



Madison County Government  
Planning and Development Department

*Matt Brandmeyer, AICP • Administrator*  
Madison County Administration Building  
157 N. Main Street, Suite 254 • Edwardsville, IL 62025-1964  
Phone (618) 692-7040 ext. 4468 • Fax (618) 692-8982  
E-Mail [zoning@co.madison.il.us](mailto:zoning@co.madison.il.us)  
<http://www.co.madison.il.us/Planning>

Date: July 13, 2015

To: Scott Hanson, City of Edwardsville  
David Coody, Village of Glen Carbon

From: Matt Brandmeyer, Madison County Planning & Development *MB*

Re: Proposed I-55 Code & Map Revisions

---

**This is the fourth in a series of memos that will look at demographics, development patterns, future housing demand, potential revisions to the I-55 map and development regulations, and future steps.**

---

As the result of comments we received at public hearings, ongoing meetings and conversations with the Homebuilders Association and the Realtors Association, information gathered from additional review and study, and meetings with the partner communities, I'm recommending the following changes to the I-55 Development Code:

**Article 1: General Provisions**

1. Change Section "1.4 Current Zoning" to specifically state that current land uses that are in conformance with the Madison County Zoning Ordinance, including but not limited to agriculture and single family residential, may continue to be used in this manner by the current owner or successive owners until the owner(s) proposes to develop the property, at which time it shall adhere to the I-55 Development Code. Change the name of this section to "1.4 Current Zoning and Land Use."

**Rationale:** Several people at the public hearings stated that the proposed code took away rights to farm ground. While this was never the case and would not be legal under Illinois statutes, the proposed language will hopefully address this concern.

**Article 2: Regulatory Plan**

1. Remove the property along the east side of Long Branch Road (Mrs. Long) and the property along the east side of Staunton Road, between Hortica and Goshen Road from the map.

**Rationale:** The subject property owners requested the change at the public hearings. The Long Branch property is part of a larger subdivision which was previously removed from the map, and the

owners of the Staunton Road property claim that their property is not shown on the adopted I-55 plan.

2. Change the name of “Urban Residential District” to “Neighborhood Residential District.”

**Rationale:** While the word ‘urban’ is broadly defined as an area that is or will be developed, it may be a misnomer in this application. Many people spoke to this at the public hearings. ‘Neighborhood’ is a better way to describe future subdivision development.

3. Expand the “Neighborhood Residential District” and reduce the size of the “General Neighborhood District.”

**Rationale:** This step is to simplify the coverage of the districts and the overall map. Glen Carbon requested that the portion along Old Troy Road remain “General Neighborhood,” which provides some commercial development options.

4. Switch the yellow and tan colors of the “Rural Residential” and “Neighborhood Residential” districts.

**Rationale:** This was a comment made by the Edwardsville Plan Commission when comparing the County’s I-55 map with the one Edwardsville prepared. It’s also identified in my 3/2/15 memo to Scott Hanson during the Edwardsville Ordinance Committee review.

5. Change the district descriptions in Section “2.2 General Provisions” of this chapter to reflect the changes made to the map and the development regulations.

**Rationale:** This will need to happen as a result of the proposed map changes and the revisions to the development regulations below.

### **Article 3: Development Regulations**

1. In Section 3.4.6.N, change the name of “Duplex, Triplex, Fourplex” to “Villa/Attached” Lot Type, and in Section 3.4.6.M, change the name to simply “Townhouse”. Make this change for all references.

**Rationale:** The proposed language is more commonly used.

2. In Table 3.4.2, remove “Apartment/Condominium” and “Row House/Townhouse” as permitted uses within the Neighborhood Residential District (previously the Urban Residential District).

**Rationale:** Several residents and homebuilders at the public hearing were opposed to potential multi-family developments within or nearby single-family subdivisions. One of the primary reasons for considering multi-family was to provide compactness and density to support walkability and the town center. Staff reviewed the buildable critical mass in the town center areas and found that the necessary density can be achieved within the current boundaries of each

district. With this change, multi-family and townhomes will be limited to Mixed-Use Commercial, Town Center, and General Neighborhood districts and will be prohibited in the Neighborhood Residential District.

3. In Section “3.4.6.O Single Family Detached”, change the lot size requirement to 7,500 square feet minimum and 21,780 square feet maximum. For property within 1,000 feet of the border of the Town Center District (not including properties that are not on the map), the range will be 7,500 to 10,890 square feet. Lot sizes may be reduced to the building envelope provided the overall density of the development does not exceed 7,500 sf/unit. In addition, replace the pictures in the code with more applicable examples.

**Rationale:** Several residents and homebuilders at the public hearing were opposed to smaller lots sizes. Some suggested that Edwardsville’s current rules should continue to be used – 7,500 is Edwardsville’s current minimum. Others said that subdivisions should continue to grow organically. The revised standards were taken directly from the subdivisions that were platted over the last 10 to 15 year. The development pattern reveals that just over 68% of the platted lots are in the 7,500 sf to 14,520 sf range and another 23.5% are between 14,520 and 21,780 sf. Along with other provisions, this range of lot sizes will achieve the objectives of the adopted I-55 plan.

