             |

**Return on Investment**: 5.95%
259 NE Randolph
TO: City of Peoria Zoning Board of Appeals  
FROM: Development Review Board (Prepared by Leah Allison)  
DATE: June 14, 2018  
CASE NO: ZBA 3047  
SUBJECT: Public Hearing on the request of Debra Young of Mid-Illinois Companies to obtain variances from the City of Peoria Unified Development Code, Section 4.3.4 CN and CG District Building Envelope Standards, to reduce the required parking setback line from 15 feet to 0 feet, and Sections 8.2.6 Front Yard Landscaping and 8.2.8 Parking Lot Perimeter Landscaping, to reduce the required landscaping points, for the property located at 905 NE Adams Street (Parcel Identification No. 18-03-359-027), Peoria Illinois (Council District 1)

PROPERTY CHARACTERISTICS
The subject property is 0.43 acre in size and zoned Class C-G (Neighborhood Commercial) District. It is surrounded by Class R-6 (Multi-Family Residential) to the north, Class C-G (Neighborhood Commercial) to the east and west, and I-3 (General Industrial) zoning to the south. The property includes two commercial buildings, an accessory garage, and an exterior materials storage yard for Mid-Illinois Companies, which has operated at this location since 1979.

REQUESTED VARIANCE:
The Petitioner is requesting variances from Section 4.3.4 CN and CG District Building Envelope Standards, to reduce the required parking setback line from 15 feet to 0 feet, and Sections 8.2.6 Front Yard Landscaping and 8.2.8 Parking Lot Perimeter Landscaping, to reduce the required landscaping points in order to construct a new parking lot containing six parking spaces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Item</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Applicant Proposal</th>
<th>Variance Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking Setback</td>
<td>15 feet from right-of-way line</td>
<td>0 feet from the property line along Morgan St</td>
<td>Setback reduced 15 feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard for Morgan St</td>
<td>64 points</td>
<td>45 points of evergreen trees located in the public right-of-way.</td>
<td>Landscaping reduced by 9 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard for Adam St</td>
<td>65 points</td>
<td>40 points of shade trees</td>
<td>Landscaping reduced by 25 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td>8 points of shade trees for the parking lot and continuous landscape hedge for the parking lot perimeter.</td>
<td>9 points of shrubs and continuous landscape hedge for the parking lot perimeter partially located in the public right-of-way.</td>
<td>Landscaping reduced by 8 points for the parking lot as points must be provided by shade trees and not shrubs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Petitioner states that the narrow and small lot creates a hardship for the construction of the parking lot.
SITE PLAN REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends APPROVAL of the requested variances based on the following criteria:

1) Reasonable Return: The subject property’s ability to yield a reasonable return may be diminished without the requested variances. Application of the district setbacks would reduce the buildable area of the lot.
2) Unique Circumstances: The property is currently developed with commercial buildings and a limited parking area. The remaining land available for development is narrow in size.
3) Character: Review of the neighborhood finds other properties with front yard setbacks less than 15 feet and limited area for planting of landscaping.

And condition of approval:

1) Provide a 100 percent opaque visual barrier or screen from view of the public right-of-way, public parking areas, or adjacent residential development for the outdoor storage of materials.
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
VARIANCE APPLICATION

1. PROPERTY INFORMATION
   a) Address: 905 NE Adams Street
   b) Tax ID Number(s): 18-03-359-017 & 18-03-359-026 Parcels to be Combined
   c) Parcel Area (acres or square feet): 017 is 0.08 acres, 026 is 0.26 acres. Total - 0.34 acres
   d) Current Zoning District: CG for both Parcels
   e) Current Property Use: 017 is a vacant lot. 026 is contractor office/shop.

2. OWNER INFORMATION – REQUIRED
   Debra L. Young
   Mid-Illinois Companies
   905 NE Adams, Peoria, IL 61603
   309-674-0717
   info@mic123.com
   Signature of Owner(s) & Date

3. APPLICANT INFORMATION – engineer, architect, attorney or other, if applicable
   Steve Kerr
   Mohr & Kerr Engineering
   5901 N. Prospect, Suite 6B, Peoria, IL 61614
   309-692-8501
   sdkerr@mohrandkerr.com
   Signature of Applicant & Date

Applicant’s Interest in Property:
- [ ] Contractor
- [ ] Contract Purchaser
- [ ] Other Engineer

Send Correspondence To: Select one entity to receive all correspondence. E-mail will be used for all correspondence unless otherwise requested.
- [ ] Owner
- [ ] Applicant
- [ ] Representative of Applicant
4. VARIANCE INFORMATION

a) Variance being requested

   Parking setback requested to be reduced from 15' to 0' for approximately 25' of the frontage on

   Morgan Street. Required front yard & parking landscaping will be installed in right of way.

b) From what section of the zoning ordinance is a variance being requested?

   4.3.4.D Parking Setback Line & & 8.2.6 Front Yard Landscaping & 8.2.6 Parking Lot Landscaping

c) What unique or exceptional characteristics of your property prevent it from meeting the requirements in your zoning district? (Check applicable)

   Too narrow  X  Too small  X  Soil  
   Subsurface  
   Elevation  
   Slope  
   Too shallow  
   Shape  
   Other  

d) What is your hardship? Please be specific.

   Mid Illinois was using existing parking to North that was not on their property. The owner of the North parking has asked that Mid Illinois no longer use that parking. Mid Illinois needs to add parking for office employees and customers. The only place on the lot to add parking is on Parcel 18-03-359-017. To add parking will require the variance

e) If granted a variance in the form requested, will it be in harmony with the neighborhood and not contrary to the intent and purpose of the Unified Development Ordinance?

   ____ Yes  X  ____ No

   Please elaborate: All existing parking lots within the block are built to the right of way line and do not meet the setback requirement.

5. FILING FEE (MUST ACCOMPANY APPLICATION)

   (0.34 x $100) + $750.00 = $784.00

   Variance Application Fees for any property in the City shall be as set forth below:

   $750.00 minimum plus $100 per acre to a maximum of $7500.00

   Per Unified Development Code Article 2.14 - Fees Table:

6. REQUIRED SITE PLANS

   See attached

   One copy of the site plan and one on a compact disc or appropriate digital media.
7. FINDINGS OF FACT WORKSHEET

Please select true or false for the following three questions:

**Sections 2.6.3.E. Standards for Variations**
No variations from the regulations of this development code shall be granted unless the entity or person granting such variation shall find based upon the evidence presented to them in each specific case that all three of the following criteria are true:

1) The property in question **cannot** yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations in that zoning district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   **Explanation:** Only 3 on site spaces for employees and customers without the variance. No additional revenue will be gained. Parking lot is only being constructed to replace lost parking.

---

**Fact to consider:**

a. The purpose of the variation is not based primarily upon a desire to increase financial gain.

---

2) The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   **Explanation:** Lot depth is only 42.5' deep. The lot likely cannot be developed on its own without being part of an adjacent development.

---

**Facts to consider:**

a. The particular physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the specific property involved, a particular hardship to the owner would result, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience if the strict letter of the regulations were to be carried out.

b. The conditions upon which an application for a variation is based are unique to the property for which the variance is sought, and are not applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification.

c. The practical difficulty or hardship is caused by this ordinance and has not been created by any persons presently having an interest in the property.

---

3) The variation, if granted, will **not** alter the essential character of the locality or be injurious to the public or other property or properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   **Explanation:** Parking is replacing existing parking that was already being used. No additional traffic is being created.