4. In Sections “3.4.6.N Villa/Attached” and “3.4.6.O Single Family Detached” Lot Types, change the minimum and maximum lot widths to a range dependent on the size of the lot as follows:

50 ft. min. to 90 ft. max for lots between 7,500 sf and 10,890 sf  
60 ft. min. to 100 ft. max for lots between 10,891 sf and 14,520 sf  
70 ft. min. to 110 ft. max for lots between 14,521 sf and 21,780 sf

**Rationale:** Several people at the public hearing said that in addition to the lot sizes, the lot width requirement should reflect what has been done in the past. The revised lot widths are a direct reflection of the lot widths that have been platted over the last 10 to 15 years. This standard takes lot size into consideration, providing a wider range of frontage while meeting the objectives of the I-55 plan.

5. In Sections “3.4.6.N Villa/Attached” and “3.4.6.O Single Family Detached” Lot Types, allow for 0 ft. side yard at common walls for attached structures.

**Rationale:** The Homebuilders Association (HBA) mentioned adding a change to clarify rules for attached units. Staff agrees with the change.

6. In Section 3.7.7, remove the applicability of the Residential Architectural Standards from Single Family Detached, Villa/Attached, Estate, Countryside, and Farm Lot Types.

**Rationale:** Several residents at the public hearing and the HBA and Realtor’s Association expressed that architectural standards should be left to the prospective homeowner. The purpose of requiring architectural standards is to reinforce an expectation of high-quality residential development, which the city has enjoyed. Staff reviewed several existing subdivisions and found that all the homes already meet minimum standards for exterior materials – brick, stone, pre-cast, stucco, or siding. Indeed, there aren’t many other options for exterior materials. Since high-quality development is being accomplished without new rules, it may not be necessary to add restrictions. With the proposed change, architectural requirements will only be applied to commercial and multi-family development.

7. Remove the “Permitted Frontages” table from the Single Family Detached, Villa/Attached, Estate, Countryside, and Farm Lot Types. This change should also be reflected in Table 3.5.2 in the “Frontage Type Descriptions” Section. This will remove the requirement for porches, common yards, and bay windows in residential subdivisions.

**Rationale:** Several residents at the public hearings and the HBA and Realtor’s Association expressed that architectural features should be up to the prospective homeowner. After reviewing the frontages in several existing subdivisions, staff found that nearly 80% of homes had one of these features. Similar to the architectural standards, if they’re currently being accomplished without regulatory control, new rules may not be necessary.

#### **Article 4: Planned Unit Development**

1. Replace all “Regulatory Code and Pattern Book” references with “I-55 Development Code.”

**Rationale:** The pattern book phrase was used very early in this process, and the PUD section was never updated.

2. In 4.4.B-1 state that the PUD should be consistent with the “I-55 Plan” and not the code.

**Rationale:** The change was recommended by the Realtor’s Association. Staff agrees that it should be updated.

#### **Article 5: Land Uses**

1. Add residential land uses specifically for seniors in the Town Center. These include senior communities, including but not limited to, independent living, assisted living centers, residential care centers, and adult day care. Each of these land uses would be permitted with the Multifamily Lot Type.

**Rationale:** With an aging population and the necessity for housing to accommodate seniors' needs, the Town Center can be a focal point for senior living, which can fulfill the critical mass element necessary to support commercial space.

#### **Article 6: Street Design Standards**

1. Remove Section 6.1.7.I

**Rationale:** Alleys will not be encouraged in residential districts.

2. In 6.1.7.Q, change the existing language to state the following:

“Cul-de-sacs may be necessary where a street cannot be connected to adjoining development, either through a stub or a direct connection. In some cases, there may be topographical hindrances or waterways that won't allow a connection to be made. In other cases, the design of the subdivision won't allow for a connection at every point. In all cases, a street connection should be considered; however, the reviewing jurisdiction may consider a variance when barriers are present. Should a cul-de-sac be necessary then each cul-de-sac should be landscaped in the center and a pedestrian and/or bicycle through connection should be made to the adjoining property or development.”

**Rationale:** Several homebuilders were against a statement discouraging cul-de-sacs. There are several purposes for reducing the number of cul-de-sacs in an area. With more through streets, a homeowner will have more travel options through the neighborhood on residential streets instead of relying on a single route which can overload connector roads. Along the same lines, fire, police, and emergency services will also have more opportunities to respond to an emergency without having to rely on a single street. Lastly, through streets are also conducive to walking and biking.

3. Change the first sentence in Section “6.6.7 Alleys” to say “alleys shall be utilized for service and rear access to development parcels and lots in the Mixed-Use Commercial, General Neighborhood, and Town Center Districts.”

**Rationale:** Several people spoke against the use of alleys in residential areas. While alleys are used in some residential applications, they are not specifically conducive to some single-family residential development. Provided alleys will continue to be used as service lanes in commercial areas (in addition to other design aspects), this change can meet the objectives of the I-55 plan.