---

**Facts to consider:**

a. The granting of the variation will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located.

b. The proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property or substantially increase the danger of fire, or impair natural drainage or create drainage problems on adjacent properties, or endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood.
8. APPLICATION/METING PROCEDURES

A) The Zoning Board of Appeals has regularly scheduled meetings the second Thursday of each month at the City Hall Building, Room 400, 419 Fulton Street, Peoria, Illinois.

B) The deadline for submitting applications for regularly scheduled Zoning Board of Appeals meetings is twenty-eight (28) days prior to the meeting.

C) The Zoning Administrator must certify that an application for a public hearing is complete (completely filled out, received by the filing deadline, and accompanied by a compact disc or appropriate digital media of the site plan, including digital versions of the application and other attachments as required, including the filing fee) to be processed and scheduled for the next regularly scheduled meeting. Incomplete applications will be returned.

D) The applicant or applicant’s representative will receive notice of the date and time of the public hearing. At least fifteen days prior to the hearing, the Community Development Department will mail notices of the hearing to the owners of all property within 250 feet of the subject property.

E) The format for each public hearing is:
   - Chairperson proceeds with swearing-in procedures.
   - Chairperson announces the case.
   - Staff enters case into the record.
     - Staff presents the case.
     - Staff answers questions from the Commission.
   - Petitioner presents case and answers questions from the Commission.
   - Chairperson opens the meeting to the public.
   - Public comments – Chairperson may ask for response/input from Staff and Petitioner.
   - Petitioner presents closing statements.
   - Public testimony is closed. (No further public comment)
   - Commission deliberates and may consult Staff.
   - Commission prepares findings, if applicable.
   - Commission votes.

F) Application and inquiries should be submitted to:

   Zoning Administrator  
   City of Peoria Development Center  
   419 Fulton Street, Room 300  
   Peoria, Illinois 61602-1217

   Phone: (309) 494-8600  
   Fax: (309) 494-8680
LANDSCAPE REQUIREMENTS

**Adams Street Lot Width = (42.5')**

- Points Required: 42.5 / 2 = 22 Points
- Provide (2) Shade Trees
- 40 Points Total

**Morgan Street Lot Width = (81')**

- Points Required: 81 / 2 = 40.5 Points
- Provide (3) Evergreen Trees in a Row
- 45 Points Total

**Parking Lot Points**

- 7 Spaces - 1 Point
- Covered in the Front Yard Landscaping Points
- 3' High Boxwood Covered as a Parking Screen

**LEGEND**

- Evergreen Tree (15 Points)
- Shade Tree (20 Points)
- 3' High Hedge Row
- Shade Tree (20 Points)

**ADAMS STREET LOT WIDTH = (42.5')**

- Points Required: 42.5 / 2 = 22 Points
- Provide (2) Shade Trees
- 40 Points Total

**MORGAN STREET LOT WIDTH = (81')**

- Points Required: 81 / 2 = 40.5 Points
- Provide (3) Evergreen Trees in a Row
- 45 Points Total

**PARKING LOT POINTS**

- 7 Spaces - 1 Point
- Covered in the Front Yard Landscaping Points
- 3' High Boxwood Covered as a Parking Screen
Disclaimer: Data is provided 'as is' without warranty or any representation of accuracy, timeliness or completeness. The burden for determining fitness for, or the appropriateness for use, rests solely on the requester. The requester acknowledges and accepts the limitations of the Data, including the fact that the Data is in a constant state of maintenance. This website is NOT intended to be used for legal litigation or boundary disputes and is informational only. -Peoria County GIS Division

Map Scale
1 inch = 167 feet
6/6/2018
Disclaimer: Data is provided 'as is' without warranty or any representation of accuracy, timeliness or completeness. The burden for determining fitness for, or the appropriateness for use, rests solely on the requester. The requester acknowledges and accepts the limitations of the Data, including the fact that the Data is in a constant state of maintenance. This website is NOT intended to be used for legal litigation or boundary disputes and is informational only. -Peoria County GIS Division

Map Scale
1 inch = 42 feet
6/6/2018